Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2019-634-RC2, 2020


Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions



# *Interactive comment on* "Elucidating the ozone pollution in Yangtze River Delta region during the 2016 G20 summit for MICS-Asia III" *by* Zhi-zhen Ni et al.

**Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 5 January 2020

It is not clear how the chemical and physical factors contribute to O3 formation based on current experimental design. Most discussions of the results are too descriptive instead of quantitative. Specific comments are listed below:

1 The authors mentioned emergency emission control measures. Were emissions perturbated to represent these measures? How did emission control measures contribute to the ozone episode?

2 The authors claimed that this study revealed notable background O3 concentrations, but it is very confusing how this conclusion was drawn. How much does it contribute to O3 levels in the YRD?



Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

3 It is not convincing that current categorization of process analysis can provide any useful information. Concluding photochemistry dominated O3 generation does not provide any indications for O3 pollution control. Which precursor or process are important? More in-depth analyses are needed.

Minor comments:

1 Fig. 1a does not show domain 1.

2 Line 119: it is confusing if assimilation of meteorological variables were used or not, how?

3 Line 143: In June, July, and August, biomass burning emissions are important in east China, why do you ignore it?

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2019-634, 2019.