

1 Referee Re-Review: “Measurement report: Firework impacts on air quality in Metro Manila, Philippines
2 during the 1 2019 New Year revelry”
3 Anonymous Referee #2
4 February 1, 2021
5
6

7 **Statement:**
8

9 This manuscript has presented new measurements of air quality in Manila, Philippines during the 2019
10 new year. Many toxins and hazardous air quality measurements were observed to be enhanced during this
11 time. The manuscript and its results showed great promise. There were many observations, and there was
12 certainly not a lack of content. Some of these measurements are novel and have never yet been done in a
13 Southeast Asian city.
14

15 The biggest concern I had with the initial submission of the manuscript was that it felt rather
16 disorganized. In particular, different sections were not linked together, there weren't very well-described
17 relationships between the sections, and there didn't seem to be clear or coherent connections between
18 them. In the results section, there were a number of comparisons to other cities around the world that felt
19 somewhat unclear and perhaps out of place. Moreover, manuscript tried to answer too many scientific
20 questions, rather than focusing on the scope of the measurements, as described in the mission of
21 *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics: Measurement Reports*.
22

23 The authors responded with an Author Comment along with submitting a new version, which I believe
24 has addressed all my concerns. There is now much better flow and consistency between sections. The
25 results are presented much more clearly. The authors have also simplified their research questions down
26 to two main questions they want to address, which are now stated clearly in the introduction. Consistent
27 with these two research questions, the conclusion has been simplified to directly answer them.
28

29 I suggested timeseries figures for the metals, but the authors have clarified that measurements were made
30 only at a few points in time, and thus they have presented the best available data.
31

32 In the revised submission, I noticed five minor technical/typographical issues, noted in the comments
33 below. With pleasure, I would recommend to the Editor that this manuscript be published in *Atmospheric
34 Chemistry and Physics: Measurement Reports*, once these specific issues are addressed.
35

36 **Specific comments:**

37

38 Line 164: There is a reference to “PSA, 2015”, but this does not appear to be in the references.

39

40 Line 166: There is a question mark immediately followed by a semicolon. Just one or the other should be
41 used (either would work).

42

43 Line 236: Standard convention is “UTC” not “UT”

44

45 Lines 243-245: The statement, “Although there is some firework activity that is expected in the evening
46 of December 24 (before the firework event), this is minimal compared to that which is the focus of this
47 study” should have a reference.

48

49 Lines 488-495, which describe the uses of metals in fireworks including which metal gives each color, is
50 introductory material and should be moved to the section starting at line 76. Same with the two sentences
51 about magnesium (lines 497-500). Actually, it seems most of these statements are redundant. For
52 example, “Sr gives the red color” is said in both places, and therefore the second time can be removed.