

# Interactive comment on “Significant wintertime PM<sub>2.5</sub> mitigation in the Yangtze River Delta, China from 2016 to 2019: observational constraints on anthropogenic emission controls” by Liqiang Wang et al.

5

Nominated Referee #1

## Suggestion comments:

The authors have addressed most of my comments.

- 10 I suggest, however, the abstract still needs a little bit clarification. The following statement is confusing, as it is not immediately clear whether the numbers reported are for long-term or emergency mitigation: "The most substantial declines in PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations ( $\sim 35 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ,  $\sim 59\%$ ) are achieved in Hangzhou and its surrounding areas. The following hotspots also emerge in megacities, especially in Shanghai ( $32 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ,  $51\%$ ), Nanjing ( $27 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ,  $55\%$ ), and Hefei ( $24 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ,  $44\%$ )." The previous version was actually better which starts the sentence with "For the winter time periods from 2016 to 2019,..."

- 15 **Response:** We thank the reviewer very much and have revised this sentence in Abstract accordingly.

**Added/rewritten part in Abstract:** These emergency measures lead to the largest decrease ( $\sim 35 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ,  $\sim 59\%$ ) in PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations in Hangzhou. The hotspots also emerge in megacities, especially in Shanghai ( $32 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ,  $51\%$ ), Nanjing ( $27 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ,  $55\%$ ), and Hefei ( $24 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ,  $44\%$ ) because of the emergency measures.