

## ***Interactive comment on “Sensitivities of UK PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations to emissions reductions” by M. Vieno et al.***

**T. Oxley (Referee)**

t.oxley@imperial.ac.uk

Received and published: 19 August 2015

General Comments: This is a useful paper describing the sensitivity of UK PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations and therefore health impacts to changes in primary and secondary precursor emissions using the EMEP4UK ACTM. I found that figure 6 not only doesn't add to the manuscript, but that it actually made it more difficult to follow because it took me some time to work out what the map was actually showing me, ie a 30% reduction in NH<sub>3</sub> combined with a 30% increase in pPM<sub>2.5</sub>, which was a bit strange? The point the authors make regarding urban or rural impacts is valid, but I had already understood this from Figure 4. Specific Comments: Is figure 2 really necessary as it is simply a population map which could be downloaded from [www.ons.gov.uk](http://www.ons.gov.uk) P20890, L14: I think

C6047

it would benefit to remove Figure 6 and revise these paragraphs accordingly so that the discussion of 2010 and 2030 effects flows better. P20891, L1: Figure 8 I like. Figure 6b is definitely unnecessary having seen figure 8.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 15, 20881, 2015.

C6048