

Interactive comment on “Cloud-scale modelling of the impact of deep convection on the fate of oceanic bromoform in the troposphere: a case study over the west coast of Borneo” by Paul D. Hamer et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 27 October 2020

I am very sorry that I made a mistake in the LaTeX formatting of my previous review. All points containing a "%" somewhere in the text were truncated, because LaTeX uses "%" as indication of comments. Here are the missing points:

Specific comments:

- 469: "These compounds contribute 86% of the PG bromine total." I'm confused by the number of 86%. Where does this number come from?
- Figure 14 d-f: The representation of HOBr as percentage of total inorganic Br

mixing ratio is dangerous here, because this plot suggests that HOBr has a large contribution to the convective system by showing relative contributions up to 100% inside the convective system. From Fig. 13 it is clear that HOBr only has very low background Br pptv above 4 km (and below even a minimum) inside the convective system, but is scaled up in Fig 14 due to the relative minimum in HBr. In my opinion this should be noted in the figure caption to avoid wrong interpretations of Fig. 14.

- 593: "Most of the bromine (>85%) transported to the UT in each convective system is in the form of CHBr₃." This is a very important statement that was not mentioned in the discussions of Section 4.3

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2020-655>, 2020.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)