

Interactive  
Comment

# ***Interactive comment on “The impact of satellite-adjusted NO<sub>x</sub> emissions on simulated NO<sub>x</sub> and O<sub>3</sub> discrepancies in the urban and outflow areas of the Pacific and Lower Middle US” by Y. Choi***

**Anonymous Referee #3**

Received and published: 18 November 2013

General comments:

This is an interesting paper that characterized the changes in simulated surface O<sub>3</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> when replacing bottom-up NEI2005 NO<sub>x</sub> emissions with the GOME-2 NO<sub>2</sub> column constrained (top-down) NO<sub>x</sub> emissions over the contiguous U.S. The paper is well written and could provide some insights into the potential biases in the NEI2005 NO<sub>x</sub> emissions over some regions of the U.S. The limitation of the study is fully discussed at the conclusion section. I recommend the publication of this paper after minor

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



revision.

Specific comments:

1) Is there a particular reason to choose NO<sub>2</sub> column retrieved from GOME over those from OMI for this study?

2) Some details should be provided on how the GOME2009 emissions were obtained. I imagine that satellite NO<sub>2</sub> column retrievals are more accurate for regions with high NO<sub>x</sub> (emissions), and may be less accurate (or below the sensitivity of the satellite sensor) for regions with low NO<sub>x</sub>. How does GOME2009 account for those during the inversion process?

3) To me the significance of this study is its implication of potential NO<sub>x</sub> emission biases in NEI2005, hence it would be valuable to discuss whether the likely biases in NO<sub>x</sub> emission found this study is reduced in NEI2008.

4) Although well written in general, the manuscript is a bit on the lengthy sides. Maybe that it could be more concise.

Technical and minor comments:

On page 21166, Lines 20-23: When several observational sites collocate with one same model grid, do the observational data from those sites get averaged before comparing with simulated data for that grid point?

On page 21173, Lines 10-14: Not clear what “decreased in a more efficient manner” means. Did you account for PBL depth variability at night for this statement?

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 13, 21159, 2013.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

