

## ***Interactive comment on “Evaluating the performance of pyrogenic and biogenic emission inventories against one decade of space-based formaldehyde columns” by T. Stavrou et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #4**

Received and published: 21 October 2008

Stavrou et al. use the recently established long-time global dataset of tropospheric formaldehyde retrieved from GOME and SCIAMACHY (published in de Smedt et al. 2008, ACP) to indirectly evaluate the performance of different global inventories of biogenic and biomass burning emissions. The evaluation is done by comparing the temporal pattern of observed HCHO columns over selected regions with HCHO columns that have been simulated with the IMAGES global chemical transport model using three different combinations of emission inventories, namely the GFEDv1 and the GFEDv2 biomass burning emissions inventories and the GEIA and the MEGAN-ECMWF inventory of biogenic emissions. This work is a first step forward to an improvement of available HCHO emission inventories, which is of great potential use for future atmo-

S8422

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



spheric chemistry modelling studies. As consequence, I consider the paper a valuable contribution to ACP, provided that several modifications are made:

General comments:

1) The paper is too long. There are several sections that could be shortened without narrowing the scientific value of the paper. In particular, large sections of chapter 2 are redundant as they use almost the same wording as the description provided in de Smedt et al. 2008. It would be sufficient to refer to the detailed description of technical details/error estimation in de Smedt et al. (2008) and provide only a short summary here.

2) The choice of the emission inventories, the statistics applied and the conclusions drawn out of the comparisons with the observed time series of HCHO columns do not convince me.

a) The GFEDv2 biomass burning inventory uses improved datasets and methods compared to the earlier version GFEDv1. The GFEDv1 inventory in the simulation S2 (with MEGAN-ECMWF), however, appears to better reflects the observed seasonal patterns in some regions than the simulation with the GFEDv2 inventory (with MEGAN-ECMWF). The differences in the correlation coefficients (S2 and S3) are, however, generally small. To provide a convincing conclusion, the differences need to be tested for statistical significance taking into account the 'true' number of degrees of freedom (sample size adjusted for autocorrelation). Simple linear correlation of the time series of modelled columns with observed columns is, to my opinion, not sufficient to prove that one inventory is better than the other. The correlation analysis also needs to cover the anomaly HCHO columns time series (deviation from the average seasonal cycle in HCHO columns).

If the outdated GFEDv1 performs significantly better than the GFEDv2 (in terms of statistical significance) in some regions, then a discussion of possible reasons (e.g. unrealistic fuel loads in GFEDv2) will be helpful. The conclusion should then contain

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



recommendations in which regions the GFEDv2 inventory needs further improvements.

b) The comments made in a) also apply to the difference between the GEIA and the MEGAN-ECMWF inventory (simulations S1 and S2).

c) Given the large uncertainty of the observed HCHO columns as described in de Smedt et al. (2008) and as visible from the large error bars in Fig. 10-14, all three simulations (S1-S3) generally lie within the range of observed values. Consequently, all combinations of the emission inventories can be considered as a realistic estimate. What would be of potential interest to the atmospheric chemistry modelling community is to use the approach used in this paper to obtain realistic lower and upper bounds of HCHO emission estimates.

d) The title of your paper announces the evaluation of the performance of pyrogenic and biogenic emission inventories. Besides the GFED biomass burning inventories (one of which is outdated), there are other biomass burning emission inventories commonly used in atmospheric chemistry modelling studies that could have been included into this evaluation work (e.g. the regional inventory 3BEM (Longo et al. 2007, ACPD) and other inventories listed at [http://www.aero.jussieu.fr/projet/ACCENT/database\\_table\\_inventories.php](http://www.aero.jussieu.fr/projet/ACCENT/database_table_inventories.php)). Please discuss why your study focussed on the GFED inventories, only. To my opinion, the paper would gain substantial value if it contained a more comprehensive evaluation by including one or more 'independent' biomass burning emission inventories. (Independent in terms of the different methodology used by different authors. The fire satellite datasets are commonly the same, e.g. ATSR or MODIS fire counts).

Specific comments:

1. Page 16982 Lines 1-3: Please mention the period your study is covering (i.e. 1997-2006).

2. Page 16982 Lines 23-27: Please provide a concluding remark at the end of the

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



abstract (so far, you only present results).

3. Page 16995 Lines 1-8: Please provide a quantitative description of the differences between the GEIA and the MEGAN-ECMWF emission inventory used (e.g. in a table).

4. Pages 16999 - 17000: You choose selected years for studying the contribution of different emission sources and to compare modelled HCHO columns with observed HCHO columns (Figures 4-6). How do you justify the selection of these specific years? Are the results different for other years?

5. Pages 16999 - 17000: Please restructure the section 5.1. The first sentence of Chapter 5.1 describes a model study focussing on the year 2006, only. In the subsequent, you present results of a model study covering the years 1997, 2000, 2005, which has not been introduced previously. This is confusing.

6. Page 17000 Lines 16-27: Please restructure this section. The first sentence of Chapter 5.1 describes a model study focussing on the year 2006, only. In the subsequent, you present results of a model study covering the years 1997, 2000, 2005, which has not been introduced previously. This is confusing.

7. Page 17001 Lines 23-26: Please mention data the observed HCHO columns are displayed as black error bars.

8. Page 17001 Lines 23-26: Please describe what regression model you applied to calculate the correlation coefficient between monthly averaged modelled and monthly averaged observed HCHO columns. I assume you applied a linear regression model with  $r$  is the Pearson's correlation coefficient. Please also mention whether your data are sufficiently normal distributed.

9. Page 17003 Lines 11-13: I cannot follow this conclusions. Please explain more. In Fig. 9 airborne measurements of HCHO profiles (NCAR/URI) are compared with two modelled profiles (S2 and S2(0.5 MEGAN-ECMWF).). How does this relate to an indirect validation of the 12-year GOME/SCIA dataset described in de Smedt et al.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



(2008)?

10. Page 17009 Lines 14-16: A high temporal correlation coefficient is not a sufficient indication that the model and the emission inventories are in good agreement with observations. Here, you discuss the agreement in the seasonal cycle, what about differences in the absolute values?

11. Page 17009 Lines 22-24: The difference in the correlation coefficients of S2 and S3 are generally too small to be statistically significant and thus counting such small (not significant) changes is not meaningful.

Technical comments:

1. Please standardise the way you write units throughout the entire manuscript. For example, you use Tg C/yr (e.g. Page 16982 Line 2), molec./cm<sup>2</sup> (e.g. Page 16994 Line 14), m<sup>3</sup>m<sup>-3</sup> (e.g. Page 16994 Line 14), mg  $\{species\}$  /m<sup>2</sup>/hr (e.g. Page 16994 Line 22) and molec.cm<sup>-2</sup> (e.g. Page 17000 Line 25).

2. Page 16983 Line 28: Please introduce the abbreviation of C-1 (per unit carbon).

3. Page 16991 Lines 19-22: Please cross-reference to Table 1.

4. Page 16993 Line 16: Please define k.

5. Page 16997 Line 726: Please use the same units as in Table 1. In Table 1, the unit is mol/mol. In the text, the unit is mol/C.

6. Page 16998 Line 25: In Table 1, the value is 66 Tg/yr, not 63 Tg/yr.

7. Page 17025 Fig.3. Caption: Mention that the time axis refers to local time.

8. Page 17030 Fig.8. Caption: Mention how the observations are displayed.

9. Pages 17032-17036 Figures 10-14 Caption: Line colors are as in Fig. 8 (not Fig. 10).

10. Pages 17032-17036 Figures 10-14: The minor tick marks along the ordinate are

S8426

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



frequently not visible (see for example Fig 14 Sumatra). Please rescale and/or redraw the figures and make the tick marks readable.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 8, 16981, 2008.

**ACPD**

8, S8422–S8427, 2008

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



S8427