

## Evaluating global emission inventories of biogenic bromocarbons.

### Response to Anonymous Referee #1

We thank the reviewer for his/her comments. The review comments are repeated below in *italics* and our responses to each are given in **bold**.

*In this article, four different emission inventories for the VSLs bromoform (CHBr<sub>3</sub>) and dibromomethane (CH<sub>2</sub>Br<sub>2</sub>) are evaluated on the basis of long-term data from ground measurement stations of NOAA and aircraft observations from the HIPPO and the SHIVA project. In the end the authors provide a new estimate of the stratospheric bromine loading based on the results of the investigations presented in this article. The article is well written and easy to understand. This evaluation provides important information for the decision which emission inventory to use. The only draw back is that it is not clear from the paper, how the emission inventories are accessible. I strongly recommend publication of this article.*

*Scientific comments:*

*This article appears to be not fully complete, as it awakes the desire to get an optimal emission inventory for CHBr<sub>3</sub> and CH<sub>2</sub>Br<sub>2</sub> compiled based on the findings of this article using the best performing emission inventory for each region and species. I understand, that this a lot of extra work. But at least it would be good to provide the information, where the single emission inventories are available for the interested reader/modeller.*

**We agree that formulation of a novel emission inventory would be desirable but would require work beyond the scope of this paper. This will be examined in future work. At present, the individual emission inventories are not archived in one place. However, we encourage potential users to contact the lead author of the respective publication in which the inventory is described. They are all co-authors on this manuscript and their affiliation is given.**

Technical corrections:

p. 12490, ll. 6-8: replace at least one of the three “contains”.

**OK.**

p. 12491, l. 3: What is TransCom-CH<sub>4</sub>  
. What does the question mark mean, a missing reference?

**TransCom-CH<sub>4</sub> was a model intercomparison project from which an optimised OH field was developed for use in models and evaluated. The missing reference has been corrected.**

p. 12491, l. 11: top-down, should this not be in italics?

**OK.**

p. 12491, l. 28: “magnitude/location” → “magnitude and location”

**OK.**

p. 12493, l. 1: remove “and”

**OK.**

p. 12503, l. 28: remove “data” behind CH<sub>2</sub>Br<sub>2</sub>

**OK.**

p. 12504, l. 20: “upto” → “up to”

**Ok.**

p. 12504, l. 20: “Although also ..” is inconvenient to read. Maybe “whilst also” ?

**OK, we will change.**

Figs. 11/12: The symbols for the different observations are not distinguishable in a plot of this small size.

**OK, we will make larger in the revised manuscript.**