

Interactive comment on “Improved 1-km-resolution PM_{2.5} estimates across China using the space-time extremely randomized trees” by Jing Wei et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 8 December 2019

I noticed that the same authors published a very similar paper in ES&T, <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.est.9b03258>. The only difference is between PM_{2.5} and PM_{1.0}. However, the ACP paper needs originality. Moreover, the manuscript has some fatal defects, (1) It does not work well with high pollution events, which is paid more attention. (2) Such method seems falling into a dead cycle, the results were compared by the observations which were used to fit the parameters. I do not think it works with another independent database, Some similar comments were pointed by the othe two reviewers.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2019-815>,

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



2019.

ACPD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

