

COMMENT FROM REVIEWER A

The paper is ready for publication.

My main concern is for the deposition scheme. I remain unconvinced by the choice of the deposition scheme but my reservation does not justify the non-publication of the paper. From my point of view they use a wet deposition scheme which aims to model many physical processes requiring plenty of information not available. Therefore they try to simplify the processes. To do so they use many parameters. But again, it is just a comment and the authors do not need to modify their paper and I believe the paper is very interesting.

The modifications done by the authors feet generally the reviewer comments. My only comment concerns the introduction. I do not agree with the paragraph to discriminate between inverse modelling approaches and what they call “reverse” approaches:

- It cannot be a merit to assess a release event by using only one data point. For information it can be done also with inverse modelling approach but in this case the assessment is highly uncertain.
- They do not need to justify their use of the reverse method and the sentence L7-8 p7 is not relevant.

From my point of view they should skip all this discussion except the part on the merit of using local data.

Several typos remain in the text.