

# ***Interactive comment on “Wildfires in Northern Eurasia affect the budget of black carbon in the Arctic. A 12-year retrospective synopsis (2002–2013).” by N. Evangeliou et al.***

**N. Evangeliou et al.**

nikolaos.evangeliou@nilu.no

Received and published: 5 May 2016

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 24 March 2016

Review: Wildfires in Northern Eurasia affect the budget of black carbon in the Arctic. A 12-year retrospective synopsis (2002–2013).

The manuscript introduces a modeling study applying BC emission inventories in an atmospheric chemistry transport model to analyse the deposition of BC in the Arctic stemming from Northern Eurasia. Several sensitivity simulations were performed to disentangle the contribution of different regions within the Northern Hemisphere. This

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



is an interesting and relevant topic and the methods used in the study sound valid. The manuscript, however, would benefit from a better structuring of the results. In general, I do recommend publication, but suggest a number of changes.

General comments:

1. The study applies the new biomass burning emission dataset by Hao et al. for Northern Eurasia (NE). How this emission dataset has been derived has to be discussed more in detail in this paper. Particularly, the differences to the GFEDv3 emissions have to be outlined as these are applied in this study as well.

Response: All these aspects and comparisons are discussed in our companion paper (Hao, W. M., et al., Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., doi:10.5194/gmd-2016-89, in review, 2016), where a great analysis is given. Discussing the same here, while the GMD paper is in revision in an open-access journal would be rather inappropriate. However, if the reviewer is still not happy, we could add some more details in a next step, although this would degrade Hao et al. publication in GMD.

2. Naming of the experiments: MACCity-FEI-NE and MACCity simulation do differ only in the representation of biomass burning in NE. One uses Hao et al., the other one GFEDv3. I'd suggest that the simulations are renamed to more explicitly reflect this differences (e.g. FEI-NE and GFEDv3).

Response: We would partially agree with the reviewer and he/she seems to understand very well the notion of the present study.

However, we do not agree with the new names that he/she suggests. We believe that naming MACCity-FEI-NE and MACCity simulation as FEI-NE and GFEDv3 is not accurate at all. GFEDv3 is a global dataset and FEINE refers to an approach applied over a certain region (Northern Eurasia). In our opinion, this would confuse the reader very much making him believe that FEINE is a global dataset, which unfortunately is not the case yet. Besides, we explain very much in detail what our runs refer to in Table

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



1 of the manuscript and in the Abstract and Methodology sections.

3. The difference between the simulations MACCity-FEI-NE and MACCity have to be discussed more in detail. Here the manuscript would benefit from a comparison of the MACCity simulation with the observations and not only the comparison MACCity-FEI-NE and observations.

Response: Corrected. We have put in Fig.7 surface concentrations from MACCity itself and we show them together with the respective observations and FEI-NE+MACCity concentrations. We further discuss which of the datasets perform better in Discussions.

4. At the same time, the discussion of the region specific simulation should only refer to the MACCity-FEI-NE simulation and it has to made clear throughout the manuscript that the conclusion are based on the MACCity-FEI-NE settings.

Response: Corrected (beginning of 4.2 section). In addition, it is shown in Table 1. The abstract is way too long and should be shortened. Page1/Line12: estimated is not the right term here – used?

Response: Corrected to “adopted from”.

Page1/Line 14: is this area based on FEI-NE or GFEDv3? Is the global number based on GFEDv3?

Response: Corrected. It is now clarified inside parentheses.

Page1/Line16: 70% is this for the FEI-NE or GFEDv3?

Response: Corrected. It is now clarified inside parentheses.

Page1/Line19: “. . . was twice as much as when using MACCity “ , i.e. twice as much as when excluding biomass burning emissions? Maybe here and in the following it would be easier for the reader to follow when you refer to anthropogenic emissions in more general and not specifically to the MACCity inventory. You mentioned in the beginning that anthropogenic emissions are used from MACCity.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

Response: It is now corrected, in order to be clearer.

Page1/Line23: As mentioned in another comments here it must be made clear what emission inventories these numbers refer to. All regions based on GFEDv3, or northern Eurasia set to FEI-NE? Best is both scenarios are mentioned.

Response: Numbers have been added in the abstract, as the reviewer suggested.

Introduction:

Page5/Line9: this argument is already given in the paragraph above. Please combine The introduction should also briefly discuss the emission inventories available for biomass burning in NE. These make up a substantial part of the paper and the conclusions.

Response: Corrected as the reviewer suggested. As regards to the emissions from BB in Nor. Eurasia, all details have been included in the Methodology.

Page7/Line26: isn't it 2005 and not 2000?

Response: In Lamarque et al. (2010) it is clearly mentioned that the dataset exists until 2000. Then ACCMIP was extended until 2100 (<http://www.geosci-model-dev.net/6/179/2013/gmd-6-179-2013.html>)

Page8/Line 25: And what injection height is used outside NE? 2.3 BC emissions . . .

Response: Corrected. Now, we clearly write in the manuscript that a similar injection profile for biomass burning outside Nor. Eurasia was used with emissions occurring up to 1000 m. I do find the naming convention not that intuitive. Why don't you use FEI-NE and GFEDv3 for Biomass burning and MACCity for the anthropogenic. That GFEDv3 is part of MACCity is not that obvious and a bit hidden in the manuscript.

Response: As I mentioned in a previous comment the names that the reviewer suggested are not accurate. GFED3 corresponds to a global dataset, which is not the case for FEI-NE. We explain in detail what MACCity and FEI-NE+MACCity correspond to in

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



the methodology and we show what input each of the simulations used in Table 1.

Page 11/Line2: from the FEI-NE+MACCity and the MACCity simulation" →used/applied in the . . . and . . . simulation.

Response: The sentence has slightly changed.

Page 11/Line10: Shouldn't there be a difference between FEI-NE and MACCity for the global number?

Response: Corrected. It is FEINE+MACCity instead of FEINE and MACCity.

Page 11/Line12: Tg – Tg/year here and in the following.

Response: Corrected everywhere in the manuscript according to reviewer's suggestion.

Page 11/Line17: Why do you reference Bond et al., Isn't this number based on your study?

Response: We acknowledge reviewer for this correct comment. This reference does not match, because the results are based on our study.

Table2:

- that the anthropogenic sources are listed twice is confusing. Also the numbers should be identical but this is not the case for some of the years.

Response: Anthropogenic source are listed twice, in order to show that they have been adopted from the same dataset in Eurasia (and elsewhere). As the Table looks now, it has 2 sets of information, first for FEINE+MACCity and for MACCity for comparison. Each set has basically 6 components, (a) Anthropogenic sources (Tg), (b) Anthropogenic sources in Eurasia (Tg), (c) BB sources (FEI-NE+MACCity) (Tg), (d) FEI-NE fires in Eurasia (Tg), (e) FEI-NE+MACCity total (Tg), and (f) Total deposition over the Arctic (kt). We believe that if we exclude (b) Anthropogenic sources in Eurasia (Tg)

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

from one of the datasets, it will be confusing for the reader. However, we agree with the reviewer about the slight difference in the values. This can be confusing and we have corrected it.

- Arctic deposition from NE fires and arctic deposition from anthropogenic sources do add to the total arctic deposition, this cannot be correct.

Response: We appreciate for this comment. We have corrected this part. The label was not correct. We stated “Arctic deposition from anthropogenic sources”, but it is actually “Arctic deposition from all sources outside Eurasia”. We have corrected this part everywhere in the text now.

Page11/ Line 20: which four years do you refer to 2006, 2003 and ? and do you refer to global or NE values?

Response: Corrected! FEI-NE emissions refer always to biomass burning in Northern Eurasia. It is clearly stated in the Methodology.

Page 11/Line13: “This indicates that during these years the largest amounts of BC were deposited over Arctic regions as a result of large fire events in Siberia, Western Russia, and Kazakhstan. “ – I don’t see here how you reached this conclusion.

Response: We have reformulated this sentence, also pointing the reader to Fig.S2 with the emission anomalies of BC.

Page 13: The deposition rates for the arctic results form all sources have to be discussed for both emission inventories. In addition, a simulation evaluation the contribution of NE fires to the Arctic deposition based on GFEDv3 would be valuable for comparison.

Response: The goal of the present paper is to identify the role of wildfires over Eurasia using a new approach on the budget of BC in the Arctic and NOT to discuss the differences of FEINE with GFED. This is discussed in detail in our companion paper published by GMD Discussions (<http://www.geosci-model-dev.net/6/179/2013/gmd-6-179-2013.html>). Nevertheless, we have added more lines on this direction, like the

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

reviewer suggested.

Page13/Line 29: but fire detection is not directly related to fire emissions.

Response: According to our companion paper “The burned area mapping method, which was originally developed for the western United States (Urbanski et al., 2011), has two steps. First, a burn scar algorithm is applied to pixels of the surface reflectance product to identify potential burn scars. Then, the potential burn scars are screened for false detections using a contextual filter that eliminates pixels not proximate with recent active fire detections. For mapping burned areas in Northern Eurasia, the burn scar algorithm was unchanged; however, the contextual filter was modified. In this study, potential burn scars not within 5 km and 10 days of active fire detection were classified as false detections and were eliminated.” We have modified “fire detections” to “burn scars” to be more consistent to our companion paper.

Page14/Line 18: I do not understand how the anthropogenic fraction is derived and what it exactly refers to (all anthropogenic, anthropogenic from NE?). Please clarify here and in Figure 5d.

Response: This is answered in the abstract (page 2 – line 12). We account for anthropogenic (MACCity) and biomass burning sources (FEINE in Eurasia – GFED3 outside Eurasia). However, we have corrected this part in Figure 5d as the reviewer suggested.

Page16/Line1: Figure 7 compares the surface concentrations not Figure 8

Response: Corrected!!

Page16/Line7: Figure 7 compares the simulated versus observed daily surface concentrations by a Box and Whisker – what is blue and red for the model results? Also, it would be interesting to compare to the observations also the MACCity simulation. Does the different representation of fire in NE in the FEI-NE simulation actually improve the model results?

Response: Corrected. We have added surface concentrations of BC from MACCity

in the Figure 7 as the reviewer suggested. Regarding if this new approach for the BB emissions improves the results, it appears that it does in some of the stations. However, it appears that anthropogenic BC is misleading in some of the stations.

Page16/Line 20: How do you distinguish in the plot between anthropogenic and BB sources?

Response: Of course, we do not distinguish between anthropogenic and bb in Figure 8. The statements of this paragraph can be easily obtained if one observes emissions of BC. This is done in Figure S2. We now point the reader to this Figure, as well. We appreciate reviewer's help.

Page17/ Line 25: Here you have to be more specific. Differences arise mainly from the fact that the BC emissions are lower in NE (a region you identified as being important for arctic BC deposition) and not so much from the fact that global depositions are reduced.

Response: We have slightly changed this part. For your consideration, we do not imply that emissions are lower in NE. The opposite though; we have shown throughout the manuscript, but also in Table 2 that the emissions from FEI-NE are larger in NE (comparing to GFED3). There should not be any misunderstanding now. Page17/ Line28: Why do you derive the importance of NE fires here from the difference of the MACCity-FEI-NE and MACCity simulation for atmospheric burden, etc. and not from the simulation were you excluded fires in NE as in the previous paragraph? More interesting would be a comparison of MACCity with observations.

Response: Corrected. 2-3 sentences about comparison of MACCity with observations have been added according to the reviewer's suggestion.

Page 18/Line1: 'We also analyzed the influence of all anthropogenic and BB emissions from the regions (defined in Table 1) to the average surface concentration of the Arctic stations (Figure 9). ' – but the anthropogenic sources are only assessed globally and

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)



not by region.

Response: Corrected. We have clarified the sentence now. As reviewer noticed anthropogenic sources are assessed globally. The contribution to surface concentrations from anthropogenic BC is not country-specific, but rather global. Only BC from FEI-NE is country-specific in this chapter. This is consistent with Table 1.

Page18/Line 14: Region 'other' . The explanation here reads different from the figure caption.

Response: Corrected!

Page 18/Line19: “. . . while our runs suggested that BB lower contribution of 29%” – please correct

Response: Corrected!

Page19/Line 12: but you didn't explicitly differentiate for different anthropogenic source regions – or did I miss something?

Response: As the reviewer pointed out, we do not mask anthropogenic sources in each of the geopolitical regions. The contribution of anthropogenic BC to surface concentrations is calculated globally and it is not country-specific. Furthermore, we made numerous sensitivity runs allowing biomass-burning emissions from a certain area (each time). Hence, one run with only biomass burning emissions from Mongolia (and nowhere else), one from Siberia, one from Asia, one from Europe and so on. . . This allowed us to estimate how much BC was deposited over the Arctic from emissions occurring over a certain country, continent, etc. . .

Page 20/Line8:  $3.0 \times 10^6$  or 250.000 as stated in the abstract? Page20/Line14: 3.5 times higher in NE or globally?

Response: Both burned areas are correct. In the Abstract, we give an annual average burned area, which is 250,000 km<sup>2</sup> per yr, while in Conclusions we give a total burned

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

area (for the 12-y period), which is 3,000,000 km<sup>2</sup>

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/acp-2015-994/acp-2015-994-AC1-supplement.pdf>

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., doi:10.5194/acp-2015-994, 2016.

ACPD

---

Interactive  
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

