Comments on ‘Potential environmental impact of bromoform from Asparagopsis farming in Australia’ by Jia et al. for Atmos. Chem. Phys.

Paul Fraser, CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere, Aspendale, Victoria

Page 1, line 9: delete ‘4811’ – no other co-author post-codes listed

Page 2, line 25: ‘which contributes’

Page 2, line 28: ‘with its ozone depletion potential’

Page 2, line 29: replace ‘halogens’ with’ halocarbons’

Page 2, line 35: ‘significantly impact’

Page 2, line 37: ‘0.02%’ – significant figures implied by 0.016% probably not justified

Page 2, line 37-38: ‘The remains are relatively small’ does not make sense

Page 2, line 39: 0.5% (as above)

Page 3, line 44: ‘GHG emissions weighted by radiative forcing’

Page 3, line 47: ‘emissions’

Page 3, line 48-49: is this what you mean – ‘Total methane (CH₄) emissions from ruminant livestock contribute about 18% of total global CH₄ emissions’

Page 3, line 51: quote GWP and lifetime data for CH4 from more recent IPCC assessments: IPCC Climate Change 2021

Page 3, line 56: ‘inefficient digestion process’

Page 4, line 74: Carpenter and Liss, 2000

Page 4, line 77-78: Engel, Rigby et al., 2018

Page 4, line 81: Carpenter, Reimann et al., 2014

Page 4, line 83-84: in the lower and middle stratosphere

Page 4, line 85: Black et al. 2021 not in reference list

Page 5, line 115: For an effective

Page 5, line 115: 0.4%? Can two significant Figures (0.38%) be justified; could the experiments distinguish between results for 0.38% and 0.40?

Page 5, line 119: 3.5 x 10⁴ Mg – 5 significant figures??

Page 5, line 121: 2.3 x 10⁴ Mg – 5 significant figures??

Page 6, line 135: 1.2 x 10⁴ Mg

Page 6, line 139: 3.5 x 10⁴ Mg
Page 6, line 147: Yong et al. (2013)

Page 7, line 166: which farms are actual and theoretical?

Page 8, line 171: $1.2 \times 10^4$ Mg

Page 9, line 180: listed as Magnusson et al. 2020 in reference list

Page 9, line 185: $1650$ ng, the Paul et al. release is quoted to 2 significant figures: $1100$ ng

Page 9, line 187: OK, $1600$ ng, ignore above

Page 9, line 191: were used in this study

Page 10, line 211: Mass et al references are listed as 2019 and 2021

Page 10, line 228: inter-? Interpolation?

Page 11, line 247: $3.5 \times 10^4$ Mg

Page 12, line 285: Montzka, Reimann et al. 2010

Page 14, line 298: to that of the reference substance CFC-11 ($\text{CCl}_3\text{F}$) on a mass emitted basis

Page 14, line 300: long-lived halocarbons

Page 14, line 304: from the same unit mass emission of CFC-11

Page 14, line 307: CHBr$_3$

Page 15 line 326: the ODP values applied here

Page 15, line 328: Engel, Rigby et al.

Page 15, line 329-330: impact on the comparison......ODP weighted emissions presented here.

Page 18, line 324: to simulate the enhanced atmospheric CHBr$_3$ mixing ratios (above natural background) for each...

Page 18, line 395: Background CHBr$_3$ levels are calculated..... These background levels derived from Ziska et al. need to be discussed. Do the authors use the latitudinally averaged data (Figure 2 of Ziska at al.). It would be instructive to compare the background CHBr$_3$ levels from Ziska et al. assumed for Triabunna, Tasmania (about 0.5 ppt?) to publicly available (and published) observations at Cape Grim, Tasmania (annual average about 1-2 ppt). The Ziska data compendium are from various laboratories but are not intercalibrated. The Triabunna background CHBr$_3$ level could be as high as 2 ppt – what difference would this make to the flux calculations?

Page 18, line 398: Figure S1 compares calculated CHBr$_3$ mixing ratios due to Asparagopsis farming at GTY and Darwin compared to appropriate Ziska mixing ratios (need to state latitude of Ziska data). The Figure shows mixing ratios only, not emissions, so need to state this and then say what this implies about emissions. The background surface CHBr$_3$ mixing
ratios in Figure S1 are 0.01 ppt, this an order of magnitude lower that the Ziska data for Darwin latitudes (minimum 0.5 ppt). Am I missing something here?

Page 18, line 400: Compared to Figure S1, Figure 4 has Ziska coastal surface mixing ratios of 0.05 ppt, 5 times Figure S1??

Page 18, line 409: Figure 5 shows Ziska coastal CHBr₃ mixing ratios of 0.1 ppt or higher, at least 2 times Figure 4 and 10Xx Figure S1??

Page 21, Figure 4 caption: Altitude-time cross-sections of CHBr₃ mixing ratio averaged over [...] from a)...

Page 22, line 456: I would have thought that the ODP distribution also depends on the surface location of the CHBr₃ emissions (as well as seasonal transport, location of ITCZ etc). Which emission scenario (strength, location) is used to calculate the ODP distribution?

Page 23, line 479-480: 1.1%, 2.9%

Page 24, line 500: ...ODP of CHBr₃ in January.... Specify emission scenario?

Page 25, line 514: 3.47

Page 25, line 520: CHBr₃

Page 26, line 527, 532, 542: CHBr₃

Page 26, line 550: laboratory scale

Page 28, line 608: Battaglia not cited (I may have missed it)

Page 28, line 614: Black et al. 2021 not listed

Page 29, line 663: Herrero et al 2016 not cited (I may have missed it)

Page 31, line 728: Machado et al. 2014 not cited (I may have missed it)

Page 31, line 746: Marshall et al. should be listed before Mata et al.

Page 32, line 775: Montzka, Reimann et al.

Page 33, line 840: Wuebbles at al. 1983 not cited (I may have missed it)