

***Interactive comment on* “Characterizing ozone production in the Mexico City Metropolitan Area: a case study using a chemical transport model” by W. Lei et al.**

C. Kolb (Editor)

kolb@aerodyne.com

Received and published: 6 October 2006

Both Reviewers have raised specific issues that, if addressed well, would significantly strengthen the manuscript. Reviewer 1 views the current manuscript quite favorably, but notes approximately twenty instances where there are ambiguities, possible errors, or opportunities to improve the presentation. Reviewer 2 is less impressed with the manuscript and is not convinced it presents novel insights into the photochemistry of the Mexico City Metropolitan Area (MCMA) or into urban photochemistry in general.

Each review comments specifically on the issue of modeling domains. It is clear that a better job needs to be done in justifying the selection of model domain size and lo-

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

**Interactive
Comment**

cation and the validity of comparing model results for specific domains with various data sets. The authors also need to consider Reviewer 2's concerns about what distinguishes this manuscript from previously published papers on MCMA photochemistry, specifically addressing which modeling techniques, model results, or better measurement data/model comparisons allow the conclusions of this manuscript to differ from or be more definitive than those of other, comparable studies. This will probably require presenting more specific comparisons with other reasonably recent publications modeling either MCMA photochemistry or that of similar urban areas.

I suggest that the authors carefully consider and respond to the comments and suggestions of both Reviewers and prepare a revised manuscript. Since the original manuscript is already fairly long, care needs to be taken to present additional material clearly but also succinctly. A response document clearly explaining the authors' responses to each Reviewer's specific critical comments and suggestions and specifying what changes have been made to the manuscript and the location of these changes should also be prepared and submitted. It is likely that additional comments from both Reviewers the revised manuscript and response document will be solicited

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 6, 7959, 2006.

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