Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 13, C8104–C8105, 2013 www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/13/C8104/2013/

© Author(s) 2013. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribute 3.0 License.



Interactive comment on "Feasibility and difficulties on China new air quality standard compliance: PRD case of PM_{2.5} and ozone from 2010 to 2025" by H. Liu et al.

T. Wang (Editor)

cetwang@polyu.edu.hk

Received and published: 17 October 2013

Dear authors,

Voure einearaly

Thanks for your effort in addressing my comments. I have two follow-up suggestions:

(1) On projection of future emissions outside the PRD region: it will be good to state how it is treated in the modeling section (4.1). Most likely, other regions will take control measures similar to the PRD region, so long-range transport from outside into the PRD will likely decrease in future. Thus the current projection of the air quality is a conservative one, that is, actual air quality will be better if a decrease of outside

C8104

transport is considered. I think it is good to add this point.

(2) Again on the increase in ozone (Section 4.3): I suggest adding more discussions on why ozone non-attainment rate will increase. From the emission estimate for GZ; NOx will reduce by 51.9% and VOC by 41.3% compared to 2010. The percentage of reduction rate is similar, so the VOC/NOX ratio will only increase by about 20%? Will this together with large absolute decrease in NOx and VOCs lead to a large increase in ozone production? This seems difficult to understand. Will future VOCs become more reactive? Will biogenic emissions be more important after a large reduction of anthropogenic sources? I think it is important to add some results and discussions to explain the modeled increase in ozone. This will also make the follow-up discussion of California experience in ozone control more relevant.

rours sincerery,						
Tao Wang						
Interactive comment on Atmos.	Chem.	Phys.	Discuss.,	13,	20923,	2013.