

[Interactive
Comment](#)

Interactive comment on “Particle number concentrations over Europe in 2030: the role of emissions and new particle formation” by L. Ahlm et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 29 May 2013

This paper is well written and authors discussed well the results of the model in scientific ways addressing domain wide results and relating them to specific receptor sites. It would be more clear for the future readers if the followings are clearer.

1. In section 3.2, authors mention that the Pan–European anthropogenic Particle Number Emission Inventory (Kulmala et al., 2011) is used for the particles whose diameters range 10–300 nm, and for the larger particles, the Pan-European Carbonaceous Aerosol Inventory (Kulmala et al., 2011) used for PM_{2.5} emissions. Is this applied regardless of types of PM_{2.5} species? How authors treat particle distribution from boundary condition. This might be important when dust emission plays an important

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



role in Europe.

2. From Fig. 1 and Fig. 3, the west Spain and East Europe including Bulgaria and Greece are staying higher level of N_{tot} while emission levels are reduced. I think that authors mention that it is due to reduction of condensational sink, and they relate this to the receptor sites of Ispra and Cabauw. I think that it is good and strong points of this paper. Readers can understand well about the results of N_{tot} . But I am curious about why high level of N_{100} is kept to be maintained around the area of the south east England, Belgium, and Netherland while emission is reduced. It looks this area is high-lightened while other area N_{100} level went down along the reduction of emission level. Is this because there are strong sea-salt emissions whose diameter is bigger than 100 nm around these region or any other direct $PM_{2.5}$ emissions? I hope authors also discuss the N_{100} patterns shown in the Figures.

3. From Fig. 4 (median diurnal cycle) and Fig. 5 (total number distribution probability distribution curves), authors relate the nucleation events indirectly. They address impact of nucleation to the budget of N_{tot} , N_{10} , and N_{100} in Fig. 6. To dig out further the role of emissions of each species, authors report Table 3 and conclude that SO_2 contributes most of particle number concentrations followed by $PM_{2.5}$ in Europe. This result is a quite contrast to the sensitivity result of Gaydos et al. (2005). Authors in the paper found that reducing SO_2 increases a number of nucleation events in Pittsburgh, PA in July as it reduces ammonia by forming ammonia sulfate. They saw that NH_3 plays an important role in the nucleation events in summer in Pittsburgh, PA. It looks most of Europe has abundant ammonia than Pittsburgh from this work. I hope authors mention the general level of ammonia in Europe so that readers can get a sense of why nucleation in Europe is different from Pittsburgh, PA, United States.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 13, 8769, 2013.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper