Atmospheric
Chemistry
and Physics
Discussions

Open Access

ACPD

Interactive
comment

Interactive comment on "MICS-Asia III: Multi-model comparison of reactive Nitrogen deposition over China" *by* Baozhu Ge et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 28 April 2020

This manuscript examines the performance of nine models within MICS-Asia III in capturing wet and dry deposition with observation from a plenty of sites. There are a number of grammar issues and typos. I would enough the authors to check carefully and improve the quality of writing. Besides, the scientific quality would be largely improved if the authors could provide more results to explain the differences between models and observations. Specific comments are listed below:

Line 52: Typo: WRF-CAMQ should be WRF-CMAQ

Line 105: Typo: shown should be showed

Line 123: uncompleted should be incomplete

Line 179: driving should be driven

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

Line 292: may not due to should be "may not be due to"

Lines 292-294: What would be the reason for the differences?

In many places, wrong tense is used. For example, in line 295: showed should be shows. Please also change the tense in other places.

Line 312-314: The differences might result from multiple reasons, including emissions, chemical conversions, deposition processes in the models, etc. There is no evidence or analysis showing that is caused by the coarse grid.

Lines 335-343: This could be one of the reasons with the assumption that models can accurately capture these processes. Is it possible to compare rainfall events, which does not require high resolution of deposition data

Lines 575-576: correlations between observed depositions between emissions

Line 662: importance should be important

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2019-1083, 2020.