1	Impact of external industrial sources on the regional and
2	local air quality of Mexico Megacity
3	
4	Supplementary Material
5	
6	V. H. Almanza ¹ , L. T. Molina ^{2,3} G. Li ² , J. Fast ⁴ and G. Sosa ^{1*}
7	[1]{Instituto Mexicano del Petróleo, 07730 México, D.F., México}
8	[2]{Molina Center for Energy and the Environment, La Jolla, CA, USA}
9	[3]{Department of Earth, Atmospheric and Planetary Sciences, Massachusetts Institute of
10	Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA}
11	[4]{Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA, USA}
12	* Correspondence to: G. Sosa (gsosa@imp.mx)
13	
14	In this supplement the corresponding Tables and Figures addressing Reviewers' comments
15	are provided.
16	

1 Table S1. Effect of including Multiscale FDDA in model simulations. Upper row:

2 baseline case of our previous study. Bottom row: simulation with Multiscale FDDA
 3 corresponding to RPC configuration case.

		_	WD	
Sta	tion	RMSEvec	IOA	BIAS
		(m/s)		(°)
CHA	(NE)	3.8	0.86	4.41
		1.29973	0.68699	1.29973
CUA	(SW)	2.99	0.75	0.2
		1.0032	0.78839	1.0032
EAC	(NW)	2.29	0.72	26.8
		0.94683	0.7184	0.94683
MER	(C)	2.45	0.75	-23.5
		0.84904	0.80453	0.84904
PLA	(SW)	2.22	0.81	-5.81
		0.79706	0.81221	0.79706
TAC	(NW)	2.21	0.68	6.27
		0.90808	0.85222	0.90808
TAH	(SE)	3.65	0.54	-0.16
		1.48058	0.70785	1.48058
TLA	(NW)	2.68	0.71	2.31
		0.99774	0.77368	0.99774
TPN	(SW)	3.93	0.63	27.64
		2.7928	0.5795	2.7928
VIF	(NE)	2.95	0.7	-35.61
		1.07771	0.81751	1.07771
XAL	(NE)	3.24	0.62	-11.54
		1.05576	0.71401	1.05576
T0		2.61	0.57	3.4
		0.84359	0.82871	0.84359
T1		3.38	0.81	-0.37
		1.10844	0.85306	1.10844
T2		3.6	0.88	9.53
		1.15227	0.89553	1.15227

⁴



2 Figure 1. Average SO₂ concentration after including the aerosol phase.



Figure 2. Boxplot of differences in the average SO₂ concentration for the considered simulation cases.

- 3 4 5



- 2 3 4





Figure 4. PM₁ Sulfate concentration on 26 March at 16:00 LST after considering the

- direct and indirect aerosol effects. Monitoring sites (red dots); MILAGRO supersites
 (green dots).



- Figure 5. Contribution of TIC, MCMA and cement plants on average SO₂ 1 concentration. Original results (top panel) and after including the aerosol chemistry
- 2 3 4 with direct/indirect effects (bottom panel).



Figure 6. Model convergence zone that prevented the transport to the south on 24 March at 17:00 LST: simulation with aerosol phase plus direct and indirect effect (left panel); original results with gas phase (right panel). These plots show the streamlines (orange), and the wind vectors of some monitoring stations (purple). The filled circles denote supersites location (yellow).



Figure 7. Contribution of TIC, MCMA and cement plants on average SO₂ concentration for 18 March.



Figure 8. Reduction scenario S5 after the inclusion of the aerosol phase (dark green) compared with the original results
(orange).



- 1 Figure 9. Ozone plume from TIC-generated precursors on 25 March at 20:00 LST. Baseline case for gas phase using Dudhia
- 2 scheme (left); Baseline case for gas phase using Goddard scheme (right).



Figure 10. Ozone plume from TIC-generated precursors after including the aerosol phase plus the direct and indirect effects on 24 March at 15:00 LST. Baseline case including all the anthropogenic sources (left); Simulation case with all the anthropogenic sources but the TIC (right); Difference of concentration fields (bottom).



1 2 3 4 Figure 11. Difference of the total average concentration for the entire simulation period.



Figure 12. Ozone concentration on 25 March at T1. Original Baseline case with gas

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 phase (blue); Baseline case with Goddard scheme for gas phase (red); Baseline case with Goddard scheme including the aerosol phase plus direct and indirect effects (green).





Figure 13. SO₂ time series at T0 supersite for each configuration of the sensitivity
cases. RPC results are in gold.