

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Comment on “Global risk of radioactive fallout after major nuclear reactor accidents” by J. Lelieveld et al. (2012)” by J. Lelieveld et al.

D.A.E. Ehlermann

dieter.ehlermann@web.de

Received and published: 21 September 2012

This anonymous reviewer really sees that here two distinct scientific approaches need to be morden: atmospheric spread of the debris from a catastrophic nuclear accident and the physical nature of such accident including its probability and measures taken elsewhere (not at Chernobyl and not at Fukushima) to reduce the emissions of such accidents as far as ever possible. As a follow-up of the criticized and disputed paper this would be the beneficial consequence of further efforts.

From the Chernobyl incident we have lot of data how and when radioisotopes were deposited; we have also (at least in Germany) the continuing measurement of Cs in

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



wild boar (any animal must be presented to the food control laboratory before put on the market!).

The original paper had adopted a scenario where at every site of a NPP the accident would be like Chernobyl; the modelling of the Fukushima emission is still arbitrary. What the world of nuclear power would welcome is modelling more realistic events.

Of course, the comments above are outside my basic competence; but after Chernobyl responsible for collecting and evaluating data about the radioactive contamination of food in Germany, those additional models and studies could be very helpful for governments and local authorities to organize and co-ordinate emergency plans.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 12, 19303, 2012.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper