Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2019-1061-RC2, 2020

Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions

Interactive comment on "Exploring the inconsistent variations in atmospheric primary and secondary pollutants during the G20 2016 Summit in Hangzhou, China: implications from observation and model" *by* Gen Zhang et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 27 January 2020

The authors evaluated the effectiveness of pollution control measures implemented during the G20 2016 Summit in Hangzhou, China. Field observation on NOx, SO2, CO, VOCs, PM10, PM2.5, PANïijŇand O3 were carried out. OBM and PMF model tools were used to analyze the data. It's valuable to publish in this journal. However, the English writing should be improved before publication.

Specific comments:

Line 269-270: CO showed a gradual increase (∼20.7%), which is not consistent with

SO2, NO2, and PM. It seems that CO sources are very different with NOx and SO2 sources in Hangzhou or pollution controls are not effective on CO reduction. Could the authors give more explanations? I also notice that 48i analyzer is used for the measurement. As we know, zero drift is inevitable for this kind of principle. So, pls provide the quality control measures during the observation.

In Fig. 1, TVOCs is needed to add.

It seems that PM10 and PM2.5 results play no roles on the data analysis in the whole context.

Fig. S1 is better in the manuscript than in the supplement information.

Fig.5, Similar fuel combustion contributions are found in DG20-II and AG20, which is very different with that in BG20. Why?

Much more contents are done in section 3.4 (VOCs source identification and OFP quantification). How do those results relate with the inconsistent variations in the primary and secondary pollutants?

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2019-1061, 2020.