Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2018-1092-RC1, 2018
© Author(s) 2018. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



ACPD

Interactive comment

Interactive comment on "The unintended consequence of SO_2 and NO_2 regulations over China: increase of ammonia levels and impact on $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations" by Mathieu Lachatre et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 14 December 2018

This paper investigated the reason for the increase of atmospheric concentrations of NH3 in China. The authors compared model simulations for 2011, 2013 and 2015 to examine inter-annual change of meteorology and reductions in SO2 and NOX emission. The results are useful for PM pollution control in China. Similar topic and conclusions have been shown in at least two recent studies studies (Fu et al., 2017, Liu et al., 2018). It is important to highlight the difference and new insights in the present work. In addition, the paper requires extensive English editing.

Specific comments:

1. Page 4, Line 6: Meteorology predictions need to be validated before exploring its

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



impacts on NH3 concentrations.

- 2. It's better to put the model validation part (section 3.4 and 3.5) to the first part of section 3, because it's the foundation of the following analysis. Validation of SO2 and NOX predictions need to be added.
- 3. Page 3, Line 6-7: Why the operationally provided IASI level 2 data cannot be used to analyze the inter-annual NH3 variability?
- 4. Page 4: In the EDGAR-HAP-v2.2 inventory you used for 2010, Chinese emissions are derived from the MEIC inventory. The MEIC inventories for 2012, 2014 and 2016 are available in its website (http://www.meicmodel.org/). Why not use the MEIC inventory directly for 2013 and 2015? What is difference between your updated emissions for 2013 and 2015 and those in MEIC?

Minor comments:

Page 1, line 4: The full name for "IASI" need to be given.

Page 2, line 5: "NH3(g) Chinese emissions " should be "NH3(g) emissions in China"

Page 2, line 23: "observed" should be deleted

Page 2, line 25: "ran" should be "conducted"

Page 10, line 2: "reaction" should be deleted.

Page 12, line 16 to Page 13, line 2: The English grammar for the last sentence need to be checked.

Page 16, line 4-7: It's difficult to understand these sentences, and the statement need to be improved.

Page 18: It's difficult to read Table 3. Better presentation and interpretation are needed.

References

ACPD

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Fu, X., Wang, S., Xing, J., Zhang, X., Wang, T., and Hao, J.: Increasing Ammonia Concentrations Reduce the Effectiveness of Particle Pollution Control Achieved via SO2 and NOX Emissions Reduction in East China, Environmental Science and Technology Letters, 4, 221–227.

Liu, M., Huang, X., Song, Y., Xu, T., Wang, S., Wu, Z., Hu, M., Zhang, L., Zhang, Q., Pan, Y., and Zhu, T.: Rapid SO2 emission reductions significantly increase tropospheric ammonia concentrations over the North China Plain, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions, 2018.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2018-1092, 2018.

ACPD

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

