

Interactive comment on “Impacts of climate change and emissions on atmospheric oxidized nitrogen deposition over East Asia” by Junxi Zhang et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 30 November 2018

General comments In this work, the authors used the multimodel results from the AC-CMIP study to investigate the projected changes in dry and wet deposition of oxidized nitrogen compounds (NO_y) in 2030–2039 and 2100–2109. This builds on the work of Lamarque et al. (2013), who used the same model results to examine changes in mean nitrogen and sulfur deposition. An important contribution over the past work is the examination of the separate impacts of emission and climate changes on NO_y deposition, as opposed to the combined effects, and how the change in NO_y deposition could affect the primary productivity (PP) of the eastern China seas. However, unlike the past work, they did not examine the contributions and changes in deposition of reduced nitrogen compounds and are thus missing a significant fraction of the reactive

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



nitrogen deposition budgets. I think this is a missed opportunity to make an important contribution to our understanding of how reactive nitrogen may change in the coming decades. Ammonia emissions have different spatial and temporal patterns from NO_x emissions and are likely to increase or remain relatively constant in the coming decades. Therefore, the changes in total inorganic reactive nitrogen deposition and its causes could be quite different compared to NO_y deposition and the resulting impacts on PP of China seas. While I do encourage the authors to include reduced nitrogen in their analyses at some level, I think the current work makes enough of a contribution to our understanding of these issues to warrant publication.

Specific comments -The figures are small and the text difficult to read. I suggest that column and row headings be added to the tables of maps to allow the reader to more easily follow what is being presented.

-Lines 108–109. How do the shipping emissions compare to the other NO_x emissions in East Asia?

-Lines 123–125. It would be interesting to know the areas where the deposition had to increase to compensate for the decreased deposition over the tropics and northern hemisphere midlatitudes.

-Section 3. Evaluation of the ACCMIP results. Some discussion of the variability in the results across the different models would be very interesting, which is alluded to in the first sentence of section 4.

-In Figure 5, what does each data point represent? If it's the changes for a grid cell in each region, then it would be informative to color the data points by region, so that the reader can see the differences in each region.

-In Figures 7 and 8, it is not clear what role the changes in shipping and lightning emissions play in the changes in their relative contributions to NO_y deposition. Therefore, please add a discussion on the changes in shipping and lightning emissions in the

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

future scenarios examined in this work.

-Lines 421–423. The Zhang et al. and Qi et al. studies examined the total inorganic nitrogen deposition and not just the NO_y fraction. Please clarify this in the manuscript and adjust the comparisons as needed.

-It is not completely clear how the results in Figure 9 were generated. However, since by equation 6.2 PP_{noy} is proportional to NO_y deposition, I would think that the percent changes in PP due to changes in NO_y deposition should be the same as the percent change in total NO_y deposition. If this is not the case, then please provide a more thorough discussion on how Figure 9 was calculated. If true, then I suggest that Figure 9 be replaced with the percent change in total NO_y deposition, which could then include the changes over land. Then, note in the discussion that the percent changes in PP in the eastern China seas are the same as the change in total NO_y deposition.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2018-917>, 2018.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

