

## ***Interactive comment on “Observational Analyses of Dramatic Developments of A Severe Air Pollution Event in the Beijing Area” by Ju Li et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 13 December 2017

This manuscript presents a detailed analysis of physical processes leading to a single air pollution episode observed in Beijing, China. The paper appears to be scientifically sound with no major errors. The paper is relatively well structured and clearly written.

The only major challenge with this paper is that, during the past couple of years, a large number of analyses on air pollution episodes in Chinese cities have already been published. The authors should better bring up in this paper how it differs from or adds to this previous knowledge. Below is a list of more detailed comments in this regard + a few other comments that should be considered when revising the paper.

In section 1, the authors summarize several factors found to contribute to the development of an air pollution episode. The authors should explicitly add here the existence of positive feedback processes (e.g. influence of high aerosol concentrations on radiation

C1

tion and BL development discussed in a few recent papers) that enhance air pollutant concentrations further. The authors should also briefly summarize the remaining gaps in our understanding on how air pollution episodes form and evolve in these kinds of environments.

At the end of section 1, the authors define the goal of this paper. In this context, it would be very important to specifically list the scientific goals of the paper (i.e. which scientific questions this paper is aiming to answer) and how these goals are related to the aims of this work.

Section 4 describes the evolution of the air pollution episode and is the most important original part of this paper. The subsections of this section should be numbered differently, i.e. 4.1.n, not 4.0.n. The second paragraph of section 4.0.5 does not fit there in its present form (except the last sentence referring to figure 11), but should be presented in a separate section. My suggestion is to add a new section (either as the final subsection into section 4 or as a separate short section 5) where the authors put their findings into a broader context, including i) how the pollution event described here compares with pollution events in general in the Beijing areas ii) how the results of this study add to our understanding on pollution event development, and iii) what broader-scale implications these results have.

Current Section 5 contains mainly a summary of the main findings, not real scientific conclusions. Such conclusions should be added here. In case the authors decide not to write a separate section 5 regarding the previous comment, but simply expand section 4, then some of that material could be presented in "Conclusions".

The caption of figure 11 should be improved to more clearly tie the upper panel of this figure to the 4 following figures.