Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2017-749-RC1, 2017

Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions

Interactive comment on "Agricultural ammonia emissions in China: reconciling bottom-up and top-down estimates" *by* Lin Zhang et al.

J. Collett (Referee)

collett@atmos.colostate.edu

Received and published: 4 October 2017

Zhang et al have done a terrific job using models and observations to improve understanding of ammonia emissions in China. Not only do they do a top-down analysis, using the GEOS-CHEM adjoint constrained by TES column NH3 measurements, to improve the seasonal and spatial variability in NH3 emissions, they then do a very thorough job improving past bottom-up inventories through careful analysis of fertilization practices and animal emissions. Combined, these make for a very strong paper – one of the best I have reviewed in some time.

I recommend the authors attend to a few comments in revising the manuscript:

1. One of the main challenges in accurately simulating ammonia concentrations in

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

chemical transport models is the treatment of dry deposition. Considerable attention has been paid recently to including more realistic, bi-directional flux parameterizations and this seems to help quite a lot in some regional simulations. Without a bidirectional treatment, NH3 loss rates by dry deposition can be biased high. While I am OK with the authors not including a bidi treatment in their model simulations here, I do think they should add some discussion how its absence might influence their results. This is relevant to the top-down NH3 emissions estimates and to the comparison of model vs. surface concentration and wet deposition estimates.

2. Line 77: I suggest changing "together contribute" to "together are estimated to contribute"

3. Lines 150-157: the authors should discuss the Streets emission inventory here in the text. It is included in the figure and shows the strongest seasonality.

4. Line 173: I suggest changing "NH3 prefers to combine" to "NH3 is thermodynamically favored to combine"

5. Line 182: change "mixed clouds" to "mixed-phase clouds"

6. Lines 182-184: please explain and justify the retention efficiencies chosen for mixed-phase and cold clouds

7. Lines 248-249: are NH3 concentrations possibly also higher here because there are fewer NOx and SO2 emissions to generate acids that tie NH3 up in aerosols?

8. Lines 336-338: How accurate/representative for China are the authors' assumptions here re: frequency of application of injection and broadcast fertilization methods?

9. While the manuscript is generally quite well written, there are several small grammatical errors that should be corrected. The most significant are

a. Line 52: change "have" to "has" and "cause" to "causes"

b. Line 66: change "in the eastern China" to "in eastern China"

c. Line 129: change “human” to “humans”

d. Line 268: change “while overestimate” to “while they overestimate”

e. Line 276: change “increases in” to “increases are noted in”

f. Line 319: change “need to consider” to “requires considering”

g. Line 394: change “spending” to “spent”

h. Line 400: change “while only” to “while we only”

i. Line 442: change “needs to address” to “requires addressing”

j. Line 443: change “layer centered” to “layer is centered”

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2017-749, 2017.