

[Interactive
Comment](#)

Interactive comment on “Estimates of European emissions of methyl chloroform using a Bayesian inversion method” by M. Maione et al.

M. Maione et al.

michela.maione@uniurb.it

Received and published: 12 June 2014

Responses to Referee 1

Major comments

COMMENT #1: I have some doubts about the results presented in figure 4. If I understand the method correctly, you assign uncertainties to the prior emissions that are a fraction of the emissions themselves. This implies that with zero or very small emissions the assigned uncertainty is small (page 8221).

REPLY: The referee is right. That piece of text was from a previous version of the paper and does not hold anymore. Therefore, the text has been rewritten as follows:

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



“As there is no information about uncertainties, we used the uncertainty in the matrix diagonal elements as defined in Stohl (2009) i.e., for inversion box j , $\sigma_{X^j} = \max(p \cdot x_j, 2 \cdot p \cdot x_{surf})$ with p being a properly chosen scaling factor, x_j the a priori emission flux in the inversion box j , and x_{surf} the global emission value, as estimated by Rigby et al., (2013), homogeneously distributed in the grid cells corresponding to land areas. We tested p values ranging from 50% to 500% of the prior emission estimate, balancing between (i) enough flexibility in emissions to allow adjustments that better fit the observations and (ii) not too high flexibility that might lead to over-fitting of the observations and to noisy and unrealistic emissions.”

COMMENT #2: Also, the resolution at which the emissions are derived varies. In a region with low sensitivity (e.g. Norway) the resolution should be about 36x36 degrees (page 8218).

REPLY: The referee is right. There was a misprint: 36°x36° are the box dimensions for the global inversion, covering the ocean (boxes not inverted). Using the three stations, the European domain is resolved in boxes whose dimension are 1°x1° lat long or 2°x2° lat long in Spain Portugal and Norway. We have corrected the text accordingly.

COMMENT #3: Figure 4 (and the accompanying text) shows that emissions are projected in Norway, exactly at the spots where “emissions to soil and water” are reported. And these were not included in the prior inventory, so I guess that the prior emissions are very low. The same holds for Madrid, Barcelona and hotspots in Northern Africa. Yet, the posterior emissions presented in figure 4 (right panel) show “hotspot” emissions rather far away from the measurement locations that are not in the prior (e.g. Madrid). This implies a tremendous skill of the model to pinpoint emissions in places where the prior has low values (with an uncertainty that is proportional to this low emissions). I cannot believe that inversions are capable to accomplish this, although also Appendix B (figure B1) shows that emissions are derived at the coast of Norway. So, I do not believe that the prior emission map in Figure 4 (left) and the described uncertainty was the basis for the posterior map in Figure 4b. So I would like to see more

analysis. What station constrains the Norway emissions? What was the resolution of the emission grid in Norway, Spain, and Portugal?

REPLY: the boxes in remote regions have dimension $1^\circ \times 1^\circ$ or $2^\circ \times 2^\circ$ and the emission from each box is distributed according to the population. This allows us to allocate emissions also in remote hot-spots, using the a priori emission field and uncertainty as described above. This choice is particularly appropriate for a compound like MCF that is purely anthropogenic. It is important to highlight that the use of such artifice is essential in order to obtain the result reported in Fig.4. In such remote areas the analysis is definitely qualitative, since the emission intensity is affected by an uncertainty equal to the emission itself. The sensitivity maps of the three single stations reported in Fig. 1 can show the sensitivity to emissions in Norway of each station

COMMENT #4 Another major issue is the posterior fit with the observations. The information is presented in Appendix A1.4. The relevant section is: "Given that the sources regions are scarce. . . being CMN with $r2,ba = 0.5$." In general, these results seem to be influenced by the fact that both the model and the observations correctly predict the general decline in MCF over the years. This naturally leads to a high correlation, which has nothing to do with the inversion. So, I think the analysis should be done on de-trended data. As a result, I would expect a very small $r2$. What strikes me also is the small improvement of the $r2eb$ compared to $r2ea$. Since this is the signal that drives the inversion, it would be instructive to present time series at the various stations (prior and posterior) just to see the skill of the model. Statistics do not look promising though. In Appendix A1.4 it is also written "the low values (of $r2eb$) obtained at MHD in this analysis confirms how scarcely is MHD affected by polluted air masses, despite the presence of numerous UK sources declared by the E-PRTR inventory". The correlation is not determined by the low number of data-points, but by the skill of the model to reproduce enhancements above the background. This has nothing to do with "scarcely". So, in general, I think Appendix A1.4 should be rewritten (text is not as well written as the main text), and more clearly present how the observations above

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



the baseline drive the emission increments. After all, these are the data that drive the whole story in the main text.

REPLY: We re-wrote the Appendix in order to make it clearer. Furthermore, the referee notes that, in order to evaluate the model performance, the coefficients r_{2ba} r_{2bb} r_{2a} r_{2b} should be evaluated on the detrended time series. Our reply is that the correlation between the observed and the not-detrended modelled signal can show not only the model capability but also the emission field characteristics (e.g. r_{2ba} for MHD is 0.91, suggesting that the station is “remote” with respect to the main MCF sources in the SEF area). The model skill can be evaluated through the differences between the a priori and a posteriori coefficients. However, the more crucial comment is that concerning the evaluation of the model performance based of the correlation coefficient of the enhancements above the baseline. The three stations used for the inversion show rather low r_{2eb} r_{2ea} values, the two mountain sites because of the well known “incurable” errors affecting mountain stations, and MHD because too far away from the main source region (SEF). In particular, JFJ and CMN have r_{2eb} r_{2ea} values 0.05 0.07 (JFJ) e 0.12 0.16 (CMN), meanwhile MHD values are 0.06 0.1., and I don’t think that, with the available data, we will be able to obtain a significant model improvement. Nevertheless, all the tests performed showed that the results are congruous

Minor comments

Page 8211, line 4. I think it should be stressed here that the amendments to the Montreal protocol were much more stringent than the original protocol. Page 8212, line 6. Same issue.

Reply: we changed the text accordingly

Page 8212, line 13: longitudinal? Do you mean latitudinal?

Reply: yes, text changed

Page 8213, line 20: on going. Should be one word (ongoing).

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Reply: yes, text changed

Page 8214, line 11: given the fact that the other stations project emissions in Norway, I find it hard to believe that ZEP does not “see “ these emissions. Thus, I find it rather strange that 1/4 of the SOGE network is not used in this analysis. At least it would be interesting to present the background concentration of ZEP in this paper.

Reply: As shown by the plot in Fig 2, reporting the MCF time series at ZEP, enhancements above the baseline are absent. We performed some tests also including ZEP for the two-year period in which the simulations were available for that station. The results didn't produce any significant difference in the estimates of the European emission fluxes or any improvement in the uncertainty associated to the emissions from Norway. For this reason, we didn't consider useful for our analysis to prolong the computation time adding the simulations for ZEP.

Page 8214, line 22: Awkward sentence. Consider: ..and m/z values of are selected for detection and ...of MCF.

Reply: text changed accordingly

Page 8215, line 19: Space is missing I guess (SA-6RIX)

Reply: yes, text changed

Page 8216, line 22: consider “points” after data

Reply: yes, text changed

Page 8217, line 24: “analytical”. This is in conflict with the iterative procedure described under (iii) at line 27. Reply: yes, text changed

Page 8218, line 10: I think this does not reflect an outlier in the model simulation, but the fact that the model is not able to adequately represent a certain measurement (i.e. a representation error). By the way, in the remainder of the paper, I have not seen a quantification of the number of outliers, and their influence on the inversion. Reply: the

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

[Interactive
Comment](#)

discussion on outliers is part of the inversion technique as described in Stohl et al., 2009 and Stohl et al., 2010. The text has been modified as follows: “The method used also identifies “outliers” in the model-simulated mixing ratios and assigns them large uncertainties to prevent the solution being strongly influenced by large measurement and/or model errors (Stohl et al. 2009).”

Page 8218, line 25: I suggest to replace “but” by “and” . Reply: text changed

Page 8218, line 26: “is needed”. I suggest something like: “The emissions at large distances from the measurement locations cannot be resolved at high spatial resolution”

Reply: text changed

Page 8219, line 3: At the start of this paragraph, it would be useful to write something about the reason why this second method is needed. Later on it becomes more or less clear, but this is the location to highlight this. Also mention here that you can estimate time varying emissions with the point source analysis (now it is written later).

Reply: we cannot anticipate here, before the description of the inversion results, the reason why we decided to apply this method.

Page 8219, line 23: “While individual emission values are noisy, their average can substantially reduce this noise”. Individual data points cannot be noisy. I would describe the method (as I understand it) as follows: The PSA method takes each individual measurement above the baseline, and determines the emission that is needed in a predefined source region (X) to reproduce this measurement exactly. Due to inaccuracies in transport and other numerical errors, this normally results in a noisy emission time series that, upon averaging in time, provides an estimate of the emission in region

Reply: we have modified the text following the reviewer’s suggestion

Page 8220, line 6: mixing ratio enhancements above the baseline. I would use either “mixing ratio enhancements” or “mixing ratios above the baseline”. Also the caption of figure 2

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

Reply: text changed

Page 8221, line 1: “emissions to soil and water”. Not clear to me what is meant exactly. Please clarify.

Reply: the E-PRTR database divides emissions into emissions to three environmental compartments: air, water and soil. Emissions to soil and water do not include subsequent and fugitive emissions from these two compartments to the atmosphere. The remarkable ability of the model to identify these emissions (not included in our a priori) in our opinion is to be considered a validation, although qualitative, of the reliability of the simulations.

Page 8221, line 10: “leading to”, consider, “i.e. 50% to 500% of the prior emission estimate. “

Reply: text changed

Page 8221, line 11: “The emission variability and correlations between measured and a posteriori modelled data substantially increased over this range of values”. Unclear sentence. I think the intention is to say that you try to balance between (i) enough flexibility in emissions to allow adjustments that fit the observations better (ii) not too much flexibility because this might lead to over-fitting of the observations and noisy and unrealistic emissions (e.g. negative emissions). I think this message should be better phrased here.

Reply: text changed

Page 8221, line 14: I think “changes” should be “improvements”.

Reply: text changed

Page 8221, line 17: “allowing” should be “obtaining”.

Reply: text changed

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Page 8221, line 25: points (ii) and (iii). See major comment.

Reply: see replies above

Page 8222, line 4: within SEF are included. I suggest: “SEF includes”

Reply: text changed

Page 8222, line 10: We can extend: : :. I suggest: We extend (to reflect your choice).

Reply: text changed

Page 8223, line 10: not impacted: : :. I suggest: not severely impacted

Reply: text changed

Page 8223, line 26: cannot be excluded. I think “is likely” better reflects the situation.

Reply: text changed

Page 8224, line 6: MHD, meanwhile. I suggest full stop: ..MHD. Meanwhile : : :

Reply: text changed

Page 8225, line 6: (except MHD). I suggest to use: : :., but not for MHD.

Reply: text changed

Page 8225, line 7: The error estimates for JFJ and MHD are unrealistically low. How are these number derived? Later on it is suggested that the error bars reflect the scatter in the individually bi-hourly derived estimates. I cannot imagine such small scatter, given e.g. the uncertainty in transport modelling.

Reply: Error bars in the plot have been calculated as a 95% confidence interval for the mean:

(see equation)

Where S is the standard deviation of N sample data. In Figure 3 is reported the time

C3547

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



series of estimated emissions for JFJ for a SRRv threshold > 1500. The time series shows how, despite the transport model uncertainties, the reported data are not too much scattered.

Page 8225, line 19: “This is expected as the inversion results are bound towards a priori emissions that are clearly too low for the SEF area. This leads to a low bias also in the obtained a posteriori emissions”. I disagree with this sentence. If you ascribe all the measured concentration enhancement to emission from the SEF region (as done with PSA), you will overestimate the SEF emissions (i.e. you project emissions elsewhere also to this region). So I think that both the Bayesian and PSA analysis are biased, but the latter more obviously.

Reply: Probably there is a misunderstanding. Actually, nor the Bayesian inversion, nor the PSA assigns all the spikes to the SEF area. The Bayesian inversion assigns a higher uncertainty to the SEF area than to the rest of the domain. As shown by the comparison between the observed and modelled time series (reported in Figure 4), the observed concentration maxima intensities sometimes are not well reproduced. We think that this suggests that emissions from the SEF area are sometimes underestimated. We do not claim that the PSA assigns all the enhancements to the SEF area; as stated at page 8224 line 24: “[...] excess concentrations that cannot be explained by the a priori emission field are assumed to originate exclusively from the SEF area.” Nonetheless, emissions could be overestimated due to the incomplete information used to derive the a priori (sources’ number and intensity). In Figure 5 we report a comparison between the observed and modelled time series using the PSA.

Page 8226, line 19: Conclusions. I suggest, “Discussion and Conclusions”, since some discussion is provided, e.g. on non-reported emissions.

Reply: text changed

Page 8227, line 2: “With a less accurate a prior field”. I have not read this in the main paper. It is presented in Appendix B, but no reference to this section can be found.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

Reply: Reference added

Page 8227, around line 13: I find this hard to believe. See major comments.

Reply: see reply above

Page 8227, around line 15: “It is thus shown”. I think this is not convincingly shown in the paper. Maybe there are “signs” of emissions from Norway, but omitting ZEP from the analysis is strange then. Which station picks up the signal, and what is the resolution at which the emissions are calculated? The reported errors are anyhow 100%, so “shown” is way to strong.

Reply: text changed

Page 8227, line 26: “even higher”. See remark above.

Reply: text changed

Page 8228, line 13: grids. Should be grid.

Reply: text changed

Page 8228, line 15: Rp. How defined? I understand to varied the grid on which emissions are derived (between 2000 and 6000?, how many simulations?). This gives a mean emission and variations. But what is meant with “maximum error”?

Reply: the Rp parameter quantifies the emission uncertainty for each year using three different tests: i) A priori emission field modulation, ii) Station network geometry e iii) Meteorological data resolution described in appendixes A1.1, A1.2 e A1.3. These tests produced 8 independent estimates, whose variations have been quantified and defined as the maximum error (or maximum semi-dispersion) defined as:

Maximum error = (maximum emission estimate – minimum emission estimate)/2

Page 8228, line 20: I think “comprised” can be removed. Does Rp now relate to the variance between the different scaling factors or to the variance calculated on the

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



different emission grid (between 2000 and 6000)? Also, in table A1 I cannot find the reported values for the SEF region. Under which header?

Reply: we removed comprised. As stated above Rp includes all the uncertainties described in Appendixes A1.1, A1.2 e A1.3. Table A1 is referred to the SEF region only (see Table caption) and shows the uncertainties associated to the three tests evaluated separately for two years. They are: Geometry: Station network geometry; Intensity: A priori emission field modulation; Wind field: Meteorological data resolution. We modified the table accordingly.

Page 8229, line 1: I thought the analysis was done only for 2008 and 2009?

Reply: In paragraph “A1 Sensitivity tests”, we say that the “A priori emission field modulation” has been performed for the entire study period. However, Figure A1 reports 2008 results only.

Page 8229, line 5: In which column?

Reply: see our reply to comment Page 8228, line 20

Page 8229, line 12: For the other regions the averaged Rp is around 40% (Table A1). Table A1 is about SEF.

Reply: we changed the text accordingly

Page 8229, line 14: Figure A2 is a mystery. The caption mentions 5 regions, while the number of points is much larger. Also, the numbers in the text do not seem to correspond with the figure. So I doubt if the correct figure is shown.

Reply: the figure is correct but there is a mistake in the caption, because we have 9 (not 5) areas. The plot includes 9 areas X 3 geometries, i.e. 27 data points.

Page 8229, line 20-21. Again the values in the text do not correspond to table A1.

Reply: we changed the text accordingly

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

Page 8230, line 9. “The relative error reduction $1 - \frac{\sigma_{\text{CMN}}}{\sigma_{\text{Eb}}}$ (see Table A2) for CMN and JFJ were 0.18 and 0.17, respectively, and for MHD was 0.42, showing that the two mountain stations are more influenced by the sources present in the study domain”. I do not see from these numbers that the mountain stations are more influenced by the sources. I would expect actually a larger error reduction at CMN and JFJ if emissions are updated, because there is more to gain.

Reply: we agree with the referee comment. We modified the text of Appendix A1.4, stating that this result shows the better performance of the model at MHD. An improvement was likely to be achieved for CMN and JFJ whose difference between the a priori and a posteriori emission fields was higher than at MHD. If this is not occurring is clearly to be ascribed to the poorer performance of the meteorological and dispersion model at the mountain sites with respect to MHD.

Page 8232, line 4-5. Note here that since the emissions are homogeneous, also the assigned errors are homogeneous. I find it rather surprising that specific hotspots are retrieved in this inversion (see also major comment #1). For instance, Greece, northern Africa and Norway. These areas are quite distant from the stations, so transport errors will be considerable. Again, at which resolution have these inversions been done?

Reply: see replies to major comments

Table 1: unit (%)? Should that not include a time unit?

Reply: units added

Table A2: units are missing in general.

Reply: units added

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/14/C3540/2014/acpd-14-C3540-2014-supplement.pdf>

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 14, 8209, 2014.

ACPD

14, C3540–C3558, 2014

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C3552






Fig. 1. Sensitivity to emissions in Norway of each station used in this study

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)




Fig. 2. Methylchloroform time series at Zepellin station (ZEP)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)




Fig. 3. Time series of estimated emissions for JFJ for a SRRv threshold >1500

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)




Fig. 4. Comparison between the observed (grey) and modelled (red) time series at the three stations.


[Interactive
Comment](#)

Fig. 5. Comparison between the observed (grey) and modelled (red) time series at CMN obtained using the PSA

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

[Interactive
Comment](#)

$$\sigma = 1.96 \frac{S}{\sqrt{N}}$$

Fig. 6. Equation

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)