

## ***Interactive comment on “Ambient measurement of shipping emissions in Shanghai port areas” by Xinning Wang et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 16 October 2018

After going through the responses, I realized that most of my comments were not addressed and/or understood by the authors. In addition, the authors presented an unfriendly attitude to the reviewer with arrogance and ignorance. Given the fact above, I have to reject this manuscript for potential publication in ACP. Specifically, I have some comments related to the responses of the authors as follows. 1) Experimental section, response to my first question. The authors were ignorant to ask the reviewer to read other published references about sampling design. Firstly, the authors were unable to understand the reviewer's questions of sampling design. Secondly, the fact that others successfully did the ship emission measurements at the ports does not mean your study is convincing if the sampling design is unclear. You should address the comment rather than rudely ask the reviewer to read other references. In fact,

C1

those published papers provided clear description of the sampling. 2) Experimental section, response to my third question about the operation principle of SPAMS. Though the authors may be familiar with this equipment, it does not mean that others know it very well. How would this be “unnecessary to be included in the text”? 3) Results and discussion section. My question to Page 5, lines 21-25. The reviewer is asking the authors to clarify why NO<sub>x</sub> in the plumes reaching the site was aged given that the fresh signals of high NO, SO<sub>2</sub> and vanadium were captured. Unfortunately, the authors were unable to understand my questions. They are more arrogant and ignorant to tell the reviewer about the reaction of NO+O<sub>3</sub>. The authors made a black humor to me given my research interest in O<sub>3</sub> pollution for many years. 4) Their response to my question on Page 5, lines 26-29. Again, the authors did not understand my comment and rudely tell me that my comment is ridiculous. However, the Figure R2 provided by the authors clearly indicated that PM<sub>2.5</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub> and SPAMS could concurrently have peaks on some other days. The authors gave themselves a slap loudly. Why didn't you see an obvious PM<sub>2.5</sub> peak sometimes (in your Figure 2)? 5) Their response to my question on Page 5, lines 31-32. Again, the authors do not have the ability to understand the question. Their answer is not related to my question. my question was that why would you use  $\Delta\text{SO}_2 > 0.5 \text{ ug/m}^3$  not other values as a minimum threshold? 6) Their response to my question on Page 6, lines 2-3. That is exactly my question. Do you understand my question? 7) Their response to my question on Page 6, line 16. They do not understand the comment. 8) Their response to my question on Page 6, line 18. Firstly, the authors' English is too poor to understand the question. Secondly, I can only say that they are ignorant and arrogant. 9) Their response to my question on Page 6, lines 21-24. The authors are joking. Though the reviewer pointed out their problem and the authors admitted it, they still insisted this was their postulated explanation. 10) Their response to my question on Pages 6-7. Before you said this, can you ask other professionals to check with you if you are so overconfident? 11) Their response to my question of “is this contradictory to your previous claim that PM<sub>2.5</sub> in ship plumes is lower than that in urban air?” Can you tell me how “fine particles are

C2

only a fraction of PM<sub>2.5</sub>”? Isn't PM<sub>2.5</sub> called “fine particle”? 12) Their response to my question on Page 8, lines 1-3. It is ridiculous that on one hand, the authors attacked the reviewer; on the other hand, they revised their explanation. This group is not doing real research. 13) Their response to my question on Page 8, line 9. How were the authors badly educated by saying so unreasonable words? At least I am confused. Can you guarantee others won't be confused? 14) Their response to my question on Page 8, lines 27-29. Their response is just robber's logic. If you do not have evidence, why do you still say this? 15) Their response to my question on Page 9, lines 3-5. Thank you for noticing that. Do you have basic ability to understand English and write a good scientific paper? 16) Their response to my question on Page 10, lines 15-17. So, can you roughly tell us the fraction of land traffic-emitted NO<sub>x</sub> and ship-emitted NO<sub>x</sub>, before you say NO<sub>x</sub> were mainly from land traffics? In fact, the reviewer hoped that the authors could clarify these. Overall, the reviewer spent much time and great efforts to help the authors improve their manuscript. Unfortunately they do not acknowledge the effort. Instead, they are arrogant and ignorant to reject or ignore the comments/suggestions of the reviewer. They are not willing to friendly discuss the scientific issues. They are wasting my time. More importantly, most of my comments were not well understood and addressed by the authors. The authors show strong resistance to significantly improve the manuscript. As such, I suggest to reject this manuscript.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2018-737>, 2018.