

1 **Assessment of inter-city transport of particulate**  
2 **matter in the Beijing-Tianjin-Hebei region**

3 X. Chang<sup>1</sup>, S. X. Wang<sup>1,2</sup>, B. Zhao<sup>3</sup>, S. Y. Cai<sup>1</sup>, and J. M. Hao<sup>1,2</sup>

4 [1] State Key Joint Laboratory of Environment Simulation and Pollution  
5 Control, School of Environment, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084,  
6 China

7 [2] State Environmental Protection Key Laboratory of Sources and  
8 Control of Air Pollution Complex, Beijing 100084, China

9 [3] Joint Institute for Regional Earth System Science and Engineering and  
10 Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences, University of  
11 California, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA

12


13 *Correspondence to:* S. X. Wang [shxwang@tsinghua.edu.cn]

14 and B. Zhao [zhaob1206@ucla.edu]

15

16 **1. Spatial distribution of emission**

17 Figure S1 shows the spatial distribution of three main pollutants, i.e. PM<sub>2.5</sub>,  
18 NO<sub>x</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub>, in the BTH region. The emissions are allocated into grids  
19 with GDP, population or road patterns, based on different emission sectors.



20

21 **Figure S1 Spatial distribution of the emission of (a) PM<sub>2.5</sub>, (b) NO<sub>x</sub> and (c) SO<sub>2</sub> in**  
 22 **the 4-km grid covering the BTH region. Units are all in t year<sup>-1</sup> grid<sup>-1</sup>**

23

## 24 **2. Evaluation of the meteorology simulation**

25 The simulated meteorological fields are evaluated by the observation data  
 26 in the BTH region. The observational data of meteorology are from the  
 27 National Climatic Data Center (NCDC) of NOAA ([www.ncdc.noaa.gov](http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov)),  
 28 where observations of every 3 hours in 78 international exchange sites in  
 29 the BTH region are provided. The statistical indices used for evaluation  
 30 include the bias and gross error (GE) between observation and simulation  
 31 with regard to wind speed at 10 m, temperature at 2 m, and specific  
 32 humidity at 2 m. The bias and GE are defined as

$$33 \quad \text{bias} = \frac{\sum_1^n (\text{SIM} - \text{OBS})}{n} \quad (1)$$

$$34 \quad \text{GE} = \frac{\sum_1^n |\text{SIM} - \text{OBS}|}{n} \quad (2)$$

35 where  $n$  is the total number of observation and simulation data pairs, and  
 36 SIM and OBS stand for individual simulated and observed values

37 respectively. The parameters evaluated include wind speed at 10 m (W10),  
 38 temperature at 2 m (T2), and specific humidity at 2 m (Q2). The results are  
 39 shown in Table S1.

40 **Table S1 Comparison of simulated and observed meteorology parameters.**

Parameter	Indice	Unit	Benchmark <sup>a</sup>	Jan-2012	Jul-2012
Wind speed 10 m	Observation Mean	m s <sup>-1</sup>	-	2.34	2.32
	Simulation Mean	m s <sup>-1</sup>	-	2.59	2.51
	Bias	m s <sup>-1</sup>	≤±0.5	-0.24	-0.20
	Gross error	m s <sup>-1</sup>	≤2	1.12	1.08
Temperature 2 m	Observation Mean	K	-	266.1	298.0
	Simulation Mean	K	-	266.2	297.8
	Bias	K	≤±0.5	-0.13	0.22
	Gross error	K	≤2	1.64	1.72
Humidity (mixing ratio) 2 m	Observation Mean	g kg <sup>-1</sup>	-	1.23	14.80
	Simulation Mean	g kg <sup>-1</sup>	-	1.36	14.56
	Bias	g kg <sup>-1</sup>	≤±1	-0.13	0.23
	Gross error	g kg <sup>-1</sup>	≤2	0.29	1.53

41 a. The benchmarks used in this study are suggested by [Emery \(2011\)](#)

42

### 43 **3. Comparison of the simulation and observation results for** 44 **the major components of PM<sub>2.5</sub>**


45 The simulation results of the major components of PM<sub>2.5</sub> are compared  
 46 with observations in Ling County and Xiong County from Jul. 22<sup>nd</sup> to Aug.

47 23<sup>rd</sup>. The results are shown in Figure S1. Some statistical indices including  
 48 NMB and NME are calculated, as is shown in Table S2.

49

50 **Table S2 Comparison of simulated and observed PM<sub>2.5</sub> and its major components**  
 51 **in two sites from Jul, 22<sup>nd</sup> to Aug. 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2013.**

<b>Jul 22 ~ Aug 23, 2013</b>		<b>Observation</b>	<b>Simulation</b>	<b>NMB</b>	<b>NME</b>
		<b>Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>		
<b>Unit</b>		$\mu\text{g}\cdot\text{m}^{-3}$	$\mu\text{g}\cdot\text{m}^{-3}$	%	%
	Total PM <sub>2.5</sub>	75.5	84.5	+11.9	36.9
	EC	2.76	6.07	+120	123.3
Xiong County	OC	10.88	8.12	-25.4	33.0
	Nitrate	11.6	22.7	+95.2	114.0
	Sulfate	20.7	9.87	-52.3	55.5
	Ammonium	10.1	10.3	+2.4	38.6
	Total PM <sub>2.5</sub>	73.9	64.5	-7.5	37.4
	EC	1.70	3.43	+117	132.3
Ling County	OC	6.09	5.76	-1.2	32.4
	Nitrate	12.3	21.4	+78.6	92.1
	Sulfate	24.6	10.0	-56.6	58.6
	Ammonium	12.3	9.99	-14.2	40.8



52

53 **Figure S2 Time series of the simulation and observation of (a, b) PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and its**  
 54 **five major components: (c, d) EC, (e, f) OC, (g, h) nitrate, (i, j) sulfate and (k,**

55 **Ammonium in Xiong County (left) and Ling County (right) during Jul. 22<sup>nd</sup> to**  
56 **Aug. 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2013.**

57

58

59 **References**

60 Emery, C., Tai, E., and Yarwood, G.: Enhanced meteorological modeling  
61 and performance evaluation for two Texas episodes, Prepared for the Texas  
62 Natural Resource Conservation Commission, by ENVIRON International  
63 Corp, Novato, CA, 2001.