

# ***Interactive comment on* “Toward resolving the mysterious budget discrepancy of ozone-depleting CCl<sub>4</sub>: An analysis of top-down emissions from China” *by* Sunyoung Park et al.**

**Sunyoung Park et al.**

sparky@knu.ac.kr

Received and published: 19 June 2018

Referees' comments on “Toward resolving the budget discrepancy of ozone-depleting CCl<sub>4</sub>: An analysis of top-down emissions from China” by Sunyoung Park, Shanlan Li, Jens Mühle, Simon O'Doherty, Ray F. Weiss, Xuekun Fang, Stefan Reimann, Ronald G. Prinn

We thank the referees for their thoughtful and thorough reviews. We are pleased that all the reviewers see our manuscript as a valuable contribution to the field. We have made changes to the manuscript to answer the suggestions of the reviewers and clarified a few points raised in review. We respond to the referee's comments below and a revised

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



version of the manuscript including most of the changes suggested by the reviewers will be submitted to the editor. We thank the reviewers and the editor for their time and effort and appreciate the recommendation for publication in Atmospheric Physics and Chemistry.

Reviewer comments:

Referee #1:

**Paper Summary:** This paper uses observations from the Korean Gosan station to identify the location of CCl<sub>4</sub> sources and the specific industrial processes involved with the CCl<sub>4</sub> emissions. There are two basic techniques used to analyze these data. First, trajectories are used in a source/receptor analysis technique to identify the CCl<sub>4</sub> emission locations. The major sources originate in Eastern China. Second, a positive matrix factorization (PMF) analysis technique is used to finger-print the specific sources of CCl<sub>4</sub>. This analysis reveals that the emissions are primarily from chloromethane production (CH<sub>3</sub>Cl), perchloroethylene production, and fugitive emissions from feedstock usages. These estimates are larger than those from the SPARC CCl<sub>4</sub> report, with the fugitive emissions being 10x larger than SPARC!

**Review Summary:** This is an excellent paper that NEEDS to be published. My overall comments are with regard to improving the writing in the paper and some of the structure.

**Paper Suggestions:** While the paper mentions the SPARC (2016) CCl<sub>4</sub> report, there ought to be more discussion of how this paper seems to resolve the discrepancy between their emissions based upon measurements. SPARC had a top-down emissions calculation of  $40 \pm 15$  Gg/y, a hemispheric gradient method of  $30 \pm 5$  Gg/y, and a regional emission estimates of  $21.4 \pm 7.5$  Gg/y. The SPARC regional 21.4 Gg/y had a 15 Gg/y contribution from China. The higher estimate herein of 24 Gg/y from China would bring this 21.4 SPARC number up to 30 Gg/y - in precise agreement with the gradient method and within the uncertainties of the 40 Gg/y top down estimate.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



»> Yes, we agree with the reviewer. This is an important point to mention and we have included the following sentences in the second paragraph of the Conclusions section: “According to Liang et al. (2016), global top-down emissions were estimated to be  $35 \pm 16$  Gg yr<sup>-1</sup> as an average estimate between  $40 \pm 15$  Gg yr<sup>-1</sup> based on the new 33-year total lifetime of CCl<sub>4</sub>, and an independent top-down method using the observed inter-hemispheric gradient in atmospheric concentrations which yielded  $30 \pm 5$  Gg yr<sup>-1</sup>. The SPARC sum of the regional emissions estimates of  $21 \pm 8$  Gg yr<sup>-1</sup>, where Chinese emission of 15 (10–22) Gg yr<sup>-1</sup> contributed  $71 \pm 33\%$ , was still less than the aggregated top-down values. Instead, if we apply the higher emission estimate of  $23.6 \pm 7.1$  Gg yr<sup>-1</sup> from China suggested here, the summed regional estimate would be calculated to be  $30 \pm 10$  Gg yr<sup>-1</sup>, largely in agreement with the best estimate of global emissions of  $35 \pm 16$  Gg yr<sup>-1</sup> from Liang et al. (2016).”

The discussion in the summary of the CCl<sub>4</sub> sources should be broken out with more definitive statements. The SPARC report used industrial estimates to characterize potential sources [Sherry et al., 2016], and this paper provides the **“first observational basis”** for these sources, but this paper also makes the case that Sherry et al. is perhaps too conservative in their estimates.

»> This comment is also very helpful. The factors were re-named as (A), (B), (C) and so on, and their descriptions in the section of “Industrial source apportionment of atmospheric CCl<sub>4</sub> in East Asia” were also updated to make it easier to compare them to the SPARC report, as suggested by reviewers 1 and 2. The figure legends in Fig. 4 were changed accordingly. As suggested, we’ve revised the conclusions to better discuss a link of the industrial sources identified from a factor analysis based on atmospheric observations to the SPARC bottom-up inventory-based estimations. The revised conclusions now read: “A factor analysis combining the observed concentration enhancements of 18 species was used to identify key industrial sources for CCl<sub>4</sub> emissions and to link our atmospheric observation based top-down identification of potential sources with bottom-up inventory-based estimates (e.g., Liang et al.,

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

2016; Sherry et al., 2017). Three major source categories accounting for  $89\pm 6\%$  of CCl<sub>4</sub> enhancements observed at GSN were identified as advertent or inadvertent co-production and escape of CCl<sub>4</sub> from CH<sub>3</sub>Cl production plants (factor (A)) and during industrial C<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>4</sub> production (factor (C)), and fugitive emissions (factor (B)) from feedstock use for the production of other chlorinated compounds (e.g., CHCl<sub>3</sub>) and process agent use. These sources are largely consistent with the bottom-up CCl<sub>4</sub> emissions pathways identified in SPARC (Liang et al., 2016). The SPARC estimate of global CCl<sub>4</sub> emissions from chloromethanes and PCE plants (pathway B from Liang et al. (2016) and Sherry et al. (2018)) was 13 Gg yr<sup>-1</sup>, as the most significant source. Fugitive feedstock/process agent emissions, denoted as pathway A by Liang et al. (2016) and Sherry et al. (2018), were estimated to be  $\sim 2$  Gg yr<sup>-1</sup>. These emissions for pathways B and A had contributions from China of 6.6 Gg yr<sup>-1</sup> and 0.7 Gg yr<sup>-1</sup>, respectively. If we assume that the emission rates from the sources correspond to the relative contributions of the corresponding source factors to the total Chinese emission rate ( $23.6\pm 7.1$  Gg yr<sup>-1</sup> for the years 2011–2015), source factors (A), CCl<sub>4</sub> emissions from chloromethane plants, and (C), emissions from PCE plants, amount to  $13\pm 4$  Gg yr<sup>-1</sup> for China. This is as high as the global bottom-up number of 13 Gg yr<sup>-1</sup> for pathway B emissions, and more than 50% higher than Chinese estimate of 6.6 Gg yr<sup>-1</sup>. This could point to a higher than assumed ratio of CCl<sub>4</sub> being emitted from these processes into the atmosphere, although factor (C) could possibly include influence of fugitive emissions as a chlorination feedstock for PCE production. Furthermore, also source factor (B), fugitive feedstock emissions are estimated at  $\sim 7\pm 2$  Gg yr<sup>-1</sup> from China alone, which again contrasts with Chinese estimate of  $\sim 0.7$  Gg yr<sup>-1</sup> and even a lower global estimate of only 2 Gg yr<sup>-1</sup> for pathway A from Liang et al. (2016) and Sherry et al. (2018).”

The paper is fairly well written, but many of the current paragraphs need to be broken up into more distinct sections or primary thoughts. The extended paragraphs of the current version obscure the thoughts, logic of the paper, and the overall content of the text.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

»> Based on the reviewer's perspective, we realized that discussions should have been better structured in various places in the previous version breaking a long body of paragraph by a single topic. We do think the revised manuscript has been improved according to reviewer's suggestions. Thanks for the reviewer's editorial comments!

For example, the 2nd para of the Introduction (P2, 4-30) talks about top down emissions, bottom up emissions. . .I would break this up into paras on: 1) top down emissions (4-12); 2) a SPARC bottom up para (12-16); and 3) a discussion of regional emissions.

»> As the reviewer suggested, we divided this long paragraph into three to make it easier to follow. First, we started with a discussion about the updated bottom-up emissions in the SPARC report, and introduced the global top-down and hemispheric gradient top-down emissions, pointing out that the revised bottom-up estimate of 25 Gg yr<sup>-1</sup> is still lower than the average SPARC-merged top-down emission estimate of 35±16 Gg yr<sup>-1</sup>. Then we added the summed regional emissions estimate from Australia, East Asia, U.S. and Western Europe, and mentioned its lowering than the global total and the relative significance of East Asia contribution.

In the 1st para of section 3 (P. 4 line 18 to P.5 line 32 - 46 lines!), there are a broad range of paragraph thoughts. The paragraph starts with a discuss of the interspecies correlation and ends with a thought on an underestimate of Chinese emissions. Please break this up to improve the flow of the text.

»> We have broken up the original, long paragraph, which is now in section 4 of the revised version, into four paragraphs corresponding to "introduction to an interspecies correlation method", "a reference compound and its emission estimate", "determination of the empirical correlations between the observed enhancements of CCl<sub>4</sub> and reference, HCFC-22" and "comparison of the annual CCl<sub>4</sub> emissions in China estimated in present study with previous results".

The "Data Overview" section both discusses the data and shows results. I would re-

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

structure sections 2 and 3 into: a data, methods, and results sections. The Supporting Information ought to flow better into these data and methods sections.

»> We have completely restructured section 2 of the manuscript by breaking it up into two sub-sections (2.1. Measurements of CCl<sub>4</sub> at Gosan and 2.2. Results), and one independent section (3. Potential source regions of CCl<sub>4</sub> in East Asia). The new section 3 is comprised of three paragraphs: introduction to trajectory statistics as a tool to illustrate the regional distribution of potential CCl<sub>4</sub>; input data and conditions for calculation; and description of the resulting map of potential source areas. We've also added specific information on corresponding SI text accordingly in the new section 3. Air mass source country classification that had been discussed in the last paragraph of Data overview section in the original manuscript, now moved to the beginning of section 4, as a transitional paragraph to the following country-specific emission analysis.

Again, break up the single paragraph of the conclusions into short paragraphs. The main messages are lost in this "run-on" paragraph.

»> We have re-organized the conclusions with four short paragraphs. We hope this can convey ideas more clearly to readers. For the text revision, please see the earlier response.

Figures are good. For Fig. 4, put some vertical lines on the plot to see how the bars line up with chemical names at the bottom.

»> Done

Fig. S5. What are the colors for? Do they indicate statistical significance?

»> We now say in the figure caption: "The colors by shade indicate statistical significance."

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/acp-2018-220/acp-2018-220-AC1->

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



supplement.pdf

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2018-220>, 2018.

ACPD

---

Interactive  
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

