

Interactive comment on “Exploring the impacts of anthropogenic emission sectors on PM_{2.5} and human health in South and East Asia” by Carly L. Reddington et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 5 April 2019

As a reviewer I have the following comments: GENERAL 1. Why does your approach is better than using the measurements from monitor stations? 2. How your results can be used? No just to report the analysis but say in longitudinal studies? 3. You have an implicit assumption that PM_{2.5}s are the same, but their structure/composition, specially urban vs. rural are very different. Probably their health effects also.

SPECIFIC 1. Formula (2). We remove “SECTOR_OFF”. It assumed that no pollution, but this sector is replaced by something else, say biomass burning by LPG. 2. You provided interesting example when migration to cities reduces biomass burial – no policy. TECHNICAL 1. Abstract; Line 11. “energy generation” – humans don’t generate

C1

energy. We only change. 2. Abstract; Line 16. After “467, 000” you missed “UI”, but please full spell in the first time of use. 3. Abstract; Line 13. PM_{2.5} it includes also =, I think you may say “no greater than 2.5...”. Also in the text, definition of PM_{2.5}. 4. Page 3; Line 8: you are using the term “exposure-response” – I think more adequately is to use “concentration-response” (but keep IER as is). We know the ambient concentration levels. 5. Page 3; Line 24: We don’t know what “UI” is. 6. Page 3; Line 29: “high resolution” –does it mean very detailed, or “high level”? 7. Page 4; Line 15: The intervals, suggestion, show as the intervals [0.039, 0.156] or) included vs. non-included. 8. Page 5; Line 31. Please change “Savannah”. 9. Page 7; Lines 8-9. “billion” –I know it’s milliard. I am guessing that you use the journal locality? 10. Page 9; Line 13. Please define UI in its first occurrence. Thank you

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2019-147>, 2019.

C2