

This is my third review of this paper. I understand that the Van Dingenen et al. (2018) paper is already published but I still wonder if there is a new science in this paper by itself, as I had questioned in the previous reviews. If the key objective of the paper is “to evaluate the relevance of uncertainties in regional sectorial emissions inventories and their propagation in modelled PM_{2.5} concentrations and associated impacts on health,” I feel that more needs to be done in the paper. For example, I find it troubling that there is a single number listed as a fraction of extra-regional pollution contribution per country in section 3.1 (Hungary 75%, etc.). The same is true for the sectorial contributions to PM_{2.5} concentrations in section 3.2 (30% by shipping emissions in the Mediterranean). Probably most troubling is the health effect quantification (e.g., 32.4% of total mortality related with agriculture). When there are large uncertainties as the authors have already acknowledged, I find it necessary to clearly describe these ranges in each step and also in tables and figures as well. Considering the objective of the paper, I do not see the point of sections 3.1-3.3. It is probably better to expand section 3.4 that discusses the impact of uncertainties from emissions.

There are also quite a few editorial issues that need to be addressed. I cannot point them all but below are a few:

1. The explanation of PM_{2.5} appears on l. 13 on p. 2 when PM_{2.5} is already mentioned on l. 5.
2. I believe it should be written as “improve global air quality” instead on l. 9, p. 2.
3. The first “and” should be deleted on l. 33, p. 3.
4. CH₄ is not mentioned in l. 28-29 on p. 5 but I believe HTAP_v2.2 includes that?
5. I think the second “the” should be taken out from l. 40, p. 5
6. Chili → Chile on l. 15, p. 11