

Interactive comment on “An evolution strategy to estimate emission source distributions on a regional scale from atmospheric observations” by P. O’Brien et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 13 May 2003

Most of my previous comments have been addressed adequately and the paper is now much more balanced, except for two items:

- on page 1339, line 17, the phrase 'source activity' is used, where I think 'source strength' is meant. If so, I recommend to use strength, since activity may erroneously refer to economic activities etc.
- the response of the authors on my earlier remarks to the comparison of ES with SVD sections 5 and 7 was to include the phrase 'in almost all cases the ES improves over the SVD results when compared at equivalent resolutions' (abstract; p. 1343, line 21; p. 1347, line 2). However, in my view comparison of Fig. 5 and 6 (a) and (b) does not support such a statement.

It is true for the area source (right side), but not for the distributed source:

(a) low resolution: both fail completely;

(b) medium resolution: both show false sources or miss sources

- ES misses some central points and is off at the far left and far right side and at the top-right side;

- SVD is far off at the bottom-left and far right side and side and at the the top-centre.

I do not have an alternative siggestion, but it seems that this conclusion is not well defined.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 3, 1333, 2003.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Print Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)