

### Authors' Responses to Reviewer Comments

Manuscript: Estimating the open biomass burning emissions in Central and Eastern China from 2003 to 2015 based on satellite observation (Ref. No.: acp-2018-282)

We are very grateful for your careful and insightful comments, which contributed greatly to improve this manuscript. We carefully answered them point-by-point as below and corrected the corresponding parts in the manuscript (in red color).

Please make sure that all the references are correct. For example, for Wiedinmyer et al. (2011) please make sure you cite the final Geosci. Model. Dev. paper (not the Geosci. Model. Dev. Discuss. paper).

Response:

Thanks for this suggestion. We have corrected it in the manuscript (in Line 794). In addition, we have checked all the references carefully during the revision of our paper.

We have carefully taken the editor's suggestion into consideration. Please see the following point-by-point responses.

Line 28-29: Change "From 2003 to 2015, the emissions from forest, shrubland and grassland fire burning had little interannual variability"

Response:

We really appreciate for this comment. We have made corresponding revision in the manuscript.

*"From 2003 to 2015, the emissions from forest, shrubland and grassland fire burning held annual fluctuation whereas the emissions from crop straw burning steadily increased."* (Line 28-29)

Line 40: What is the meaning of "whole"? Do you mean total?

Response:

Sorry for the confusing sentence. the whole pollutants emission means the total pollutant emission in research period. We have changed "the whole pollutants emission" to "the total pollutant emission" in the manuscript (Line 39).

Line 46: Change "influence" to "influencing"

Response:

It has been corrected (Line 45).

Line 67: "hundreds of million of open biomass burned": the meaning here is not clear.

Response:

Sorry for the confusing sentence. We have made revision in the manuscript.

*"China is suffering from severe air pollution with **hundred million tons of biomass open** burned each year."*

(Line 60)

# Estimating the open biomass burning emissions in Central and Eastern China from 2003 to 2015 based on satellite observation

Jian Wu <sup>1</sup>, Shaofei Kong <sup>2</sup>, Fangqi Wu <sup>2</sup>, Yi Cheng <sup>2</sup>, Shurui Zheng <sup>2</sup>, Qin Yan <sup>1</sup>, Huang Zheng <sup>2</sup>, Guowei Yang <sup>2</sup>, Mingming Zheng <sup>1</sup>, Dantong Liu <sup>3</sup>, Delong Zhao <sup>4</sup> and Shihua Qi <sup>1,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Environmental Science and Technology, School of Environmental Studies, China University of Geosciences, Wuhan, 430074, China

<sup>2</sup> Department of Atmospheric Sciences, School of Environmental Studies, China University of Geosciences, Wuhan, 430074, China

<sup>3</sup> Centre for Atmospheric Sciences, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, UK

<sup>4</sup> Beijing Weather Modification Office, Beijing 100089, China

<sup>5</sup> State Key Laboratory of Biogeology and Environmental Geology, China University of Geosciences, Wuhan, 430074, China

*Correspondence to:* Shaofei Kong (kongshaofei@cug.edu.cn); Shihua Qi (shihuaqi@cug.edu.cn)

**Abstract.** Open biomass burning (OBB) has significant impacts on air pollution, climate change and potential human health. OBB has raised wide attention but with little focus on the annual variation of pollutant emission. Central and Eastern China (CEC) is one of the most polluted regions in China. This study aims to provide a state-of-the-art estimation of the pollutant emissions from OBB in CEC from 2003 to 2015, by adopting the satellite observation dataset (the burned area product (MCD64A1) and the active fire product (MCD14 ML)), local biomass data (updated biomass loading data and high-resolution vegetation data) and local emission factors. The successful adoption of double satellite dataset for long term estimation of pollutants from OBB with a high spatial resolution can support the assessing of OBB on regional air-quality, especially for harvest periods or dry seasons. It is also useful to evaluate the effects of annual OBB management policies in different regions. Here, monthly emissions of pollutants were estimated and allocated into a  $1 \times 1$  km spatial grid for four types of OBB including grassland, shrubland, forest and cropland. From 2003 to 2015, the emissions from forest, shrubland and grassland fire burning ~~had held a minor annual fluctuation variation~~—whereas the emissions from crop straw burning steadily increased.

The cumulative emissions of organic carbon (OC), elemental carbon (EC), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitric oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>), non-methane volatile organic compounds (NMVOCs), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>), carbon monoxide (CO), carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and fine particles (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) were  $3.64 \times 10^3$ ,  $2.87 \times 10^2$ ,  $3.05 \times 10^3$ ,  $1.82 \times 10^3$ ,  $6.4 \times 10^3$ ,  $2.12 \times 10^2$ ,  $4.67 \times 10^2$ ,  $4.59 \times 10^4$ ,  $9.39 \times 10^5$  and  $4.13 \times 10^3$  Gg in these years, respectively. Crop straw burning was the largest contributor for all pollutant emissions, by 84%-96%. For the forest, shrubland and grassland fire burning, forest fire burning emissions contributed the most and emissions from grassland fire was negligible due to few grass coverage in this region. High pollutant emissions concentrated in the connection area of Shandong, Henan, Jiangsu and Anhui, with emission intensity higher than 100 ton per square kilometers, which was related to the frequent agricultural activities in these regions. Peak emission of pollutants occurred in summer and autumn harvest periods including May, June, September and October, at which ~50% of the ~~whole~~total pollutants emission were emitted in these months. This study highlights the importance in controlling the crop straw burning emissions. From December to March, the crop residue burning emissions decreased, while the emissions from forest, shrubland and grassland exhibited their highest values, leading to another small peak emissions of pollutants. Obvious regional differences in seasonal variations of OBB were observed due to different local biomass types and environmental conditions. Rural population, agricultural output, economic levels, local burning habits, social customs and management policies were all ~~influee~~influencing factors for OBB emissions.

## 1. Introduction

Open biomass burning (OBB), which includes forest, shrubland, grassland and crop residue fire burning (van der Werf et al., 2010; Qiu et al., 2016), is one of the most important sources for gaseous and particulate matter (PM) especially for fine particulate particles (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) and associated carbonaceous aerosols (elemental carbon (EC) and organic carbon (OC)) (Zha, 2013; Yan et al., 2014; Zong et al., 2016; Zhou et al., 2017). Previous studies have shown that the OBB contributed to approximately 40% of the annual average submicron EC emission and 65% of primary OC emission globally (Bond et al., 2013), and contributed more than 45% of PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration on days of heavy air pollution (Deng, 2011). The pollutants with high emission amounts from OBB posed significant impacts on regional and global climate change, air quality and human health (Seiler and Crutzen, 1980; Crutzen and Andreae, 1990; Andreae and Merlet, 2001; Bond et al., 2004; Akagi et al., 2011; Zhang et al., 2016).

From 1970s (Crutzen et al., 1979), emission estimation of biomass burning has been a research hot topic from global (Seiler and Crutzen et al., 1980; Levine, 1995; Lioussé et al., 1995; Bond et al., 2004; Randerson et al., 2012; Kaiser et al., 2012) to regional scale (Yevich and Logan, 2003; Chang et al., 2010; Lioussé et al., 2010; Li et al.,

2017). China is suffering from severe air pollution with hundred million tons of open-biomass open burned each year (Zhang et al., 2015). The quantitative estimation of pollutants emission for the whole China (Streets et al., 2003; Tian et al., 2002; Cao et al., 2005; Zhou et al., 2017) or a certain region (Liu et al., 2015; Zhou et al., 2015; Jin et al., 2017) is also a vital practice, which is the base for assessing the impact of OBB on air regional quality deterioration. The Central and Eastern China (CEC), including the Central China (Hunan, Henan and Hubei) and the Eastern China (part of the North Plain of China (Shandong), the Yangtze River delta (YRD, including Zhejiang, Jiangsu, Anhui and Shanghai) and part of the Pan-Pearl River delta (Fujian and Jiangxi)) (Figure 1), is an area with plenty of vegetation coverage (as listed in Figure S1 of Supplementary File). Yin et al (2017) have indicated that the crop residue fire burning in summer harvest time can lead to the increase of PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration in China's middle-east region. As one of the most heavily polluted regions in China (Chang et al., 2009; Fu et al., 2013), many large cities are included in this region, such as Nanjing, Wuhan, Shanghai and Hangzhou. Former studies have highlighted the role of OBB on worsening air quality regionally or at megacities, especially for crop residue burning at harvest periods (Yamaji et al., 2010; Zhu et al., 2010; Yin et al., 2011; Huang et al., 2012b; Su et al., 2012; Cheng et al., 2014; Zhou et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2017).

Previous studies mainly focused on crop residue burning emissions with relatively low spatial and temporal resolution (Yamaji et al., 2010; Huang et al., 2012b), which may limit its adoption in air quality modeling to give an accurate result. An accurate estimation of monthly emissions from OBB with a long timescale and high spatial resolution is still limited. It should be noted that, the OBB activities owned spatial-temporal variation properties and have changed greatly during the last two decades in China, especially for forestland fire burning (Huang et al., 2011) and crop residue burning, considering the implementation of related policies (Table S1 and Table S2). As a big agricultural country, the Chinese government has placed a high priority on environmental pollution prevention caused by OBB. From 1965 to 2015, 51 management documents for crop straw have been formulated and 34 documents were intensively issued after 2008 (Chen et al., 2016). Up to now, few studies have accurately estimated the biomass burning emissions in a long time period (Fu et al., 2013; Cheng et al., 2014). The role of the pollution prevention policies on the spatial-temporal variation of pollutants emitted needs to be better clarified.

In addition, most previous studies have adopted the top-down method (Seiler and Crutzen et al., 1980) to estimate the OBB emission by national or provincial statistical data and then the total emission amounts of pollutants were re-allocated in grids by population, land cover area, or even equal sharing, which is one of the key reasons for the high uncertainties of OBB emission inventories (Streets et al., 2003; Klimont and Streets., 2007; Gadde et al., 2009; He et al., 2013; Zhou et al., 2015; Zhou et al., 2017). Quantitative estimation of biomass

90 burning was highly improved by the satellite observations of fire burned area or active burning fires (Freitas et al.,  
91 2005; Wooster et al., 2005; Roy et al., 2008; Giglio et al., 2008; Roy et al., 2008; Reid et al., 2009; Sofiev et al.,  
92 2009; Giglio et al., 2010; Lioussé et al., 2010; Huang et al., 2012; Li et al., 2016). The improvement of  
93 spatial-temporal distribution evolution was achieved by active fire products (e.g., the AVHRR fire count product  
94 (Setzer and Pereira, 1991), MODIS active fire satellite products (Cooke et al., 1996) and VIRS fire count product  
95 (Ito et al., 2007)). The burned area detection was improved by burned area products (e.g., GBA2000 product (Ito  
96 and Penner, 2004; Korontzi, 2005), MODIS burned area dataset (Ito et al., 2007) and Global Fire Emissions  
97 Database (GFED) (Randerson et al., 2012)). However, satellite observation also exhibited weakness in estimating  
98 fire burning emissions (Duncan et al., 2003; He et al., 2015). One is the burned area product, which provides fire  
99 burned areas of the whole month. It is limited by the lower pixel resolutions. The size of many small burn scars is  
100 below the detection limit of these products (Eva and Lambin, 1998; Laris, 2005; McCarty et al., 2009; Roy and  
101 Boschetti, 2009). Therefore, the contribution of small fires to fire burned area and corresponding fire burning  
102 emissions are still poorly understood (Randerson et al., 2012). The other is the active fire product, which can  
103 provides information on small fire locations, occurrence time and small fire burned area (Prins and Menzel, 1992;  
104 Giglio et al., 2006; Chuvieco et al., 2008; Roberts et al., 2009; Aragao and Shimabukuro, 2010; Bowman et al.,  
105 2011; Lin et al., 2012; Arino et al., 2012). The uncertainty of fire detection is mainly due to the limitation of  
106 satellite overpass periods. To reduce the uncertainty of emission estimation by satellite products, the combination of  
107 two satellite dataset has been proved to be an effective practice recently (Qiu et al., 2016).

108 The lack of local biomass data (biomass loading data and vegetation speciation data) and local emission  
109 factors could introduce uncertainty in emission estimates. Currently, local biomass loading data need to be updated  
110 and accurately measured. Local high spatial-resolution vegetation speciation data has been rarely adopted in OBB  
111 estimations. Meanwhile, a lot of researches about OBB have used the same emission factors for pollutants emitted  
112 from OBB without considering the various biomass species and combustion conditions (Andela et al., 2013; Giglio  
113 et al., 2013). All these should be considered and improved in the establishment of OBB emission inventory.

114 In this study, the multiple satellite data (MCD14 ML and MCD64A1), local high spatial-resolution of  
115 vegetation speciation data, updated local biomass loading data, local emission factors and survey results were used  
116 to estimate multi-year OBB emissions from 2003 to 2015 in CEC. High spatial-temporal resolution of emission  
117 allocation was achieved. The possible driving factors like local habits, social customs, rural population, economic  
118 level, agricultural production, energy and pollution control policies which may impact the spatial distribution and  
119 temporal variation of OBB emissions were explored. They have been overlooked in previous studies (Song et al.,

2009; Chen et al., 2013; Shi et al., 2015). The results here will provide scientific evidence for policy making on controlling OBB emission and modeling its regional impact on air quality, climate and human health. The methods are also helpful for other regions for OBB emission estimation.

## 2. Methods

### 2.1 Estimation of burned areas

OBB emissions in CEC were initially estimated based on the local biomass data (biomass loading data and vegetation speciation data), satellite burned area data (Figure S2) and emission factors. Fire burning emission amount was calculated by the following equation (Wiedinmyer et al., 2011; Shi et al, 2015).

$$E_{i, x, t} = \sum_{j=1}^n BA_{x, t} \times CE_x \times BL_x \times EF_{i, j} \quad (1)$$

where  $j$  stands the different aggregated vegetation types;  $i$  stands for different pollutant species;  $E_{i, x, t}$  is the emission amount of pollutant  $i$  in location  $x$  and month  $t$ ;  $BA_{x, t}$  is the total burned area ( $\text{km}^2$ ) of aggregated vegetation class in location  $x$  and month  $t$ ;  $CE_x$  is defined as the combustion efficiency in location  $x$ ;  $BL_x$  is the biomass fuel loading (kg) in location  $x$ ;  $EF_{i, j}$  is the emission factor of pollutant specie  $i$  for vegetation type  $j$ .

MODIS burned area product (MCD64AL: <http://modis-fire.umd.edu/>) and MODIS active fire product (MCD14 ML: <https://earthdata.nasa.gov/faq#ed-firms-faq>) were combined to obtain accurate open biomass burned area data. MCD64AL had a 500 m spatial resolution and monthly temporal resolution, which could accurately detect the burning area at 500 m pixel. A much lower pixel resolution burning was difficult to detect by this satellite. Therefore, we used MODIS active fire product MCD14 ML as a supplemental tool to obtain the small fire burned area. The active fire detection method based on thermal anomalies could detect fires as low as 1/20 of a pixel. We resampled the two fire products data into  $1 \text{ km} \times 1 \text{ km}$  grid. The total burned area in each grid cell was estimated by the following equation (Randerson et al., 2012).

$$BA_{\text{total}(i, t, j)} = BA_{\text{MCD64AL}(i, t, j)} + BA_{\text{sf}(i, t, j)} \quad (2)$$

where  $BA_{\text{total}(i, t, j)}$  is the total fire burned area in grid cell  $i$ , month  $t$  and aggregated vegetation class  $j$ ;  $BA_{\text{MCD64AL}(i, t, j)}$  is the MCD64AL burned area in grid cell  $i$ , month  $t$  and aggregated vegetation class  $j$ ;  $BA_{\text{sf}(i, t, j)}$  is the small fire burned area in grid cell  $i$ , month  $t$  and aggregated vegetation class  $j$ .

$BA_{\text{MCD64AL}(i, t, j)}$  was directly detected from MCD64AL product. MCD14ML active fire points in each grid included two parts: active fires points with or near MCD64AL burned area ( $FC_{\text{in}}$ ) and active fires outside the MCD64AL burning area ( $FC_{\text{out}}$ ).  $BA_{\text{sf}(i, t, j)}$  was the burned area of  $FC_{\text{out}}$ . The  $BA_{\text{sf}(i, t, j)}$  was used as supplement. Due to the active fire product existed as the fire points and could not directly obtain the burned area data, the burned

149 area of small fire was estimated based on the following method (Randerson et al., 2012).

$$150 \quad BA_{sf(i,t,j)} = FC_{out(i,t,j)} \times \alpha_{(r,s,j)} \times \gamma_{(r,s,j)} \quad (3)$$

151 where  $BA_{sf(i,t,j)}$  is the small fire burned area of  $F_{out}$  in grid cell  $i$ , month  $t$  and aggregated vegetation class  $j$ ;  
 152  $FC_{out(i,t,j)}$  is the total number of MCD14 ML active fires outside of the burned area in grid cell  $i$ , month  $t$  and  
 153 aggregated vegetation class  $j$ ;  $\alpha$  is the ratio of  $BA_{MCD64A1}$  to  $F_{in}$  and  $\alpha$  is equal to the value of surrounding grid cell  
 154 if  $BA_{MCD64A1}$  is equal to 0;  $\gamma$  is an additional unit less scalar which indicates the difference between  $F_{in}$  and  $F_{out}$   
 155 and  $\gamma$  is assumed equal to 1 in this research;  $r$  denotes the burning region;  $s$  indicates the burning period.

156

## 157 2.2 Biomass fuel loading

158 For forestland, most previous studies used the forest biomass loading data from Fang et al (1996). The forest  
 159 biomass loading data in recent years need to be updated. In this study, the forest loading data between 2003 and  
 160 2008 was collected from Fang et al (1996). From 2008-2015, the forest loading data was calculated based on the 8<sup>th</sup>  
 161 Chinese National Forest Resource Inventory (Xu, 2014). The forest biomass density data (Table 1) was estimated  
 162 by the following equation:

$$163 \quad B_{i,r} = T_{i,r} / A_{i,r} \quad (4)$$

164 where  $i$  stands for different forest species (broadleaf forest, coniferous forest and mixed forest);  $r$  means each  
 165 province;  $B_{i,r}$  is the biomass density of forest specie  $i$  in province  $r$ ;  $T_{i,r}$  means the total biomass of forest specie  $i$  in  
 166 province  $r$ ;  $A_{i,r}$  denotes the total area of forest specie  $i$  in province  $r$ .

167 The total biomass of different forest species was calculated based on the forest stock volume method as  
 168 follows (Fang et al., 1996):

$$169 \quad T_{i,r} = \sum_{j=1}^n E_{j,r} = \sum_{j=1}^n (aV_{j,r} + b) \quad (5)$$

170 where  $j$  stands for different tree types of forest specie  $i$ ;  $E_{j,r}$  means the biomass of different tree type  $j$  in  
 171 province  $r$ ;  $V_{j,r}$  indicates the forest stock volume of different tree type  $j$  in province  $r$ ;  $a$  and  $b$  are set as correlation  
 172 coefficient.

173 The correlation coefficient “ $a$ ” and “ $b$ ” for different tree types were derived from previous studies (Fang et al.,  
 174 1996; Tian et al., 2011; Lu et al., 2012; Li et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2014; Wen et al., 2014) (Table 2).  $A_{j,r}$  and  $V_{j,r}$   
 175 was collected from the 8<sup>th</sup> Chinese National Forest Continuous Inventory. As shown in Table 1, the forest biomass  
 176 density in recent years has changed a lot, which highlighted the importance of the updation for improving the



emission estimation.

For grassland and shrubland, local biomass density data were collected (Pu et al, 2004; Hu et al, 2006) in Table 1. To determine the accurate provincial amounts of crop residue burning, we gathered the production of different species of crops from the China Statistical Yearbook (NBSC, 2004-2016). Detailed data of crop residue to production ratio (dry matter) were collected from local statistical data (Table 3) and the updated data for crop straw burned ratio were derived from survey results (Table 4). Using the updated biomass data, the accuracy of the estimation of OBB emission is expected to be improved.

### 2.3 Combustion efficiency

In previous studies (Wang et al., 2008; Tian et al., 2011), the combustion efficiency (CE) of OBB was mainly set as a constant, which may bias the emission estimation. To improve the accuracy, for cropland, the CE was set as 0.68 for soya bean and 0.93 for other types (Koopmans and Koppejan, 1997; Wang and Zhang, 2008; Zhang et al., 2011). For forest, shrubland and grassland, the CE of fires at each grid cell was assumed as a function of forest cover of corresponding grid cell (Ito et al, 2004; Wiedinmyer et al, 2006). If areas with tree coverage exceeding 60%, the CE for woody and herbaceous cover was set as 0.3 and 0.9, respectively; the CE was set as 0 and 0.98 for woody and herbaceous cover with tree coverage less than 40%; for 40-60% tree cover of fires, the CE was defined as 0.3 for woody fuels and the calculation of herbaceous areas was referred to the following equation:

$$CE_s = e^{-0.13 \times TB} \quad (6)$$

where TB stands for the percent tree cover for fires in each grid cell.

It should be noted that though we improved the selection of CE values for different biomass burning types by reviewing literatures, the CE value should not be a constant during burning and the pollution emissions were not uniform in different burning phase, such as smoldering (Kondo et al., 2011) and flaming burning (Burling et al., 2010). Emission inventory in this research and currently published papers (Wang and Zhang, 2008; Zhang et al., 2011; Lu et al., 2011) were estimated for a long time period or a whole year with the timescale as month, instead of hour. Therefore, the CE values used here reflected the average biomass burning condition. In the future, for researches on developing emission inventory with hourly or daily resolution, corresponding high time-resolution activity data and emission factors for different burning stages should be considered.

### 2.4 Emission Factors

Emission factors (EFs) of different OBB were summarized in Table 5. EFs for cropland burning were mainly collected from previous researches carried out in CEC (Tang et al., 2014). As the lack of EFs research on some crop

species conducted in CEC and forest, grassland and shrubland conducted in China, EFs were collected from previous researches (Cao et al., 2008; Wang et al., 2008; Akagi et al., 2011; He et al., 2015). In addition, some emission factors measured by our research group in CEC were included in this study.

## 2.5 Spatial and temporal allocation

In order to estimate high spatial resolution of OBB emission in CEC, a high resolution vegetation map (1:1 000 000) (Figure S1) together with the burned area of every open biomass species was used. All the data were relocated into a 1 km×1 km grid to identify and estimate spatial variations of OBB emission. The monthly distribution of OBB emissions were estimated based on the monthly burned area of different vegetation cover types.

The emission in t-th grid was calculated by the following equation:

$$E_{t,j} = BA_{t,j} / BA_{i,j} \times E_{i,j} \quad (7)$$

Where j means different biomass species; i denotes different provinces;  $E_{t,j}$  is the emission of different biomass specie j in t-th grid;  $BA_{t,j}$  is the burned area in t-th grid cell;  $BA_{i,j}$  is the total burn area of different vegetation types in province i;  $E_{i,j}$  is the total emission amounts from OBB in province i.

## 2.6 Other factors influencing OBB emission

Several detailed statistics data in the NBSC were collected, such as rural population, per capita net income of rural residents, agricultural output and forestry output in each province and each year. They may impact the OBB emission. Correlation analysis between the OBB emissions and these influencing factors were conducted. Rural population data in 2003, 2004 and 2010 were lack as the detailed data was not reported in NBSC.

## 2.7 Uncertainty analysis

The Monte Carlo method together with the crystal software was used to evaluate the estimation uncertainty quantitatively for all the pollutants. Pollutant emissions were estimated from 20,000 Monte Carlo simulations with a 95% coincidence interval.

## 3. Results and Discussion

### 3.1 Accumulated pollutants emission from OBB in CEC

Table 6 presented the cumulative OBB emission amounts during 2003-2015 and multi-year emissions of different provinces were detailedly listed in Table S3. By the end of 2015, the cumulative emissions of OC, EC, CH<sub>4</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, NMVOCs, SO<sub>2</sub>, NH<sub>3</sub>, CO, CO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> were  $3.64 \times 10^3$ ,  $2.87 \times 10^2$ ,  $3.05 \times 10^3$ ,  $1.82 \times 10^3$ ,  $6.4 \times 10^3$ ,  $2.12 \times 10^2$ ,  $4.67 \times 10^2$ ,  $4.59 \times 10^4$ ,  $9.39 \times 10^5$  and  $4.13 \times 10^3$  Gg, respectively. For better revealing the spatial-temporal

variation of OBB emissions, the PM<sub>2.5</sub> variation was detailedly discussed as an example. From 2013 to 2015, the highest emission amounts of PM<sub>2.5</sub> were found in Henan and Shandong, accounting for 27.93% and 24.35% of the total emission amounts, respectively. The lowest emission appeared in Zhejiang and Shanghai, which only contributed for 4.05% and 0.43%. For other provinces, Hunan, Hubei, Fujian, Anhui, Jiangxi and Jiangsu accounted from 5.52% to 10.13% of the whole emission.

The contributions of different biomass burning types for various pollutants were shown in Figure 2a. Cropland burning contributed the most emission for all the pollutants, by 84%-96%. The forest fire exhibited higher emission of NH<sub>3</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, NMVOCs and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, accounting for 12%, 11%, 7% and 5% of corresponding total emission, respectively. As shown in Figure 2b, for cropland, wheat, corn and rice straw burning were the top three emission source types for all the pollutants. Corn straw burning contributed the most to SO<sub>2</sub> (48%), NO<sub>x</sub> (37%), NMVOCs (33%), CO (32%) and CO<sub>2</sub> (28%) emission. Highest contributions of EC (45%), OC (33%) and CH<sub>4</sub> (32%) from rice straw burning was found, while wheat straw burning contributed the most (31%) to PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission.

In Figure 3, except for Fujian, cropland burning emission was the largest contributor to PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission, with the contributions ranging from 75.25% (Jiangxi) to almost 100% (Shanghai). The higher rural agglomeration, abundant crop production and more crop residue burning activities in these provinces can explain the higher contributions. Shanghai is one of the most developed cities in China. The highest contribution of cropland burning is not related with its high levels of agricultural activities, but is due to the lack of emissions from other open biomass burning sources. Highest contribution from the forest fire burning and shrubland fire burning were found in Fujian as 45.29% and in Jiangxi as 23.95%, respectively. For forest fire burning, the southern provinces (Fujian, Zhejiang, Jiangxi, Hunan, Hubei and Anhui) exhibited higher values, varying from 3.66% (Hubei) to 38.3% (Fujian) and for shrubland fire burning, the contributions varied from 1.5% (Hubei) to 7.23% (Zhejiang). The relative high emission contributions of forest and shrubland fire burning in the southern provinces can be explained by the large forest and shrubland coverage, frequent human forestry activities, low precipitation and dry weather in spring and winter (Cao et al., 2015), which may easily lead to forest and shrubland fires. While for the northern provinces (Shandong, Henan and Jiangsu), the contributions ranged around 0.76%-1.97%, which can be neglected. PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission from grassland in CEC was negligible with the following provinces holding higher contributions: Jiangxi (0.8%), Hunan (0.25%), Fujian (0.11%) and Anhui (0.1%).

From Figure 4, emissions from wheat and corn straw burning mainly concentrated in Shandong and Henan (totally accounting for 82% and 78% of the whole emissions, respectively) and the rice straw burning exhibited higher concentrations in Hunan, Jiangxi and Hubei provinces, by 25%, 18% and 16%, respectively. The total

contributions of rapeseed, cotton, potato and peanut straw burning to the PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission were relatively small, accounting for 21%-24% of the total emissions. Most emissions from cotton, peanut and potato straw burning located in Shandong (totally accounting for 35%, 35% and 20%) and Henan (totally accounting for 19%, 40% and 15%). Hubei (32%) and Hunan (31%) were the major provinces for rapeseed straw burning emissions. In addition, emissions from soya bean, sugar cane, tobacco, sesame and sugar beet straw burning were negligible, which never exceeded 1% of total crop residue burning emission in this study.

## **3.2 Temporal variation and spatial distribution for OBB emissions in CEC**

### **3.2.1 Yearly variation**

Multi-year emissions of OBB from 2003 to 2015 in CEC were shown in Figure 5. The multi-year variation of OBB emissions for various pollutants was similar (Figure 6).

The increase of crops residue burning dominated the significant growth of OBB emission. Pollutants emitted from OBB all increased obviously from 2003 to 2008. Then with the adoption of strict control policies (Table S1 in Supplement), the growth of crops residue burning emission gradually slow down. The forest, shrubland and grassland fire burning were related to weather conditions and human activities. Their emissions were difficult to predict and control and existed random yearly variation. Therefore, we discussed the multi-year variation during 2003-2015 instead of the overall trend for the whole period (Figure S3). Take PM<sub>2.5</sub> as example, emission exhibited clearly increasing trend from 2003 (256 Gg) to 2008 (353 Gg) and then decreased in the following two years to 322 Gg. After 2010, there existed higher (2011, 2013 and 2015) and lower values (2010, 2012 and 2014) alternately. The values in 2011, 2013 and 2015 all did not exceed the peak values in 2008.

Emissions from forest, shrubland and grassland fire burning have an obvious trend of declining from 2003 to 2006 and rising from 2006 to 2008. Peak emissions for PM<sub>2.5</sub> from forest, shrubland and grassland fire burning were found in 2008, as 49 Gg, 8.9 Gg and 0.7 Gg, respectively. In 2008, intensive policies for utilization of straw energy (Table S1) and strengthening the forestry fires prevention (Table S2) were published, which effectively limited the emissions from forest and shrubland fire burning as Figure 6a shown. Obvious decreasing was found from 2008 to 2010, down to 19 Gg, 4.8 Gg and 0.24 Gg, respectively. Then they exhibited inter-annual oscillation from 2010 to 2015, with higher emission in 2011, 2013 and 2015 and lower emission in 2012 and 2014 (Jin et al., 2017a). The multi-year tendency for forest, shrubland and grassland fire burning were mainly affected by the variations in climate, management measures and other human forcing. It can also conclude that the yearly fluctuation of pollutants from OBB was mainly impacted by the emission of forest, shrubland and grassland fire burning, but not the crop residue burning.

295 The emission of PM<sub>2.5</sub> from crop residue burning exhibited quite different yearly variation trend with other  
296 three types of biomass burning, which gradually increased from 2003 (228 Gg) to 2015 (323 Gg), by 29%. The  
297 increase of crop residue production can primarily explain the increasing of pollutant emission. Meanwhile, as  
298 shown in Figure S6 and Table S1, the controlling of pollutants from crop residue burning in China started from  
299 1965s. In 2000, the law for prevention of air pollution was published. Then in 2003, the regulations on straw  
300 banning and comprehensive utilization were released. In Figure 6, we found that the emission of PM<sub>2.5</sub> from crop  
301 residue burning significantly increased from 2003 (228 Gg) to 2008 (294 Gg), due to the increase of crops  
302 production and deficiency of strict control policies in this period (Table S1). Although emissions from forest,  
303 shrubland and grassland fire burning fluctuated markedly during this period, the obvious increase of crops residue  
304 burning dominated the total growth of OBB emission from 2003 to 2008 as their higher emission amounts. From  
305 2008 to 2015, strict policies were developed to improve the straw energy utilization and reduce the air pollution  
306 raised by its burning. However, it has to say, the policies may not be well implemented, with the annual averaged  
307 increasing amounts of 7.3 Gg for PM<sub>2.5</sub>. From Figure 6b, the large contributions to PM<sub>2.5</sub> (22%-28% and 29%-33%)  
308 and increasing trends for corn straw burning and wheat straw burning could be found, which should be further  
309 focused. The contribution of rice straw burning has slightly decreased in research period, by about 19% . Other  
310 types of biomass totally accounted for averaged 25% of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission and all exhibited slightly increasing trend  
311 from 2003 to 2015, by about 21%-29%.

312 Figure 7 showed that the crop residue burning emission in Henan, Shandong, Anhui, Jiangsu, Hubei, Hunan  
313 and Jiangxi exhibited obvious increasing trends, which suggested the importance of crop residue burning control in  
314 these provinces. For Fujian and Zhejiang, no obvious increase for cropland burning emission was found, implying  
315 that the emission has been well controlled in these years. It should be noted that in Fujian and Zhejiang, the main  
316 crop is rice. While in other provinces, the main crops are corn and wheat especially for northern provinces. To  
317 conclude, pollutants emitted from crop straw burning (wheat, corn and rice) are still now the key sources for air  
318 pollution, in view of its increasing emission trend. The randomness of burning activities and corresponding  
319 widespread and scattered distribution make it difficult to control them. The wheat and corn emissions at northern  
320 provinces and rice burning emissions at southern provinces should be controlled specially in the future.

321 In Figure 8, the PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission from crop residue burning exhibited higher amounts for Henan and Shandong  
322 province in 2015, as 100 Gg and 82 Gg, respectively, which are 200%-1200% times of those for other provinces.  
323 As the main source regions for air pollution of Yangtze River Delta (YRD) and Beijing-Tijin-Hebei (BTH) region  
324 (Fu et al., 2013; Zhou et al., 2015), the enforced and effective control of crop residue burning in the two provinces

at summer and autumn harvest periods are important for improving the air quality of these regions.

### 3.2.2 Monthly distribution

The monthly PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission variation of different OBB in CEC was shown in Figure 8a. PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission held higher amounts in May and June (90.4 Gg-179.3 Gg), followed by December to March of next year (32.2 Gg-127.3 Gg) and September-October (8.2 Gg-89.2 Gg), and was lowest during July-August (14.3 Gg-65.9 Gg). As the emission amounts of cropland fire burning was one or two magnitude higher than other three types of biomass burning, the monthly variation of total PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission was dominantly controlled by the crop residue fire burning (Zhang et al., 2016). The periods with highest PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions were the summer and autumn harvest times, when the burning activities are more frequent. The peak of open biomass fire burning occurred in May and June, totally accounted for 42% of the whole PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission in 2003-2015, which is caused by the harvest and open residue burning of winter wheat, especially in Henan, Shandong, Jiangsu and Anhui (Figure 8b). Large amounts of wheat straw were burned after the harvest to increase the soil fertility and prepare for following corn cultivation (Levine et al., 1995). The small peak of open biomass burning emission in September to October (totally accounted for 13.82% of the whole PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission in 2003-2015) can be attributed to the burning of corn straw after corn harvest. Though the open biomass burning was strictly forbidden in recent years, scattered burning activities still existed in these regions. As shown in Figure S4, the PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions in CEC and major agricultural provinces during harvest time have shown a rapid decline in recent years, in accordance with the change tendency of burned area due to increased government management. Considering of the yearly increasing fact of crops straw burning, it is worth noting that fire burning out of harvest season as a way of circumventing governmental policies needs to be well regulated. From December to February, the crop residue burning emission decreased to the lowest level in the whole year (18.9% of the whole PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission in 2003-2015). However, the emissions of PM<sub>2.5</sub> from forest, shrubland and grassland burning achieved peak values from December to March, being 67% of that in 2003-2015.

Figure 9 clearly listed the monthly average emissions of PM<sub>2.5</sub> from OBB in different provinces. These provinces were classified based on the correlation between their monthly emissions of 2003-2015. Henan, Shandong, Anhui and Jiangsu provinces ( $R^2$  higher than 0.92,  $P < 0.01$ ), as one of the largest and contiguous wheat planting areas in China (Fang et al., 2014), have two crop rotations. The highest monthly emissions were observed for winter wheat harvesting (sown in October and harvested from May to June) and corn harvesting (sown in middle June and harvested from September to October). A large proportion of crop straw were always burnt directly after the crop harvest (MEPC, 2015). For Hubei province, agricultural emissions fluctuated over the period from February to October with several peaks due to that different crop species matured in succession. In Jiangxi,

Fujian and Hunan ( $R^2$  higher than 0.9,  $P < 0.01$ ), the largest monthly emissions were observed with forest and shrubland fire burning during the time between December and March, which is the dry season in these provinces (Li et al., 2014; Li et al., 2015). While in other months, the emissions were limited. For Shanghai and Zhejiang ( $R^2 = 0.7$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ), lowest levels of  $PM_{2.5}$  emission were found, with peak values occurring in summer and autumn harvest periods. Obvious two peaks were found for April-May and July-August periods, which may reflect the rice harvesting at these times. To sum up, the regional differences of monthly  $PM_{2.5}$  emissions from OBB were mainly caused by the different biomass burning types and times as well as corresponding environmental conditions.

### 3.2.3 Spatial distribution within 1 km $\times$ 1 km of $PM_{2.5}$ emitted from OBB in CEC

The spatial distribution of  $PM_{2.5}$  emitted from OBB within 1 km $\times$ 1 km resolution was mapped based on the burned area and a high-resolution vegetation map (1:1 000000) in CEC. The multi-year averaged spatial distributions of  $PM_{2.5}$  emission were shown in Figure 10. It can be found that the OBB was widespread and scattered. The average emissions intensity of  $PM_{2.5}$  ranged from 0 to 15 tons per pixel in most provinces. The variation range is mainly caused by the social-economic development level, rural population and agricultural activities. The highest value in different provinces was all mainly raised by the cropland fire burning due to the centralized burning in a relatively small area. Some pixels with high emissions exceeding more than 100 tons each year were found in Henan, Shandong and Hunan. It can be attributed to the large amounts of crop straws in these provinces. The pixels of high emission intensity more than 70 tons from crop straw burning were also found in Hubei, Jiangsu and Anhui. For forest and shrubland fire burning, the high emission points (more than 30 tons per pixel) were found in Fujian and Jiangxi. Lower emission intensities in Zhejiang (lower than 10 tons per pixel on average) and Shanghai (lower than 7 tons on average) were mainly due to the highly developed economy and limited agricultural activities (Su et al., 2012). In addition, northern Anhui and eastern Jiangsu featured high emissions of OBB with a relatively lower intensity (lower than 15 tons per pixel on average), which may be due to that the crop straw were burned in a large area in these regions.

Though the emission intensities varied in the past ten years, the areas with high emission amounts remain similar. They were mainly located in the main agricultural areas in eastern Henan, southern Shandong, northern Anhui, northern Jiangsu, eastern Hubei and northern Hunan. This result is in accordance with formers (Huang, et al., 2012b). The junction regions of the four provinces (Henan, Shandong, Anhui and Jiangsu) should be paid more attention, where the pollutants emission from OBB jointed together. This was similar to a recent research (Jin et al., 2017b). This region belongs to HuangHuai Plain, with large area of cropland and low economic development levels. The open burning activities and corresponding banning policies are both abundant in village scale. The game of

385 “cat and mouse” is frequently acted. More effective policies for guiding or helping farmers to utilize straw energy  
386 rather than banning crop residue burning arbitrarily should be considered sincerely. In Zhejiang and Shanghai, OBB  
387 emissions are sparsely scattered, due to the relatively developed economic level, scarce biomass sources and  
388 limited agricultural activities. The recycling of crop straw faces many difficulties due in part to its high cost and the  
389 relative low price of crop straw. Improving policies for effectively utilizing crop residue straw is also an important  
390 challenge for the government.

391 Figure 11 highlights the spatial distribution of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emitted from OBB in different seasons of 2015.  
392 Emissions were more concentrated in summer, followed by winter. In summer, the emission was concentrated in  
393 the connection regions of Henan, Shandong, Anhui and Jiangsu, which is mainly raised by the crop residue burning  
394 as discussed before. In winter, Jiangxi, Hunan and Fujian showed the higher emission intensities from forest and  
395 shrubland burning.

### 396 **3.3 The impact of social-economic factors on OBB emission**

397 Emissions from OBB were found to be in line with the local burning habit, social customs, rural population,  
398 local economic level, agricultural level and pollution controlling policies. Local burning habits have a great  
399 influence on different types of OBB emissions. According to our survey, in agricultural provinces, such as Henan,  
400 Shandong, Jiangsu and Anhui, people always burn crop straws in sowing and harvest seasons. Despite the strict  
401 implementation of crop residue burning management policies, the burning habit is difficult to change in a short  
402 time. Less crop residue production and crop burning activities are found in Jiangxi and Fujian, where people are  
403 accustomed to use crop straw to feed draught animals and produce biogas instead of open burning directly.  
404 Emission from crop residue burning is low. However, due to the rich forest and shrubland resources, wood is served  
405 as the staple household fuel, which mainly comes from felling trees or collecting branches. These human activities  
406 can lead to an increase of forest and shrubland fire burning, resulting in the elevated levels of corresponding  
407 emission in these provinces.

408 Social customs also pose impact on OBB emissions. Biomass burning emissions in April can be enhanced by  
409 human burning activities in the tomb-sweeping day. The tomb-sweeping day (often in April 4 or April 5) is a time  
410 to memorize the death. People sweep graves and burn sacrifices by ignited straw, which can easily cause grass,  
411 shrub and forest fires (Qiu et al., 2016). The fire points at the tomb-sweeping day in CEC occupied by 22%-38% of  
412 the whole fire points in April in some years (Figure S5). The Chinese government has also introduced policies to  
413 prevent forest, shrubland and grassland fires on tomb-sweeping day (Table S2). The wildfires caused by biomass  
414 burning from late January to early February are partially related to the firework burning in the Spring Festival (Zuo,



2004). The firework burning activities for celebration and official sacrifices to ancestors in the Spring Festival easily lead to grass, shrub and forest fires. All these activities can affect the emission levels and air quality in a short time scale.

In order to understand the impact of the rural population, local economic level and agricultural level, correlation analysis between  $PM_{2.5}$  emissions from OBB and statistics data (rural population, per capita net income of rural residents, agricultural output (crop straw burning) and forestry output (forest, shrubland and grassland burning) in different provinces were conducted. Significant positive correlations were found between the rural population, agricultural output and the  $PM_{2.5}$  emissions from crops straw burning ( $R^2$  higher than 0.58,  $P < 0.01$ ) for the whole CEC (Figure 12a). According to our survey, the high rural population and agricultural output indicate that agricultural activities are quite important in a certain region. With more crops residue produced, it can easily cause high emissions from cropland fire burning. No significant correlations were found for  $PM_{2.5}$  emission from crop straw burning with the income of rural residents (Figure 15), which indicates that the rural economic level in different regions in CEC have no relationship with the  $PM_{2.5}$  emission. Then we calculated the correlations between the change tendency of  $PM_{2.5}$  emission from crops fire burning and the multi-year variation of other three social-economic factors as Table 7 shown for different provinces. Significant positive correlations were found for  $PM_{2.5}$  emission with per capita income of rural residents and agricultural output (most  $R^2$  higher than 0.59,  $P < 0.01$ ) and negative correlation were found for  $PM_{2.5}$  emission with rural population (most  $R^2$  higher than 0.73,  $P < 0.01$ ) except for the provinces of Shanghai, Zhejiang and Fujian, which are underdeveloped agricultural provinces. From 2003 to 2015, with the increase of agricultural outputs, more crop residue was produced. However, rapid economic development and less rural population in each province lead to the popular of commercial energy and clean energy in rural area. It decreased the demands in using crop residue as fuel. As a consequence, more crop residues were directly burned in the agricultural field. But it was not suitable for Shanghai, Zhejiang and Fujian (most  $R^2$  lower than 0.19,  $P > 0.05$ ), which holds less crop residue production and high utilization efficiency of crop straws.

Positive correlations were also found between forestry output and  $PM_{2.5}$  emission from forestland, shrubland and grassland fire burning ( $R^2 = 0.14$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) in the whole CEC (Figure 12b), which indicated that human forestry activities played positive role on open fire burning (Yan et al., 2006). According to our survey, human forest activities such as felling trees or picking up branches from trees can easily cause more forest and shrubland burning. However, compared with the crops straw burning, no correlation was found between  $PM_{2.5}$  emission and other statistics data (the rural population and the per capita net income of rural residents) (Figure 13b and Table S4). It may indicate that the forestry fire burning activities were not predominantly associated with the rural human living

activity. According to previous studies, forestry fire burning was affected by environmental conditions and human activities with environmental factors having a larger impact (Chen et al., 2013).

### 3.4 Comparison with others

Emission data from OBB in CEC during the past several years have been compared with other studies for the similar year (Table 8). Compared with the emissions derived from Wang et al. (2008) based on statistical data, the differences of OC, EC, CH<sub>4</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, NMVOCs, NH<sub>3</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub> and CO emissions ranged from -41% to 12%. For SO<sub>2</sub> (121%) and PM<sub>2.5</sub> (288%) emission, the differences were relative high. All these differences were mainly caused by the selection of EFs. The EFs employed in Wang et al.(2008) were constant values for different biomass species. In addition, the crop residue to production ratio data and the burned ratio for various crop types were all specific to CEC in this study based on literatures and survey results, which increased the reliable of these data. Similarly, Huang et al. (2012) used the same EF<sub>s</sub> of different crops straw burning for emission calculation. Compared with Wang et al. (2008) and Huang et al. (2012), the estimate in our study is believed to be more accuracy. An obvious underestimation of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission from crop straw burning were found in Jin et al. (2017), in which not all the crop species were considered.

The estimation based on satellite observation was prevalent recently. Compared to Zhou et al. (2017) who estimated the pollutant emission amounts from MODIS burned area product, the results in this study were much higher. The reason may be that when using a single satellite data set, pollutant emission can be underestimated due to that some actual fire activities could not be detected (van der Werf et al., 2010). The lower emission of CO<sub>2</sub>, NMVOCs, SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> in our study is due to the adoption of more accurate and suitable EFs values as those in a previous study (Tang et al, 2014). Our emission estimation of the pollutants is more similar to the results of Qiu et al. (2016), who also used multiple satellite products (MCD14 ML and MCD64A1) to estimate the OBB emissions of China in 2013, with the differences of the two studies ranging from -42% to 22%. For CH<sub>4</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, NMVOCs, NH<sub>3</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub>, the differences were less than 10%. The reason for the differences is due to the use of updated local biomass data and EFs in this study. Therefore, the combination of multiple satellite products with local EFs data and updated local biomass data (updated forest loading data, the crop residue to production ratio data and the burned ratio for various crop types) are likely to have improved the estimation of pollutant emission from OBB effectively.

### 3.5 Uncertainty analysis

Emission uncertainties in this study were associated with the satellite fire products, biomass fuel loading data, combustion efficiency and emission factors. It is difficult to assess the uncertainty of the satellite-derived data for

burned land area (Hoelzemann et al., 2004, Chang et al., 2010). The estimation of fire burned area were proved to be reliable by using the burned area product MCD64AL (Giglio et al., 2013) and active fire product MCD14ML (Randerson et al., 2012). Although some active fires which burned out at 10:30 am-1:30 pm each day could not be captured by MCD14ML, the burned area used in this study were more reliable due to the combination of multiple satellite dataset (MCD64AL and MCD14ML). The uncertainties in this study were mainly caused by biomass loading data, combustion efficiency and emission factors. These data were assumed to be normal distributions (Zhao et al., 2011). The uncertainty of biomass loading data and combustion efficiency was estimated to be approximately 50% (Shi et al., 2015) and the uncertainty of EFs of each pollutant mainly ranged from 0.03 to 0.85 (Table S5). The reliable of emission factors played the most important role in driving uncertainty. Considering all these parameters, 20,000 Monte Carlo simulations were performed to evaluate the estimation uncertainty quantitatively for pollutant emissions with 95% coincidence level. Table 9 showed the emission uncertainty for different pollutants from 2003-2015. On average, the uncertainty of the estimated OC, EC, CH<sub>4</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, NMVOCs, CO, SO<sub>2</sub>, NH<sub>3</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> were (-30%, 30%), (-48%, 48%), (-20%, 20%), (-20%, 20%), (-45%, 45%), (-18%, 18%), (-45%, 45%), (-35%, 35%), (-3%, 3%) and (-36%, 36%), respectively.

Compared with previous studies, the uncertainty was improved in our study due to the datasets used here were better and more suitable. The reliable multiple satellites could better obtain burned area data. The local EFs data, updated forest loading data, the adoption of local crop residue to production ratio data and the crop residue burned ratio data based on survey results improved the emission estimation of forestry and cropland burning as they could better reflect the actual situation in this region. Compared with the constant combustion efficiency in previous researches, the activity combustion efficiency data could also reduce the uncertainty as they could more accurately reflect the actual combustion conditions (Chen et al., 2013) Therefore, due to the adoption of multiple satellite products, updated local biomass data and local emission factors, the uncertainty ranges of different pollutant emissions were narrowed and reliable in this study, which could better reflect the real emission.

#### 4 Conclusions

In this study, a combination of the burned area product (MCD64Al) with the active fire product (MCD14 ML), as well as local high resolution vegetation speciation data, updated local biomass data, local emission factors and survey results were used to estimate the pollutant emissions from open burning in Central and Eastern China (CEC) from 2003 to 2015. The emission from crop residue, forest, shrubland and grassland fire burning were considered.

Crop residue burning was the major source type for pollutant emissions, followed by forest and shrubland fire burning. The grassland fire burning emissions were negligible in CEC. For cropland, the fire burning was mainly

concentrated in agricultural provinces, such as Henan and Shandong. For forest and shrubland, the fire burning was mainly concentrated in Fujian, Jiangxi and Hunan provinces, with abundant forest resources. Wheat, corn and rice straw were the major three types of crop straws for pollutant emission. Wheat and corn straw burning dominated in Shangdong and Henan and the rice straw burning dominated in Hunan, Jiangxi and Hubei provinces. For various pollutant emissions, corn straw burning was the largest contributor to SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, NMVOCs, CO<sub>2</sub>, NH<sub>3</sub>. OC, EC and CH<sub>4</sub> emission was mainly produced by rice straw burning. Wheat straw burning was the largest contributor to PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The spatial distribution of open biomass residue burning in different years was similar. The high emissions were mainly found in the major agricultural areas in eastern Henan, southern Shandong, northern Anhui, northern Jiangsu, eastern Hubei and northern Hunan, due to their abundant agricultural cultivated areas and low straw utilization efficiency.

From 2003 to 2015, the multi-year tendency of opening biomass residue burning emission for various pollutants was similar. Emissions from crop straw burning continued to increase, due to the gradual increase of crop residue production. While emissions from forest, shrubland and grassland fire burning exhibited yearly fluctuations, which was mainly influenced by the environmental conditions, management measures and other human driving factors. Monthly distributions revealed that the pollutant emissions were at the highest levels in May and June, with the lowest emissions in July and August. The high emissions in May, June and October were mainly caused by crop straw burning in sowing and harvest times. It is worth noting that the fire burning activities at harvest season need to be regulated continuously by local governments and emissions from forest and shrubland burning accounted for the vast majority of total emissions in December to March should also be paid attention. The emission of crop residue burning was associated with the rural population, agricultural output and economic levels while the environmental conditions play an important role in the emissions from forestland, shrubland and grassland fire burning.

The estimation of mulit-year open biomass burning emissions by satellite data in this study will provide an objective and creditable evidences for assessing the role of pollution prevention policies on open burning activities issued in the last decade. The high-spatial (1 × 1 km) resolution emission inventory in month scale is also useful in modeling regional air quality and human health risks in the future.

## Acknowledgements

This study was financially supported by the Key Program of Ministry of Science and Technology of the People's Republic of China (2016YFA0602002; 2017YFC0212602), the Key Program for Technical Innovation of

535 Hubei Province (2017ACA089) and Program for Environmental Protection in Hubei Provinces. The research was  
536 also supported by the Start-up Foundation for Advanced Talents (201616) and Fundamental Research Funds for the  
537 Central Universities (201802), China University of Geosciences, Wuhan.

538

## 539 **References**

- 540 Akagi, S. K., Yokelson, R. J., Wiedinmyer, C., Alvarado, M. J., Reid, J. S., Karl, T., Crounse, J. D. and Wennberg, P.  
541 O.: Emission factors for open and domestic biomass burning for use in atmospheric models, *Atmos. Chem.*  
542 *Phys.*, 11(9), 4039-4072, doi:10.5194/acp-11-4039-2011, 2011.
- 543 Andreae, M. O. and Rosenfeld, D.: Aerosol-cloud precipitation interactions. Part 1, The nature and sources of  
544 cloud-active aerosols, *Earth Sci. Rev.*, 89, 13–41, doi:10.1016/j.earscirev.2008.03.001, 2008.
- 545 Andela, N., Schultz, M., Van, der W., Van Leeuwen, T. T., Kaiser, J. W., Wooster, M. J., Heil, A. and Remy, S.:  
546 Assessment of the Global Fire Assimilation System (GFASv1), MACC-II Deliverable D\_31.2, 2013.
- 547 Andreae, M. O. and Merlet, P.: Emission of trace gases and aerosols from biomass burning, *Global Biogeochem.*  
548 *Cy.*, 15(4), 955-966, 2001.
- 549 Ao, H. J., Zou, Y. B., Shen, J. B., Peng, S. B., Tang, Q. Y. and Feng, Y. h.: Effects of fertilizer-N application for  
550 double early rice on the yield, nitrogen use efficiency and soil nitrogen content of double rice, *Plant Nutr. Fert.*  
551 *Sci.*, 13(5), 772-780, 2007 (in Chinese).
- 552 Aragao, L. E. O. C. and Shimabukuro, Y. E.: The Incidence of Fire in Amazonian Forests with Implications for  
553 REDD, *Science*, 328(5983), 1275-1278, doi:10.1126/science.1186925, 2010.
- 554 Arino, O., Casadio, S. and Serpe, D.: Global night-time fire season timing and fire count trends using the ATSR  
555 instrument series, *Remote. Sens. Environ.*, 116, 226-238, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2011.05.025, 2012.
- 556 Bond, T. C.: A technology-based global inventory of black and organic carbon emissions from combustion, *J.*  
557 *Geophys. Res.*, 109(D14), doi:10.1029/2003JD003697, 2004.
- 558 Bond, T. C., Doherty, S. J., Fahey, D. W., Forster, P. M., Berntsen, T., DeAngelo, B. J., Flanner, M. G., Ghan, S.,  
559 Kärcher, B., Koch, D., Kinne, S., Kondo, Y., Quinn, P. K., Sarofim, M. C., Schultz, M. G., Schulz, M.,  
560 Venkataraman, C., Zhang, H., Zhang, S., Bellouin, N., Guttikunda, S. K., Hopke, P. K., Jacobson, M. Z.,  
561 Kaiser, J. W., Klimont, Z., Lohmann, U., Schwarz, J. P., Shindell, D., Storelvmo, T., Warren, S. G. and Zender,  
562 C. S.: Bounding the role of black carbon in the climate system: A scientific assessment: black carbon in the  
563 climate system, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 118 (11), 5380-5552, doi:10.1002/jgrd.50171, 2013.
- 564 Bowman, D. M. J. S., Balch, J., Artaxo, P., Bond, W. J., Cochrane, M. A., D’Antonio, C. M., DeFries, R., Johnston,

565 F. H., Keeley, J. E., Krawchuk, M. A., Kull, C. A., Mack, M., Moritz, M. A., Pyne, S., Roos, C. I., Scott, A. C.,  
566 Sodhi, N. S. and Swetnam, T. W.: The human dimension of fire regimes on Earth: The human dimension of  
567 fire regimes on Earth, *J. Biogeogr.*, 38 (12), 2223-2236, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2699.2011.02595.x, 2011.

568 Burling, I. R., Yokelson, R. J., Griffith, D. W. T., Johnson, T. J., Veres, P., Roberts, J. M., Warneke, C., Urbanski, S.  
569 P., Reardon, J., Weise, D. R., Hao, W. M. and de Gouw, J.: Laboratory measurements of trace gas emissions  
570 from biomass burning of fuel types from the southeastern and southwestern United States, *Atmos. Chem.*  
571 *Phys.*, 10(22), 11115-11130, doi:10.5194/acp-10-11115-2010, 2010.

572 Cao, G. L., Zhang, X. Y., Wang, D. and Deng, F. C.: Inventory of Atmospheric Pollutants Discharged from Biomass  
573 Burning in China Continent, *China Environ. Sci.*, 25, 389-393, 2005 (in Chinese).

574 Cao, G. L., Zhang, X. Y., Gong, S. L. and Zheng, F. C.: Investigation on emission factors of particulate matter and  
575 gaseous pollutants from crop residue burning, *J. Environ. Sci.*, 20 (1), 50-55, 2008.

576 Chang, D. and Song, Y.: Estimates of biomass burning emissions in tropical Asia based on satellite-derived data,  
577 *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10(5), 2335-2351, doi:10.5194/acp-10-2335-2010, 2010.

578 Chang, D., Song, Y. and Liu, B.: Visibility trends in six megacities in China 1973-2007, *Atmos. Res.*, 94(2),  
579 161-167, doi:10.1016/j.atmosres.2009.05.006, 2009.

580 Chen, C., Wang, H., Zhang, W., Hu, D., Chen, L. and Wang, X.: High-resolution inventory of mercury emissions  
581 from biomass burning in China for 2000-2010 and a projection for 2020: Mercury emission from biomass  
582 burning, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 118(21), 12, 248-12, 256, doi: 10.1002/2013JD019734, 2013.

583 Chen, C. L., Yang, Y. and Xie, G. H.: Study of the development of crop straw management policy in China, *J.*  
584 *China Agric. Univ.*, 21, 1-11, 2016 (in Chinese).

585 Chen, H. F., Lin, R. Y., Liang, Y. Y., Zheng, L. D., Liang, K. J. and Lin, W. X.: Dry-matter accumulation and  
586 transportation in first-rice crop of early rice-ratoon rice under different cultivation patterns, *Chin. J. Eco.*  
587 *Agric.*, 16(1), 129-133, 2008 (in Chinese).

588 Cheng, Z., Wang, S., Fu, X., Watson, J. G., Jiang, J., Fu, Q., Chen, C., Xu, B., Yu, J., Chow, J. C. and Hao, J.:  
589 Impact of biomass burning on haze pollution in the Yangtze River delta, China: a case study in summer 2011,  
590 *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 14(9), 4573-4585, doi:10.5194/acp-14-4573-2014, 2014.

591 Chuvieco, E., Giglio, L. and Justice, C.: Global characterization of fire activity: toward defining fire regimes from  
592 Earth observation data, *Global Change Biol.*, 14(7), 1488-1502, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01585.x, 2008.

593 Cooke, W. F., Koffi, B. and Grégoire, J. M.: Seasonality of vegetation fires in Africa from remote sensing data and  
594 application to a global chemistry model, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 101(D15), 21051-21066, 1996.

Crutzen, P. J. and Andreae, M. O.: Biomass burning in the tropics: impact on atmospheric chemistry and biogeochemical cycles, *Science*, 250, 1669-1678, 1990.

Crutzen, P. J., Heidt, L. E., Krasnec, J. P., Pollock, W. H. and Seiler, W.: Biomass burning as a source of atmospheric gases CO, H<sub>2</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, NO, CH<sub>3</sub>Cl and COS, *Nature*, 282, 253–256, doi:10.1038/282253a0, 1979.

Deng, C. R.: Identification of biomass burning source in aerosols and the formation mechanism of haze, PhD dissertation, Fudan University, Shanghai, 2011 (in Chinese).

Duncan, B. N.: Interannual and seasonal variability of biomass burning emissions constrained by satellite observations, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108(D2), doi:10.1029/2002JD002378, 2003.

EPD: Guide for compiling atmospheric pollutant emission inventory for biomass burning, Environmental Protection Department, available at: [http://www.zhb.gov.cn/gkml/hbb/bgg/201501/t20150107\\_293955.htm](http://www.zhb.gov.cn/gkml/hbb/bgg/201501/t20150107_293955.htm), 2014 (in Chinese).

Fang, J. Y., Liu, G. H. and Xu, S. L.: Biomass and net production of forest vegetation in China, *Acta. Eco. Sin.*, 16(5), 497-508, 1996 (in Chinese).

Fang, S., Qi, Y., Han, G., Zhou, G. and Cammarano, D.: Meteorological drought trend in winter and spring from 1961 to 2010 and its possible impacts on wheat in wheat planting area of China, *Sci. Agric. Sin.*, 47(9), 1754-1763, 2014 (in Chinese).

Freitas, S. R., Longo, K. M., Dias, M. A. F. S., Dias, P. L. S., Chatfield, R., Prins, E., Artaxo, P., Grell, G. A. and Recuero, F. S.: Monitoring the transport of biomass burning emissions in South America, *Environ. Fluid. Mech.*, 5(1-2), 135-167, 2005.

Fu, X., Wang, S., Zhao, B., Xing, J., Cheng, Z., Liu, H. and Hao, J.: Emission inventory of primary pollutants and chemical speciation in 2010 for the Yangtze River Delta region, China, *Atmos. Environ.*, 70, 39-50, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.12.034, 2013.

Gadde, B., Bonnet, S., Menke, C. and Garivait, S.: Air pollutant emissions from rice straw open field burning in India, Thailand and the Philippines, *Environ. Pollut.*, 157(5), 1554-1558, doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2009.01.004, 2009.

Giglio, L., Csiszar, I. and Justice, C. O.: Global distribution and seasonality of active fires as observed with the Terra and Aqua Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) sensors: Global fire distribution and seasonality, *J. Geophys. Res. Biogeo.*, 111(G2), doi:10.1029/2005JG000142, 2006.

Giglio, L., Randerson, J. T. and van der Werf, G. R.: Analysis of daily, monthly, and annual burned area using the fourth-generation global fire emissions database (GFED4): ANALYSIS OF BURNED AREA, *J. Geophys. Res.*

Biogeo., 118(1), 317-328, doi:10.1002/jgrg.20042, 2013.

He, M., Wang, X. R., Han, L., Feng, X. Q. and Mao, X.: Emission Inventory of Crop Residues Field Burning and Its Temporal and Spatial Distribution in Sichuan Province, *Environ. Sci.*, 36, 1208-1216, 2015 (in Chinese).

He, M., Zheng, J., Yin, S. S. and Zhang, Y.: Trends, Temporal and spatial characteristics, and uncertainties in biomass burning emissions in the Pearl River Delta, China, *Atmos. Environ.*, 45(24), 4051-4059, 2011.

Hoelzemann, J. J., Schultz, M. G., Brasseur, G. P., Granier, C. and Simon, M.: Global Wildland Fire Emission Model (GWEM): Evaluating the use of global area burnt satellite data, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 109, D14S04 doi:10.1029/2003JD003666, 2004.

Hu, H. F., Wang, Z. H., Liu, G. H. and Fu, B. J.: Vegetation carbon storage of major shrublands in China, *Chin. J. Plant Ecol.*, 30, 539–544, 2006 (in Chinese).

Huang, X., Li, M., Friedli, H. R., Song, Y., Chang, D. and Zhu, L.: Mercury Emissions from Biomass Burning in China, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 45(21), 9442-9448, doi: 10.1021/es202224e, 2011.

Huang, X., Li, M., Li, J. and Song, Y.: A high-resolution emission inventory of crop burning in fields in China based on MODIS Thermal Anomalies/Fire products, *Atmos. Environ.*, 50, 9-15, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.01.017, 2012a.

Huang, X., Song, Y., Li, M., Li, J. and Zhu, T.: Harvest season, high polluted season in East China, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 7(4), 044033, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/7/4/044033, 2012b.

Hugh, E. and Eric F, L.: Remote sensing of biomass burning in tropical regions: Sampling issues and multisensor approach, 1998.

Ito, A.: Global estimates of biomass burning emissions based on satellite imagery for the year 2000, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109(D14), doi: 10.1029/2003JD004423, 2004.

Ito, A. and Akimoto, H.: Seasonal and interannual variations in CO and BC emissions from OBB in Southern Africa during 1998-2005: seasonal CO/BC emissions, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 21(2), doi: 10.1029/2006GB002848, 2007.

Jin, Q. F., Ma, X. Q., A., Wang, W. H., Yang, S. Y. and Guo, F. T.: Temporal and spatial dynamics of pollutants emission from forest fires in Fujian during 2000-2010, *China Environ. Sci.*, 37, 476-485, 2017a (in Chinese).

Jin, Q. F., Ma, X. Q., A., Wang, W. H., Yang, S. Y. and Guo, F. T.: Temporal and spatial variations of PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions from crop straw burning in eastern China during 2000—2014, *Acta. Sci. Circum.*, 37, 460-468, 2017b (in Chinese).

Kaiser, J. W., Benedetti, A., Detmers, R., Heil, A., Morcrette, J. J., Schultz, M. G., Van, der W., Wooster, M. J.



655 and Xu, W.: Assimilation of FRP observations for global fire emission estimation in MACC-II, in EGU  
656 general assembly conference, p. 10521., 2012a.

657 Kaiser, J. W., Heil, A., Andreae, M. O., Benedetti, A., Chubarova, N., Jones, L., Morcrette, J.-J., Razinger, M.,  
658 Schultz, M. G., Suttie, M. and van der Werf, G. R.: Biomass burning emissions estimated with a global fire  
659 assimilation system based on observed fire radiative power, *Biogeosciences*, 9(1), 527-554,  
660 doi:10.5194/bg-9-527-2012, 2012b.

661 Klimont, Z. and Streets, D.: Emission inventories and projections for assessing hemispheric or intercontinental  
662 transport, *Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution*, 2007.

663 Kondo, Y., Matsui, H., Moteki, N., Sahu, L., Takegawa, N., Kajino, M., Zhao, Y., Cubison, M. J., Jimenez, J. L.,  
664 Vay, S., Diskin, G. S., Anderson, B., Wisthaler, A., Mikoviny, T., Fuelberg, H. E., Blake, D. R., Huey, G.,  
665 Weinheimer, A. J., Knapp, D. J. and Brune, W. H.: Emissions of black carbon, organic, and inorganic aerosols  
666 from biomass burning in North America and Asia in 2008, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 116(D8),  
667 doi:10.1029/2010JD015152, 2011.

668 Koopmans, A. and Koppejan, J.: *Agricultural and Forest Residues-Generation, Utilization and Availability*, 6, 1997.

669 Laris, P. S.: Spatiotemporal problems with detecting and mapping mosaic fire regimes with coarse-resolution  
670 satellite data in savanna environments, *Remote. Sens. Environ.*, 99(4), 412-424, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2005.09.012,  
671 2005.

672 Lei, E., Tang, Q. Y., Luo, H. B. and Chen, L. J.: Comparison of late maturing spring maize varieties in paddy field  
673 and its correlation analysis, *Crop. Res.*, 23(1), 24-29, 2009 (in Chinese).

674 Levine, J. S., Iii, W. R. C., Jr, D. R. C. and Winstead, E. L.: A driver for global change, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*,  
675 1995.

676 Li, C., Hu, Y., Zhang, F., Chen, J., Ma, Z., Ye, X., Yang, X., Wang, L., Tang, X., Zhang, R., Mu, M., Wang, G., Kan,  
677 H., Wang, X. and Mellouki, A.: Multi-pollutant emissions from the burning of major agricultural residues in  
678 China and the related health-economic effects, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 17(8), 4957-4988,  
679 doi:10.5194/acp-17-4957-2017, 2017.

680 Li, H. K., Lei, Y. C. and Zeng, W. S.: Forest carbon storage in China estimated using forestry inventory data, *Sci.*  
681 *Silv. Sin.*, 47, 7-12, 2011 (in Chinese).

682 Li, J., Li, Y., Bo, Y. and Xie, S.: High-resolution historical emission inventories of crop residue burning in fields in  
683 China for the period 1990-2013, *Atmos. Environ.*, 138, 152-161, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2016.05.002, 2016.

684 Li, L., Liu, W. D., Zou, D. S. and Liu, F.: The correlation between main characteristics and pod yield in peanut

685 genotypes under natural waterlogging stress, *Chin. J. Oil Crop Sci.*, 30(1), 62-70, 2008 (in Chinese).

686 Li, S. M., Yang C. Q., Wang, H. N. and Ge, L. Q.: Carbon storage of forest stands in Shandong Province estimated  
687 by forestry inventory data, *Chin. J. Appl. Ecol.*, 25(8), 2215–2220, 2014 (in Chinese).

688 Li, X. H., Wang, S. X., Duan, L., Hao, J., Li, C., Chen, Y. S. and Yang, L.: Particulate and trace gas emissions from  
689 open burning of wheat straw and corn stover in China, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 41, 6052–6058, doi:  
690 10.1021/es0705137, 2007.

691 Li, Y. P., Wang, J. S., Li Y. H., Wang, S. P. and Sha, S.: Study of the sustainability of droughts in China, *J. Glaciol.*  
692 *Geocryol.*, 36, 1131-1142, 2014 (in Chinese).

693 Li, W. J., ZUO J. Q., Song, Y. L., Liu, J. P., LI Y., Shen, Y. Y.. and Li, J. X.: Changes in spatio-temporal  
694 distribution of drought/flood disaster in Southern China under global climate warming, *Meteor. Mon.*, 3,  
695 261-271, 2015 (in Chinese).

696 Lin, H. W., Jin, Y. F., Giglio, L., Foley, J. A. and Randerson, J. T.: Evaluating greenhouse gas emissions inventories  
697 for agricultural burning using satellite observations of active fires, *Ecol. Appl.*, 22(4), 1345-1364, 2012.

698 Liousse, C., Devaux, C., Dulac, F. and Cachier, H.: Aging of savanna biomass burning aerosols: Consequences on  
699 their optical properties, *J. Atmos. Chem.*, 22(1-2), 1-17, 1995.

700 Liousse, C., Guillaume, B., Grégoire, J. M., Mallet, M., Galy, C., Pont, V., Akpo, A., Bedou, M., Castéra, P.,  
701 Dungall, L., Gardrat, E., Granier, C., Konaré, A., Malavelle, F., Mariscal, A., Mieville, A., Rosset, R., Serça,  
702 D., Solmon, F., Tummon, F., Assamoi, E., Yoboué, V. and Van Velthoven, P.: Updated African biomass burning  
703 emission inventories in the framework of the AMMA-IDAF program, with an evaluation of combustion  
704 aerosols, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10(19), 9631-9646, doi:10.5194/acp-10-9631-2010, 2010.

705 Liu, D. M., Liu, Q., Rong, X. M., Peng, J. W., Xie, G. X., Zhang, Y. P. and Song, H. X.: Influences of  
706 photosynthesis and dry matter accumulation of different oilseed rape cultivars on nitrogen use efficiency,  
707 *Hunan Agric. Sci.*, 34(9), 29-31, 2010 (in Chinese).

708 Liu, M., Song, Y., Yao, H., Kang, Y., Li, M., Huang, X. and Hu, M.: Estimating emissions from agricultural fires in  
709 the North China Plain based on MODIS fire radiative power, *Atmos. Environ.*, 112, 326-334,  
710 doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2015.04.058, 2015.

711 Lu, J. L., Liang, S. L. and Liu, J.: Study on estimation of forest biomass and carbon storage of Shanxi Province,  
712 *Chin. Agric. Sci. Bull.*, (31), 51–56, 2012 (in Chinese).

713 McCarty, J. L., Korontzi, S., Justice, C. O. and Loboda, T.: The spatial and temporal distribution of crop residue  
714 burning in the contiguous United States, *Sci. Total. Environ.*, 407(21), 5701-5712,

doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2009.07.009, 2009.

MEPC: Ministry of Environmental Protection of China, Crop residue burning report, available at: <http://www.zhb.gov.cn/>, 2015 (in Chinese).

NBSC (National Bureau of Statistics of China): China Statistical Yearbook 2004-2016, China Statistics Press, Beijing, available at: <http://www.stats.gov.cn/tjsj/ndsj/>, 2004-2016 (in Chinese).

Prins, E. M. and Menzel, W. P.: Geostationary satellite detection of bio mass burning in South America, *Int. J. Remote. Sens.*, 13(15), 2783-2799, 1992.

Pu, S. L., Fang, J. Y., He, J. S. and Xiao, Y.: Spatial distribution of grassland biomass in China, *Acta. Phyt. Sci.*, 28(4), 491-498, 2004 (in Chinese).

Qiu, X., Duan, L., Chai, F., Wang, S., Yu, Q. and Wang, S.: Deriving high-resolution emission inventory of OBB in China based on satellite observations, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 50(21), 11779-11786, doi:10.1021/acs.est.6b02705, 2016.

Randerson, J. T., Chen, Y., van der Werf, G. R., Rogers, B. M. and Morton, D. C.: Global burned area and biomass burning emissions from small fires: burned area from small fires, *J. Geophys. Res. Biogeo.*, 117(G4), n/a-n/a, doi:10.1029/2012JG002128, 2012.

Reid, J. S., Hyer, E. J., Prins, E. M., Westphal, D. L., Zhang, J., Wang, J., Christopher, S. A., Curtis, C. A., Schmidt, C. C., Eleuterio, D. P., Richardson, K. A. and Hoffman, J. P.: Global monitoring and forecasting of biomass-burning smoke: Description of and lessons from the fire locating and modeling of burning emissions (FLAMBE) program, ~~*IEEE J-STARS, IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*~~, 2(3), 144-162, doi:10.1109/JSTARS.2009.2027443, 2009.

Roberts, G., Wooster, M. J. and Lagoudakis, E.: Annual and diurnal African biomass burning temporal dynamics, *Biogeosciences*, 6(5), 849-866, 2009.

Roy, D. P., Ju, J., Lewis, P., Schaaf, C., Gao, F., Hansen, M. and Lindquist, E.: Multi-temporal MODIS-Landsat data fusion for relative radiometric normalization, gap filling, and prediction of Landsat data, *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 112(6), 3112-3130, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2008.03.009, 2008.

Roy, D. P. and Boschetti, L.: Southern Africa Validation of the MODIS, L3JRC, and Glob Carbon Burned-Area Products, ~~*IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens. IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*~~, 47(4), 1032-1044, doi:10.1109/TGRS.2008.2009000, 2009.

Seiler, W. and Crutzen, P. J.: Estimates of gross and net fluxes of carbon between the biosphere and the atmosphere from biomass burning, *Climatic Change*, 2(3), 207-247, 1980.

Setzer, A. W. and Pereira, M. C.: Amazonia biomass burnings in 1987 and an estimate of their tropospheric emissions, *Ambio*, 20(1), 19-22, 1991.

Shi, Y., Matsunaga, T., Saito, M., Yamaguchi, Y. and Chen, X.: Comparison of global inventories of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from biomass burning during 2002-2011 derived from multiple satellite products, *Environ. Pollut.*, 206, 479-487, doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2015.08.009, 2015a.

Shi, Y., Matsunaga, T. and Yamaguchi, Y.: High-resolution mapping of biomass burning emissions in three tropical regions, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 49(18), 10806-10814, doi:10.1021/acs.est.5b01598, 2015b.

Sofiev, M., Vankevich, R., Lotjonen, M., Prank, M., Petukhov, V., Ermakova, T., Koskinen, J. and Kukkonen, J.: An operational system for the assimilation of the satellite information on wild-land fires for the needs of air quality modelling and forecasting, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 9(18), 6833-6847, doi: 10.5194/acp-9-6833-2009, 2009.

Song, Y., Liu, B., Miao, W., Chang, D. and Zhang, Y.: Spatiotemporal variation in nonagricultural open fire emissions in China from 2000 to 2007: open fire emissions in China, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 23(2), n/a-n/a, doi: 10.1029/2008GB003344, 2009.

Streets, D. G., Yarber, K. F., Woo, J. H. and Carmichael, G. R.: Biomass burning in Asia: Annual and seasonal estimates and atmospheric emissions, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 17(4), n/a-n/a, doi:10.1029/2003GB002040, 2003.

Su, J. F., Zhu, B., Kang, H. Q., Wang, H. L. and Wang, T. J.: Applications of pollutants released from crop residues at open burning in Yangtze River Delta Region in air quality model, *Environ. Sci.*, 33, 1418-1424, 2012 (in Chinese).

Sun, J., Peng, H., Chen, J., Wang, X., Wei, M., Li, W., Yang, L., Zhang, Q., Wang, W. and Mellouki, A.: An estimation of CO<sub>2</sub> emission via agricultural crop residue open field burning in China from 1996 to 2013, *J. Clean. Prod.*, 112, 2625-2631, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.09.112, 2016.

Tao, S.: Study on the Effect of crop production on the air quality in Wuhan, *J. Residuals. Sci. Tech.*, 14(S1), S41-S45, doi:10.12783/issn.1544-8053/14/S1/5, 2017.

Tang, X. B., Huang, C., Lou, S. R., Qiao, L. P., Wang, H. L., Zhou, M., Chen, M. H., Chen, C. H., Wang, Q., Li, G. L., Li, L., Huang, H. Y. and Zhang, G. F.: Emission factors and PM chemical composition study of biomass burning in the Yangtze River Delta Region, *Environ. Sci.*, 35, 1623-1632, 2014 (in Chinese).

Tang, Z. X., Xu, R. R. and Lan, X. L.: Breeding of a new peanut variety fuhua 3 and the physiological foundation of high yield, *Chin. Agric. Sci. Bull.*, 25(23), 232-237, 2009 (in Chinese).

775 Tian, H., Hao, J., Lu, Y. Q. and Zhou, Z.: Evaluation of SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions resulted from biomass fuels  
776 utilization in China, *Acta Scien. Circum.*, 22(2), 204-208, 2002 (in Chinese).

777 Tian, H., Zhao, D. and Wang, Y.: Emission inventories of atmospheric pollutants discharged from biomass burning  
778 in China, *Acta Scien. Circum.*, 31(2), 349-357, 2011 (in Chinese).

779 Tian, X. L., Xia, J., Xia, H. B. and Ni, J.: Forest biomass and its spatial pattern in Guizhou Province, *Chinese J.*  
780 *Appl. Ecol.*, 22(2), 287-297, 2014 (in Chinese).

781 van der Werf, G. R., Randerson, J. T., Giglio, L., Collatz, G. J., Mu, M., Kasibhatla, P. S., Morton, D. C., DeFries,  
782 R. S., Jin, Y. and van Leeuwen, T. T.: Global fire emissions and the contribution of deforestation, savanna,  
783 forest, agricultural, and peat fires (1997-2009), *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10(23), 11707-11735,  
784 doi:10.5194/acp-10-11707-2010, 2010.

785 Wang, K. D. and Deng, L. Y.: Dynamics of forest vegetation carbon stock in Fujian Province based on national  
786 forest inventories, *J. Fujian For. Univ.*, 34(2), 145-151, 2014 (in Chinese).

787 Wang, S. X. and Zhang, C. Y.: Spatial and temporal distribution of air pollutant emissions from open burning of  
788 crop residues in China, *Science paper Online*, 3, 329-333, 2008 (in Chinese).

789 Wen, X. R., Jiang, L. X., Liu, L., Lin, G. Z., Zheng, Y., Xie, X. J. and She, G. H.: Forest biomass, spatial  
790 distribution analysis and productivity estimation in Jiangsu Province, *J. Northwest. For. Univ.*, 29(1), 36-40,  
791 2014 (in Chinese).

792 Wiedinmyer, C., Quayle, B., Geron, C., Belote, A., McKenzie, D., Zhang, X., O'Neill, S. and Wynne, K. K.:  
793 Estimating emissions from fires in North America for air quality modeling, *Atmos. Environ.*, 40(19),  
794 3419-3432, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2006.02.010, 2006.

795 Wiedinmyer, C., Akagi, S. K., Yokelson, R. J. and Emmons, L. K.: The Fire INventory from NCAR (FINN) - a high  
796 resolution global model to estimate the emissions from open burning, *Geosci. Model. Dev. Discuss.*, 3(4),  
797 625-641, 2011.

798 Wooster, M. J., Roberts, G., Perry, G. L. W. and Kaufman, Y. J.: Retrieval of biomass combustion rates and totals  
799 from fire radiative power observations: FRP derivation and calibration relationships between biomass  
800 consumption and fire radiative energy release, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 110 (D24), doi: 10.1029/2005JD006318,  
801 2005.

802 Xie, G. H., Han, D. Q., Wang, X. Y. and Lv, R. H.: Harvest index and residue factor of cereal crops in China, *J.*  
803 *China Agric. Univ.*, 16(1), 1-8, 2011a (in Chinese).

804 Xie, G. H., Wang, X. Y., Han, D. Q. and Xue, S.: Harvest index and residue factor of non-cereal crops in China, *J.*

China Agric. Univ., 16(1), 9-17, 2011b (in Chinese).

Xu, J. D.: The 8th forest resources inventory results and analysis in China, For. Econ, doi: 10.13843/j.cnki.lyjj.2014.03.002, 2014 (in Chinese).

Xue, X. P., Wang, J. G., Guo, W. Q., Chen, B. L., You, J. and Zhou, Z. G.: Effect of nitrogen applied levels on the dynamics of biomass, nitrogen accumulation and nitrogen fertilization recovery rate of cotton after initial flowering, Acta. Eco. Sin., 26(11), 3632-3640, 2006 (in Chinese).

Yamaji, K., Li, J., Uno, I., Kanaya, Y., Irie, H., Takigawa, M., Komazaki, Y., Pochanart, P., Liu, Y., Tanimoto, H., Ohara, T., Yan, X., Wang, Z. and Akimoto, H.: Impact of open crop residual burning on air quality over Central Eastern China during the Mount Tai Experiment 2006 (MTX2006), Atmos. Chem. Phys., 10(15), 7353-7368, doi:10.5194/acp-10-7353-2010, 2010.

Yan, X., Ohara, T. and Akimoto, H.: Bottom-up estimate of biomass burning in mainland China, Atmos. Environ., 40(27), 5262-5273, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2006.04.040, 2006.

Yan, W. L., Liu, D. Y., Sun Y., Wei, J. S. and Pu, M. J.: Analysis of the sustained fog and haze event resulting from crop burning residue in Jiangsu province, Climatic Environ. Res., 19, 237-247, 2014 (in Chinese).

Yevich, R. and Logan, J. A.: An assessment of biofuel use and burning of agricultural waste in the developing world, Global Biogeochem. Cy., 17(4), doi:10.1029/2002GB001952, 2003.

Yin, S., Wang, X., Xiao, Y., Tani, H., Zhong, G. and Sun, Z.: Study on spatial distribution of crop residue burning and PM<sub>2.5</sub> change in China, Environ. Pollut., 220, 204-221, doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2016.09.040, 2017.

Yu, L. X., Zhang, J. H., Liu, L. Q., Chen, Q. Q., Zhou, Y., Wang, X. G., Xia, S. B. and Bie, S.: Study on high yield mechanism of hybrid cotton, Hubei Agric. Sci., 48(9), 2084-2086, 2009 (in Chinese).

Zeng, J. M., Cui, K. H., Huang, J. L., He, F. and Peng, S. B. : Responses of physio-biochemical properties to N-fertilizer application and its relationship with nitrogen use efficiency in rice, Acta Agron. Sin., 33(7), 1168-1176, 2007 (in Chinese).

Zha, S.: Agricultural fires and their potential impacts on regional air quality over China, Aerosol Air Qual. Res., 13(3), 992-1001, 2013.

Zhang, H., Hu, D., Chen, J., Ye, X., Wang, S. X., Hao, J. M., Wang, L., Zhang, R. and An, Z.: Particle size distribution and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons emissions from agricultural crop residue burning, Environ. Sci. Technol., 45(13), 5477-5482, doi:10.1021/es1037904, 2011.

Zhang, H., Wang, S., Hao, J., Wang, X., Wang, S., Chai, F. and Li, M.: Air pollution and control action in Beijing, J. Clean. Prod., 112, 1519-1527, doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.04.092, 2016.

835 Zhang, H. F., Ye, X. N., Cheng, T. T., Chen, J. M., Yang, X., Wang, L. and Zhang, R. Y.: A laboratory study of  
836 agricultural crop residue combustion in China: Emission factors and emission inventory, *Atmos. Environ.*, 42,  
837 8432–8441, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2008.08.015, 2008.

838 Zhang, L., Liu, Y. and Hao, L.: Contributions of open crop straw burning emissions to PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations in  
839 China, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 11(1), 014014, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/1/014014, 2016.

840 Zhang, J., Cui, M., Fan, D., Zhang, D., Lian, H., Yin, Z. and Li, J.: Relationship between haze and acute  
841 cardiovascular, cerebrovascular, and respiratory diseases in Beijing, *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.*, 22(5),  
842 3920-3925, doi:10.1007/s11356-014-3644-7, 2015.

843 Zhang, Y., Tang, L., Croteau, P. L., Favez, O., Sun, Y., Canagaratna, M. R., Wang, Z., Couvidat, F., Albinet, A.,  
844 Zhang, H., Sciare, J., Prévôt, A. S. H., Jayne, J. T. and Worsnop, D. R.: Field characterization of the PM<sub>2.5</sub>  
845 aerosol chemical speciation monitor: insights into the composition, sources, and processes of fine particles in  
846 eastern China, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 17(23), 14501-14517, doi:10.5194/acp-17-14501-2017, 2017.

847 Zhao, P. and Chen, F.: Short-term influences of straw and nitrogen cooperation on nitrogen use and soil nitrate  
848 content in North Henan, *J. China Agric. Univ.*, 13(4), 19-23, 2008 (in Chinese).

849 Zhou, Y., Cheng, S. Y., Lang, J., Chen, D. S., Zhao, B. B., Liu, C., Xu, R. and Li, T.: A comprehensive ammonia  
850 emission inventory with high-resolution and its evaluation in the Beijing-Tianjin-Hebei (BTH) region, China,  
851 *Atmos. Environ.*, 106, 305-317, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2015.01.069, 2015.

852 Zhou, Y., Yue, Y., Lan, L. I., Liu, M. and Zhou, T.: Analysis of a serious haze event resulting from crop residue  
853 burning in Central Eastern Hubei, *Climatic Environ. Res.*, 2016.

854 Zhou, Y., Xing, X., Lang, J., Chen, D., Cheng, S., Wei, L., Wei, X. and Liu, C.: A comprehensive biomass burning  
855 emission inventory with high spatial and temporal resolution in China, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 17(4), 2839-2864,  
856 doi:10.5194/acp-17-2839-2017, 2017.

857 Zhu, B., Su, J. F., Han, Z. W., Y, C and Wang, T. J.: Analysis of a serious air pollution event resulting from crop  
858 residue burning over Nanjing and surrounding regions, *China Environ. Sci.*, 30(5), 585-592, 2010.

859 Zhu, L. J., Wang, G. Y. and Zhang, Y. L.: Spatial and temporal distribution of crop straw resources in Yangtze River  
860 Delta area, *Guizhou Agric. Sci.*, 45(4), 138-142, 2017 (in Chinese)

861 Zong, Z., Wang, X., Tian, C., Chen, Y., Qu, L., Ji, L., Zhi, G., Li, J. and Zhang, G.: Source apportionment of PM<sub>2.5</sub>  
862 at a regional background site in North China using PMF linked with radiocarbon analysis: insight into the  
863 contribution of biomass burning, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 16(17), 11249-11265, doi:10.5194/acp-16-11249-2016,  
864 2016.

865 Zou, J., Lu, J. W., Liao, Z. W., Gong, X. M., Wang, H., Zhou, Y. G. and Zhou, H.: Study on response of rapeseed to  
866 boron application and critical level of soil available B in Hubei province, Sci. Agric. Sin., 41(3), 752-759,  
867 2008 (in Chinese).

868 Zuo, Z. G.: The cause and prevention of forest fire in forest area of Southern China, Land Greening, 2004 (in  
869 Chinese).

870



**Table 1.** Forest, shrubland and grassland biomass fuel loading (kt km<sup>-2</sup>) in each province.

Province	Forest (2003-2008) <sup>a</sup>	Forest (2009-2015) <sup>*</sup>	Shrubland <sup>b</sup>	Grassland <sup>c</sup>
Shandong	4.26	2.95	6.94	0.78
Henan	5.66	4.16	6.94	0.77
Anhui	6.32	3.61	12.2	0.77
Jiangsu	4.7	2.64	6.86	0.72
Hubei	5.34	3.28	7.87	0.88
Hunan	4.79	2.52	17.4	0.8
Jiangxi	4.75	3.08	18.5	0.76
Fujian	6.29	5.91	18.9	0.85
Zhejiang	3.51	3.11	18.4	0.86
Shanghai	6.09	2.99	6.86	0.93

References: <sup>a</sup> Fang et al. (1996); <sup>b</sup> Pu et al. (2004); <sup>c</sup> Hu et al. (2006); <sup>\*</sup> This study.

**Table 2.** Parameters of linear regression model for biomass and stock volume of dominant tree species.

Tree species	a	b	Tree species	a	b
Larix	0.967 <sup>a</sup>	5.7598 <sup>a</sup>	Cinnamomum camphora	1.0357 <sup>a</sup>	8.0591 <sup>a</sup>
Pinus koraiensis	0.5185 <sup>a</sup>	18.22 <sup>a</sup>	Phoebe	1.0357 <sup>a</sup>	8.0591 <sup>a</sup>
Pinus sylvestris var. mongolica	1.11 <sup>a</sup>		Elm	0.7564 <sup>f</sup>	8.3013 <sup>f</sup>
Pinus densiflora	1.0945 <sup>b</sup>	2.004 <sup>b</sup>	Robinia	0.7564 <sup>a</sup>	8.3103 <sup>a</sup>
Pinus thunbergii parl	0.5168 <sup>b</sup>	33.237 <sup>b</sup>	Schima superba	0.76 <sup>e</sup>	8.31 <sup>e</sup>
Chinese pine	0.7554 <sup>a</sup>	5.0928 <sup>a</sup>	Sweetgum	0.76 <sup>e</sup>	8.31 <sup>e</sup>
Pinus armandi	0.5856 <sup>a</sup>	18.7435 <sup>a</sup>	Other hard broad leaf	0.7564 <sup>b</sup>	8.3103 <sup>b</sup>
Pinus massoniana	0.52 <sup>a</sup>		Tilia	0.7975 <sup>b</sup>	0.4204 <sup>b</sup>
Pinus yunnanensis	0.52 <sup>a</sup>		Sassafras	1.0357 <sup>a</sup>	8.0591 <sup>a</sup>
Pinus kesiya var. langbiamensis	0.510 <sup>b</sup>	1.045 <sup>b</sup>	Populus	0.4754 <sup>a</sup>	30.603 <sup>a</sup>
Pinus densata	0.5168 <sup>b</sup>	33.237 <sup>b</sup>	Salix	0.4754 <sup>c</sup>	30.6034 <sup>c</sup>
Foreign pine	0.5168	33.2378	Paulownia	0.8956 <sup>d</sup>	0.0048 <sup>d</sup>
Pinus elliottii	0.51 <sup>e</sup>	1.05 <sup>e</sup>	Eucalyptus	0.7893 <sup>a</sup>	6.9306 <sup>a</sup>
Pinus taeda	0.5168 <sup>f</sup>	33.2378 <sup>f</sup>	Rich acacia	0.4754 <sup>a</sup>	30.60 <sup>a</sup>
Mount huangshan pine	0.5168 <sup>f</sup>	33.2378 <sup>f</sup>	Casuarina equisetifolia	0.7441 <sup>b</sup>	3.2377 <sup>b</sup>
Joe pine	0.5168 <sup>f</sup>	33.237 <sup>f</sup>	Melia azedarach	0.4754 <sup>b</sup>	30.603 <sup>b</sup>
Other pine	0.5168 <sup>a</sup>	33.2378 <sup>a</sup>	Other soft broad leaf	0.4754 <sup>b</sup>	30.603 <sup>b</sup>
Cunninghamia lanceolata	0.399 <sup>a</sup>	22.54 <sup>a</sup>	Coniferous mixed	0.5168 <sup>f</sup>	33.2378 <sup>f</sup>
Cryptomeria fortunei	0.4158 <sup>a</sup>	41.3318 <sup>a</sup>	Broad-leaved mixed	0.8392 <sup>b</sup>	9.4157 <sup>b</sup>
Metasequoia	0.4158 <sup>a</sup>	41.3318 <sup>a</sup>	Coniferous and broad-leaved mixed	0.7143 <sup>b</sup>	16.9154 <sup>b</sup>
Taxodium ascendens	0.399 <sup>a</sup>	22.541 <sup>a</sup>	Betula	0.9644 <sup>a</sup>	0.8485 <sup>a</sup>
Abies	0.4642 <sup>a</sup>	47.499	White birch	0.9644 <sup>a</sup>	0.8485 <sup>a</sup>
Picea	0.4642 <sup>a</sup>	47.499 <sup>a</sup>	Betula costata	0.9644 <sup>a</sup>	0.8485 <sup>a</sup>
Tsuga	0.4158 <sup>a</sup>	41.3318 <sup>a</sup>	Water, beard and yellow	0.7975 <sup>b</sup>	0.4202 <sup>b</sup>
Keteleeria	0.4158	41.3318	Manchurian Ash	0.798 <sup>c</sup>	0.42 <sup>c</sup>
Cupressus	0.6129 <sup>a</sup>	26.1451 <sup>a</sup>	Juglans mandshurica	0.798 <sup>c</sup>	0.42 <sup>c</sup>
Yew	0.4642 <sup>b</sup>	47.499 <sup>b</sup>	Amur corktree	0.798 <sup>c</sup>	0.42 <sup>c</sup>
Other fir	0.399 <sup>a</sup>	22.541 <sup>a</sup>	Quercus	1.3288 <sup>a</sup>	-3.8999 <sup>a</sup>

References: <sup>a</sup> Fang et al. (1996); <sup>b</sup> Wen et al. (2014); <sup>c</sup> Lu et al. (2012); <sup>d</sup> Tian et al (2011); <sup>e</sup> Wang et al (2014); <sup>f</sup> Li et al. (2014).

**Table 3.** Detailed crop residue to production ratio data for each province

Province	Rice	Corn	Wheat	Cotton	Rapeseed	Soy bean	Sugar cane	Peanut	Potato	Sesame	Sugar beet	Tobacco
Anhui	1.09 <sup>a</sup>	1 <sup>a</sup>	1.12 <sup>a</sup>	3.35 <sup>a</sup>	2.98 <sup>a</sup>	1.52 <sup>a</sup>	0.34 <sup>a</sup>	1.26 <sup>a</sup>	0.53 <sup>a</sup>	2.01 <sup>a</sup>	0.37 <sup>a</sup>	0.71 <sup>a</sup>
Fujian	0.85 <sup>b</sup>	1.04 <sup>c</sup>	1.17 <sup>c</sup>	2.91 <sup>d</sup>	2.87 <sup>d</sup>	1.5 <sup>d</sup>	0.43 <sup>d</sup>	1.08 <sup>m</sup>	0.57 <sup>d</sup>	2.01 <sup>d</sup>	0.43 <sup>d</sup>	0.56 <sup>d</sup>
Henan	1 <sup>c</sup>	0.96 <sup>c</sup>	1.08 <sup>h</sup>	2.41 <sup>i</sup>	2.87 <sup>d</sup>	1.5 <sup>d</sup>	0.34 <sup>d</sup>	0.89 <sup>d</sup>	0.57 <sup>d</sup>	1.78 <sup>d</sup>	0.43 <sup>d</sup>	0.49 <sup>d</sup>
Hubei	1.17 <sup>e</sup>	1.04 <sup>c</sup>	1.17 <sup>c</sup>	4.09 <sup>j</sup>	3.17 <sup>k</sup>	1.5 <sup>d</sup>	0.43 <sup>d</sup>	1.14 <sup>d</sup>	0.57 <sup>d</sup>	2.01 <sup>d</sup>	0.43 <sup>d</sup>	0.71 <sup>d</sup>
Hunan	0.94 <sup>f</sup>	1.11 <sup>g</sup>	1.17 <sup>c</sup>	2.91 <sup>d</sup>	3 <sup>l</sup>	1.5 <sup>d</sup>	0.43 <sup>d</sup>	1.38 <sup>n</sup>	0.57 <sup>d</sup>	2.23 <sup>d</sup>	0.43 <sup>d</sup>	0.85 <sup>d</sup>
Jiangsu	1.04 <sup>a</sup>	1 <sup>a</sup>	1.41 <sup>c</sup>	2.61 <sup>i</sup>	2.98 <sup>a</sup>	1.52 <sup>a</sup>	0.34 <sup>a</sup>	1.26 <sup>a</sup>	0.53 <sup>a</sup>	2.01 <sup>a</sup>	0.37 <sup>a</sup>	0.71 <sup>a</sup>
Jiangxi	1 <sup>c</sup>	1.04 <sup>c</sup>	1.17 <sup>c</sup>	2.91 <sup>d</sup>	2.87 <sup>d</sup>	1.5 <sup>d</sup>	0.43 <sup>d</sup>	1.14 <sup>d</sup>	0.57 <sup>d</sup>	2.01 <sup>d</sup>	0.43 <sup>d</sup>	0.71 <sup>d</sup>
Shandong	1 <sup>c</sup>	0.96 <sup>c</sup>	1.33 <sup>c</sup>	2.91 <sup>d</sup>	2.87 <sup>d</sup>	1.5 <sup>d</sup>	0.43 <sup>d</sup>	0.85 <sup>d</sup>	0.57 <sup>d</sup>	2.01 <sup>d</sup>	0.43 <sup>d</sup>	0.71 <sup>d</sup>
Shanghai	1.28 <sup>a</sup>	0.93 <sup>a</sup>	1.09 <sup>a</sup>	3.35 <sup>a</sup>	2.98 <sup>a</sup>	1.52 <sup>a</sup>	0.34 <sup>a</sup>	1.26 <sup>a</sup>	0.53 <sup>a</sup>	2.01 <sup>a</sup>	0.37 <sup>a</sup>	0.71 <sup>a</sup>
Zhejiang	1.07 <sup>a</sup>	0.96 <sup>a</sup>	1.2 <sup>a</sup>	3.35 <sup>a</sup>	2.98 <sup>a</sup>	1.52 <sup>a</sup>	0.34 <sup>a</sup>	1.26 <sup>a</sup>	0.53 <sup>a</sup>	2.01 <sup>a</sup>	0.37 <sup>a</sup>	0.71 <sup>a</sup>

References: <sup>a</sup> Zhu et al. (2017); <sup>b</sup> Chen et al. (2008); <sup>c</sup> Xie et al. (2011a); <sup>d</sup> Xie et al (2011b); <sup>e</sup> Zeng et al (2007); <sup>f</sup> Ao et al. (2007); <sup>g</sup> Lei et al. (2009); <sup>h</sup> Zhao et al. (2008); <sup>i</sup> Xue et al. (2006); <sup>j</sup> Yu et al (2009); <sup>k</sup> Zou et al (2008); <sup>l</sup> Liu et al. (2010); <sup>m</sup> Tang et al. (2009); <sup>n</sup> Li et al. (2008).

**Table 4.** Detailed crops straw burned ratio data for each province.

Region	Crops straw burning percentage
Anhui	0.10 <sup>a</sup>
Fujian	0.188 <sup>b</sup>
Henan	0.208 <sup>c</sup>
Hubei	0.207 <sup>c</sup>
Hunan	0.278 <sup>c</sup>
Jiangsu	0.10 <sup>a</sup>
Jiangxi	0.18 <sup>c</sup>
Shandong	0.178 <sup>c</sup>
Shanghai	0.148 <sup>d</sup>
Zhejiang	0.319 <sup>c</sup>

References: <sup>a</sup> Tian (2011); <sup>b</sup> Huang (2014); <sup>c</sup> Peng et al; (2016).<sup>d</sup> Zhou et al (2017).

**Table 5.** The emission factors of open biomass burning emissions for various pollutants (g kg<sup>-1</sup> dry matter)

Vegetation	OC	EC	CO	CH <sub>4</sub>	NO <sub>x</sub>	NMVOCs	SO <sub>2</sub>	NH <sub>3</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Corn	1.457 <sup>*</sup>	0.14 <sup>*</sup>	70.2 <sup>a</sup>	4.4 <sup>b</sup>	3.36 <sup>a</sup>	10 <sup>c</sup>	0.45 <sup>c</sup>	0.68 <sup>g</sup>	1261 <sup>f</sup>	5 <sup>c</sup>
Rice	1.96 <sup>a</sup>	0.52 <sup>c</sup>	52.32 <sup>c</sup>	3.9 <sup>b</sup>	1.42 <sup>d</sup>	6.05 <sup>f</sup>	0.147 <sup>a</sup>	0.53 <sup>g</sup>	791 <sup>f</sup>	3.03 <sup>d</sup>
Wheat	2.7 <sup>b</sup>	0.49 <sup>a</sup>	61.90 <sup>c</sup>	3.4 <sup>b</sup>	1.19 <sup>d</sup>	7.5 <sup>c</sup>	0.147 <sup>c</sup>	0.37 <sup>b</sup>	1557 <sup>f</sup>	7.6 <sup>a</sup>
Cotton	3.06 <sup>c</sup>	0.57 <sup>f</sup>	70.29 <sup>c</sup>	4.4 <sup>b</sup>	2.98 <sup>c</sup>	10 <sup>c</sup>	0.23 <sup>c</sup>	0.68 <sup>b</sup>	1445 <sup>h</sup>	11.7 <sup>c</sup>
Rapeseed	1.08 <sup>d</sup>	0.23 <sup>d</sup>	34.3 <sup>d</sup>	3.9 <sup>b</sup>	1.12 <sup>d</sup>	8.64 <sup>c</sup>	0.25 <sup>c</sup>	0.53 <sup>g</sup>	1445 <sup>h</sup>	5.76 <sup>c</sup>
Soya bean	1.05 <sup>d</sup>	0.13 <sup>d</sup>	32.3 <sup>d</sup>	3.9 <sup>b</sup>	1.08 <sup>d</sup>	8.64 <sup>c</sup>	0.25 <sup>c</sup>	0.53 <sup>g</sup>	1445 <sup>h</sup>	3.32 <sup>d</sup>
Sugar cane	2.03 <sup>c</sup>	0.41 <sup>c</sup>	40.08 <sup>f</sup>	3.9 <sup>b</sup>	2.03 <sup>c</sup>	11.02 <sup>f</sup>	0.25 <sup>c</sup>	0.53 <sup>g</sup>	1445 <sup>h</sup>	4.12 <sup>f</sup>
Peanut	2.03 <sup>c</sup>	0.41 <sup>c</sup>	55.13 <sup>c</sup>	3.9 <sup>b</sup>	2.11 <sup>c</sup>	8.64 <sup>c</sup>	0.25 <sup>c</sup>	0.53 <sup>g</sup>	1445 <sup>h</sup>	5.76 <sup>c</sup>
Potato	2.03 <sup>c</sup>	0.41 <sup>c</sup>	55.13 <sup>c</sup>	3.9 <sup>b</sup>	2.11 <sup>c</sup>	8.64 <sup>c</sup>	0.25 <sup>c</sup>	0.53 <sup>g</sup>	1445 <sup>h</sup>	5.76 <sup>c</sup>
Tobacco	2.03 <sup>c</sup>	0.41 <sup>c</sup>	55.13 <sup>c</sup>	3.9 <sup>b</sup>	2.11 <sup>c</sup>	8.64 <sup>c</sup>	0.25 <sup>c</sup>	0.53 <sup>g</sup>	1445 <sup>h</sup>	5.76 <sup>c</sup>
Sesame	2.03 <sup>c</sup>	0.41 <sup>c</sup>	55.13 <sup>c</sup>	3.9 <sup>b</sup>	2.11 <sup>c</sup>	8.64 <sup>c</sup>	0.25 <sup>c</sup>	0.53 <sup>g</sup>	1445 <sup>h</sup>	5.76 <sup>c</sup>
Sugar beet	2.03 <sup>c</sup>	0.41 <sup>c</sup>	55.13 <sup>c</sup>	3.9 <sup>b</sup>	2.11 <sup>c</sup>	8.64 <sup>c</sup>	0.25 <sup>c</sup>	0.53 <sup>g</sup>	1445 <sup>h</sup>	5.76 <sup>c</sup>
Coniferous forest	7.8 <sup>e</sup>	0.2 <sup>e</sup>	118 <sup>e</sup>	6 <sup>e</sup>	2.4 <sup>e</sup>	28 <sup>e</sup>	1 <sup>i</sup>	3.5 <sup>e</sup>	1514 <sup>e</sup>	9.7 <sup>e</sup>
Broadleaf forest	9.2 <sup>e</sup>	0.6 <sup>e</sup>	102 <sup>e</sup>	5 <sup>e</sup>	1.3 <sup>e</sup>	11 <sup>e</sup>	1 <sup>e</sup>	1.5 <sup>e</sup>	1630 <sup>e</sup>	13 <sup>e</sup>
Mixed forest	9.2 <sup>e</sup>	0.6 <sup>e</sup>	102 <sup>e</sup>	5 <sup>e</sup>	1.3 <sup>e</sup>	14 <sup>e</sup>	1 <sup>i</sup>	1.5 <sup>e</sup>	1630 <sup>e</sup>	9.7 <sup>e</sup>
Grassland	2.6 <sup>e</sup>	0.4 <sup>e</sup>	59 <sup>e</sup>	1.5 <sup>e</sup>	2.8 <sup>e</sup>	9.3 <sup>e</sup>	0.5 <sup>e</sup>	0.5 <sup>e</sup>	1692 <sup>e</sup>	5.4 <sup>e</sup>
Shrubland	6.6 <sup>e</sup>	0.5 <sup>e</sup>	68 <sup>e</sup>	2.6 <sup>e</sup>	3.9 <sup>e</sup>	4.8 <sup>e</sup>	0.7 <sup>e</sup>	1.2 <sup>e</sup>	1716 <sup>e</sup>	9.3 <sup>e</sup>

References: <sup>a</sup> Cao et al. (2008); <sup>b</sup> Li et al. (2007); <sup>c</sup> He et al. (2015); <sup>d</sup> Tang et al. (2014); <sup>e</sup> Akagi et al. (2011); <sup>f</sup> Zhang et al. (2008); <sup>g</sup> EPD (2014); <sup>h</sup> Wang et al. (2008); <sup>i</sup> Andreae and Rosenfeld (2008); <sup>\*</sup> This study.

**Table 6.** Cumulative emissions of major pollutants from open biomass burning in Central and Eastern China during 2003-2015 (Gg)

Province	OC	EC	CH <sub>4</sub>	NO <sub>x</sub>	NMVOCs	SO <sub>2</sub>	NH <sub>3</sub>	CO	CO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Shandong	783.9	48.56	669.4	479.3	1505	54.55	95.56	10880	226705	1007
Henan	1068	63.19	738.3	512.1	1629	54.23	101.3	11869	260239	1155
Anhui	238.2	20.24	197.7	115	410	12.94	29.75	2939	63623	283.1
Jiangsu	201.6	19.88	178	98.48	341	9.29	23.89	2543	53106	228.5
Hubei	234.2	33.92	337.7	173.1	660.7	19.86	48.5	4555	97788	415.8
Hunan	202	40.34	376.8	179.1	738.4	24.33	64.3	5239	96338	418.8
Jiangxi	132.8	27.88	236.1	109	447.6	14.2	40.55	3305	57692	252.3
Fujian	97.15	15.15	148.1	71.14	347.4	12.81	34.45	2285	40095	190.2
Zhejiang	91.41	16.22	147.9	70.53	290.9	9.62	25.83	2055	39142	167.8
Shanghai	14.34	2.09	17.14	8.56	29.89	0.76	2.29	233.8	4392	17.88
Total	3064	287.5	3047	1816	6399	212.6	466.5	45904	939120	4136

**Table 7.** Correlation of the variation tendency between PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission from crops straw burning and rural population, agricultural output, per capita incomes of rural residents in each province from 2003 to 2015.

PM <sub>2.5</sub> emission (Gg)	Rural population (10 thousand)	Per capita income of rural residents (RMB)	Agricultural output (0.1 billion RMB)
Shanghai	$y = -0.001x + 1.64$ $R^2 = 0.17$ $P > 0.05$	$y = -5E-06x + 1.4$ $R^2 = 0.09$ $P > 0.05$	$y = 7E-05x + 1.36$ $R^2 = 0.0005$ $P > 0.05$
Zhejiang	$y = 0.002x + 6.19$ $R^2 = 0.06$ $P > 0.05$	$y = -6E-05x + 10.47$ $R^2 = 0.19$ $P > 0.05$	$y = -0.001x + 10.72$ $R^2 = 0.19$ $P > 0.05$
Fujian	$y = -0.0002x + 8.219$ $R^2 = 0.01$ $P > 0.05$	$y = -3E-05x + 8.1884$ $R^2 = 0.06$ $P > 0.05$	$y = -0.0002x + 8.2144$ $R^2 = 0.06$ $P > 0.05$
<b>Jiangsu</b>	$y = -0.002x + 23.41$ $R^2 = 0.8$ $P < 0.01$	$y = 0.0002x + 15.33$ $R^2 = 0.66$ $P < 0.01$	$y = 0.001x + 15.18$ $R^2 = 0.69$ $P < 0.01$
<b>Hubei</b>	$y = -0.008x + 56.19$ $R^2 = 0.94$ $P < 0.01$	$y = 0.0009x + 25.39$ $R^2 = 0.86$ $P < 0.01$	$y = 0.004x + 24.31$ $R^2 = 0.92$ $P < 0.01$
<b>Anhui</b>	$y = -0.005x + 37.11$ $R^2 = 0.91$ $P < 0.01$	$y = 0.0007x + 16.12$ $R^2 = 0.79$ $P < 0.01$	$y = 0.004x + 14.5$ $R^2 = 0.85$ $P < 0.01$
<b>Hunan</b>	$y = -0.01x + 62.66$ $R^2 = 0.78$ $P < 0.01$	$y = 0.0008x + 20.66$ $R^2 = 0.8$ $P < 0.01$	$y = 0.003x + 20.1$ $R^2 = 0.91$ $P < 0.01$
<b>Jiangxi</b>	$y = -0.008x + 33.73$ $R^2 = 0.92$ $P < 0.01$	$y = 0.0006x + 11.19$ $R^2 = 0.82$ $P < 0.01$	$y = 0.006x + 9.84$ $R^2 = 0.87$ $P < 0.01$
<b>Henan</b>	$y = -0.01x + 150.14$ $R^2 = 0.8$ $P < 0.01$	$y = 0.003x + 70.41$ $R^2 = 0.59$ $P < 0.01$	$y = 0.008x + 62.79$ $R^2 = 0.72$ $P < 0.01$
<b>Shandong</b>	$y = -0.009x + 122.46$ $R^2 = 0.73$ $P < 0.01$	$y = 0.0014x + 66.48$ $R^2 = 0.66$ $P < 0.01$	$y = 0.004x + 62.11$ $R^2 = 0.77$ $P < 0.01$


**Table 8.** Comparison of the emissions with previous studies in different years (Gg)

Reference	Year	OC	EC	CH <sub>4</sub>	NO <sub>x</sub>	NMVOCs	SO <sub>2</sub>	NH <sub>3</sub>	CO	CO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Wang et al., 2008	2006	252	25.8	197	189	459	31.8	44.1	3841	81225	1138
This study		215.3	21.13	220.7	131.9	451.1	14.33	31.46	3267	67753	293.09
Huang et al., 2012	2006	54	17.4	136	123	1196	8.1	50.6	2379	36886	146
This study		209.8	20.67	215.8	129.1	436.4	13.56	29.64	3172	66088	283.3
Qiu et al., 2016	2013	222	41.5	243	168	591	30.2	46.9	3273	78633	475
This study		258.2	23.53	252.1	151.2	531.5	17.86	38.67	3817	78050	343.44
Zhou et al., 2017	2012	185	16.9	254	160	543	40.4	34.5	3330	92797	484
This study		248.6	23.11	245.7	148.5	507.8	16.71	35.92	3688	75785	329.46




**Table 9.** The uncertainty estimation of open biomass burning emissions for various pollutants from 2003 to 2015.


Year	OC	EC	CO	CH <sub>4</sub>	NO <sub>x</sub>	NMVOC	SO <sub>2</sub>	NH <sub>3</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
2003	(-31%, 31%)	(-46%, 46%)	(-20%, 20%)	(-20%, 20%)	(-23%, 23%)	(-52%, 53%)	(-52%, 51%)	(-33%, 33%)	(-3%, 3%)	(-44%, 44%)
2004	(-29%, 29%)	(-47%, 48%)	(-21%, 21%)	(-22%, 22%)	(-24%, 24%)	(-45%, 45%)	(-56%, 58%)	(-34%, 34%)	(-3%, 3%)	(-47%, 47%)
2005	(-31%, 31%)	(-42%, 44%)	(-16%, 16%)	(-16%, 17%)	(-19%, 19%)	(-41%, 40%)	(-44%, 44%)	(-32%, 33%)	(2%, 3%)	(-35%, 34%)
2006	(-32%, 33%)	(-44%, 44%)	(-13%, 13%)	(-14%, 14%)	(-16%, 17%)	(-43%, 43%)	(-34%, 35%)	(-34%, 34%)	(-3%, 3%)	(-25%, 25%)
2007	(-30%, 30%)	(-46%, 46%)	(-18%, 19%)	(-19%, 19%)	(-22%, 22%)	(-50%, 51%)	(-50%, 50%)	(-33%, 34%)	(-3%, 3%)	(-42%, 42%)
2008	(-26%, 26%)	(-52%, 53%)	(-25%, 25%)	(-28%, 28%)	(-29%, 29%)	(-69%, 69%)	(-62%, 61%)	(-38%, 39%)	(-3%, 3%)	(-55 %, 56%)
2009	(-28%, 28%)	(-48%, 48%)	(-21%, 21%)	(-21%, 22%)	(-24%, 24%)	(-59%, 59%)	(-54%, 54%)	(-34%, 35%)	(-3%, 3%)	(-47%, 47%)
2010	(-31%, 31%)	(-44%, 44%)	(-16%, 17%)	(-17%, 17%)	(-19%, 19%)	(-45%, 46%)	(-42%, 42%)	(-33%, 34%)	(-3%, 3%)	(-34%, 34%)
2011	(-29%, 29%)	(-46%, 46%)	(-18%, 18%)	(-19%, 19%)	(-21%, 21%)	(-52%, 53%)	(-47%, 47%)	(-34%, 35%)	(-3%, 3%)	(-40%, 40%)
2012	(-32%, 33%)	(-44%, 44%)	(-14%, 14%)	(-14%, 14%)	(-17%, 17%)	(-35%, 35%)	(-35%, 35%)	(-34%, 35%)	(-3%, 3%)	(-27%, 26%)
2013	(-30%, 30%)	(-44%, 44%)	(-16%, 16%)	(-17%, 17%)	(-20%, 20%)	(-51%, 51%)	(-42%, 43%)	(-33%, 34%)	(-3%, 3%)	(-36%, 36%)
2014	(-32%, 32%)	(-45%, 46%)	(-15%, 15%)	(-16%, 16%)	(-19%, 18%)	(-43%, 43%)	(-42%, 42%)	(-35%, 35%)	(-3%, 3%)	(-33%, 33%)
2015	(-31%, 31%)	(-44%, 44%)	(-14%, 146%)	(-14%, 13%)	(-17%, 17%)	(-41%, 41%)	(-34%, 34%)	(-34%, 35%)	(-3%, 3%)	(-26%, 26%)




**Figure 1.** Location of Central and Eastern China and the key megacities



**Figure 2.** The mean contributions of different types of biomass to biomass burning pollutant emission (a) and the mean contributions of different types of crops to cropland accumulative pollutant emission (b) from 2003 to 2015.



**Figure 3.** The averaged contributions of different biomass burning types to  $PM_{2.5}$  emission in each province.



**Figure 4.** The averaged contributions of various crops straw burning to cropland PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission in different provinces.






Figure 5. Yearly emissions of open biomass burning from 2003 to 2015.




**Figure 6.** The multi-year PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission of different opening biomass burning sources (a) and various crop types (b) from 2003 to 2015.




**Figure 7.** The multi-year PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission of the four types of biomass burning in different provinces from 2003 to 2015.







**Figure 8.** The monthly PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission of different open biomass burning from 2003 to 2015 for the whole Central and Eastern China (a) and each province (b).




**Figure 9.** The monthly PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission from open biomass burning in each province.



**Figure 10.** Annual spatial distribution ( $1 \text{ km} \times 1 \text{ km}$ ) of  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  emission from opening biomass burning in Central and Eastern China.



**Figure 11.** Seasonal emission distribution ( $1 \text{ km} \times 1 \text{ km}$ ) of  $\text{PM}_{2.5}$  in 2015 from opening biomass burning in Central and Eastern China.



**Figure 12.** Correlation between  $PM_{2.5}$  emission from crop residue burning and agricultural output , rural population, per capita incomes of rural residents (a) and correlation between  $PM_{2.5}$  emission from forestry fire burning and forestry output, rural population, per capita incomes of rural residents (b) in different provinces from 2003 to 2015.