

Interactive comment on “Regional pollution potentials of megacities and other major population centers” by M. G. Lawrence et al.

M. G. Lawrence et al.

Received and published: 12 March 2007

We are thankful for the comments of all three referees, who have generally seen the paper positively and worthy of publication after revisions, with no major criticisms on the runs, the relevance, the importance or the basic approach to the analysis. However, all three have criticized the format and organization of the manuscript and made suggestions that this needs to be revised, and in two cases (Referees #4 and #1) very substantial revisions are recommended. Some of these comments are related to our intended broad audience, as noted in our initial short response to Referee #4. In general, we find the suggestions sensible and helpful for focusing the manuscript more towards an atmospheric sciences specialist audience, as well as helping make it generally more easily readable, and in revising we plan to follow the majority of these. We give more specific information in the individual responses to each referee.

Here we also give a few comments that are applicable to all three reviews:

All referees were not satisfied with the description of the method of injection of the tracers, which we will revise to make it more definitive (the emissions are “per grid cell”, not per unit area or volume; we intended to make this clear by providing the units of 1 kg/s (without reference to area or volume), and stating that these were assigned to the model surface layer at the source location; however, our terminology “emitted...from the model surface layer” rather than “emitted...into...” was likely misleading).

All referees indicated that the discussion of the additional metric to explain the unexpected behavior of Mexico City was unnecessary to include; we will either shorten or remove this discussion (with perhaps a reference to the ACPD version for those curious about the unexpected behavior of the Mexico City tracer).

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 6, 13323, 2006.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper