

Response to Reviewers #1's Comments

Summary:

The study of Lv et al. presents a multi-scale modelling framework for the simulation of urban scale NO₂ and potentially other primary pollutants at high spatial resolution with a focus on traffic-related air pollution. The method combines several different types of models and approaches, a regional chemistry-transport-model (CMAQ), a dispersion model (RLINE), an urban heat island scheme, and machine-learning based simulation of street-canyon flows trained with a CFD model. The overall framework is referred to as CMAQ-RLINE_URBAN.

The overall approach is interesting, but the publication has major deficiencies, is difficult to follow, and leaves many questions unanswered. In my view it cannot be published in the present form but will need substantial improvements.

Response:

Thank you very much for spending time to give us many constructive comments, and they have great importance in improving our manuscript. We have revised our manuscript and we believe that all the concerns are now fully addressed in this revision. In general, as you suggested, a more detailed review on multi-scale air quality models was added in the Introduction, and more descriptions on various parameterization schemes were provided in the Method and Supplement Materials. In addition, more explanations and expectations in the future were added in the Results and Discussions, respectively.

Question 1

The individual model components as well as their interplay are very poorly described.

Examples:

The RLINE model is never explained. It remains unclear whether this is Gaussian dispersion or any other type of model. Providing only references without any further details is not sufficient given the fact that this model plays a central role in this study.

How are emissions released into the model? Is traffic a line source? How are the emissions transported forward and dispersed by the (RLINE) model?

Response:

Thanks for your advice. We apologized that the introduction of RLINE was missing in our original manuscript so that the details of our model is not sufficient. In general, the RLINE is a Gaussian dispersion model specially for the line source simulation. In this revision, we have added the description of RLINE model including its mechanism and application in **Section 2.1**.

The traffic emission is treated as a line source in RLINE. The concentration from the traffic emission is found by approximating the line as a series of point sources and integrating the contributions of point sources using an efficient numerical integration scheme.

Revisions in Manuscript:

(1) Materials and Methods, Line 118-127.

RLINE is a Gaussian line source dispersion model developed by Snyder et al. (Snyder et al., 2013) to predict pollutant concentrations in near-road environments. In the RLINE model, the mobile source is considered as a finite line source, from which the concentration is found by approximating the line as a series of point sources and integrating the contributions of point sources using an efficient numerical integration scheme. The number of points needed for convergence to the proper solution is a function of distance from the source line to the receptor, and each point source is simulated using a Gaussian plume formulation. The RLINE model performs generally comparable results when evaluated with other line source models for on-road traffic emissions dispersion (Chang et al., 2015; Heist et al., 2013; Snyder et al., 2013), and has been successfully used in many studies to evaluate the impacts from traffic emissions on air quality (Benavides et al., 2019; Filigrana et al., 2020; Valencia et al., 2018; Zhai et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2021).

Question 2

An UHI scheme is implemented, which "increases atmospheric turbulence intensity around sunset in the afternoon", but it is never explained how this increased turbulence affects the simulation or what is meant by "afternoon". Is the UHI scheme only triggered around sunset? Does it affect the turbulent intensity in RLINE? If so, how exactly? Which localized meteorological parameters are recalculated and how? Is the UHI scheme of Cimorelli et al. (2005) different from the algorithm proposed by Benavides et al., or is the

Benavides algorithm based on Cimorelli et al.? The text remains extremely vague despite the fact that, again, this UHI scheme is an essential component of the final model system. Please note that WRF can be run with an urban canopy module (e.g. Barlage et al., 2016; doi:10.1002/2015JD024450), which would alleviate the necessity of implementing an UHI scheme in such a complicated (and unclear) way as done here. Why was this scheme not used to drive CMAQ and to compute the winds and stability above roof level?

Response:

Thanks for your questions. We apologize for misleading the reviewer about the UHI scheme, and the detailed description for UHI scheme were added in this revision. In this response, we will give a response to each question as follows:

- The impacts of UHI effect in the hybrid model is considered not only in the afternoon but also over the whole day. However, based on previous studies, the UHI effect is more significant in the afternoon around sunset.
- The UHI scheme will affect the turbulent intensity in RLINE. First, the upward surface heat flux and the urban boundary layer height due to convective effects was estimated. And then the mixing height Z_{mix} , convective velocity scale w^* , surface friction velocity u^* , and Monin-Obhukov length L_{MO} were recalculated. The UHI scheme was never considered in Benavides's study (Benavides et al., 2019), and in this study, it was built based on the algorithm used in the AERMOD model (Cimorelli et al., 2005). We have also added a brief introduction of **UHI scheme** in the **Section 3. Urban heat island scheme** and details in **Supplement Materials**.
- The WRF model can actually be coupled with urban canopy models (UCMs) to quantify the changes in meteorological conditions caused by special underlying surface structures in cities, where the UHI effect is included. However, the WRF model was applied for mesoscale meteorological simulation (not smaller than an urban scale), so it is too large to consider the impact on each road. The hybrid model in this study mainly focuses on local meteorology at the street level. In addition, if WRF coupled with UCMs and the UHI scheme are both used in the hybrid model, it will cause a double-counting problem of UHI effects.

Revisions in Manuscript:

(1) Materials and Methods. Line 138-143.

The atmospheric turbulence intensity in urban areas around sunset in the afternoon was obviously enhanced considering the influence of the urban heat island effect based on methods in the AERMOD model (UHI scheme) (Cimorelli et al., 2005). The UHI scheme would affect the turbulent intensity based on the evaluation for the upward surface heat flux and the urban boundary layer height due to convective effects, and then the mixing height, convective velocity scale, surface friction velocity, and Monin-Obhukov length were all recalculated (details in SI. Section 3).

(2) Supplement Materials. Section 3 Urban heat island scheme.

The Urban Heat Island effect refers to a phenomenon that the temperature of urban atmosphere and surface is higher than that of nearby rural areas, of which intensity can be quantified by using the temperature difference. UHI is caused by the thermodynamic effect of the special underlying surface structure induced by urbanization and the influence of human activities. In past decades, the intensity of UHI in Beijing has been increasing at a rate of 1.35 °C every decade, and has gradually expanded from within the 2nd Ring Road to the 6th Ring Road and its surrounding areas (Ge et al., 2016). When the UHI intensity is high, the circulation between urban and suburban areas will enhance the boundary layer height and turbulence intensity in urban areas, and reduce the concentration of primary pollutants such as NO_x which are easily affected by the local climate. After adding the UHI scheme to the model, the overestimation of the simulation can be reduced, and the simulation is more consistent with the observed concentration (Sarrat et al., 2006).

Here, based on the algorithm used in AERMOD (Cimorelli et al., 2005), we estimated the influence of UHI on turbulence in urban areas, especially in the afternoon (16:00-23:00), to reduce the over-predicted pollutant concentrations caused by the overestimation of atmospheric stability in this period. During this period, due to the large amount of anthropogenic heat generated by transportation, cooking and other human activities, as well as the gradual release of solar radiation stored by buildings in daytime, the UHI intensity in Beijing increase to the peak (Wang et al., 2017). In the calculation, we still regarded each road as a basic unit for the calculation, and first estimated the sensible heat flux $H_{w,UHI}$ (W/m²) caused by UHI and the height of the mixing layer $Z_{mix,c}$ (m) formed by

thermal turbulence. And then the mixing height Z_{mix} , convective velocity scale w^* , surface friction velocity u^* , and Monin-Obhukov length L_{MO} were recalculated, as follows,

$$\begin{cases} H_{\text{u,UHI}} = \alpha \rho c_p \Delta T_{\text{u-r}} u^* \\ Z_{\text{mix,c}} = Z_{\text{mix,ref}} (P/P_{\text{ref}})^{0.25} \end{cases}$$

where, α is the empirical coefficient, with a value of 0.03. ρ is air density (kg/m^3) and calculated by air pressure and temperature. c_p is the specific heat capacity of air at constant pressure, with a value of $1004 \text{ J/kg}\cdot\text{K}$. $\Delta T_{\text{u-r}}$ is the temperature difference between urban and suburban areas, which is set with the value of 3°C according to the observation of several meteorological ground observation stations and satellite remote sensing data (Wang et al., 2017). $Z_{\text{mix,ref}}$ and P_{ref} are the reference boundary layer height and urban population, with values of 400 m and 2 million, respectively (Cimorelli et al., 2005). P is the total population of urban areas in the research region, with the value of 9.2 million in our study domain for 2020 based on the WorldPop dataset (Bondarenko et al., 2020).

Question 3

- CFD simulations were performed to train a machine-learning based street-canyon flow model (MLSCF) in order to predict airflow in street canyons efficiently. This part of the publication is quite clear, but how the results of the MLSCF are finally applied to compute the dispersion of NO_2 is never explained. It should also be noted that the MLSCF model only predicts wind speeds at different locations in the street canyon (in along-canyon and perpendicular direction), but not turbulence, which also varies depending on wind speeds and angle between wind and canyon. The publication mentions the importance of the buildup of a vortex in certain situations, but it remains unclear how the mixing of air pollution induced by this vortex affects the mixing in RLINE. If RLINE is a simple Gaussian dispersion model, how would it be able to represent such a vortex?

Response:

Thanks for questions. The MLSCF is developed to estimate the wind velocity and direction at different height in the street canyon. In other words, outputs from the MLSCF model are wind vectors. Therefore, the impact of turbulence induced by street canyon effect on wind environment is considered. As shown in the Figure 8, the impacts of the MLSCF scheme on simulated NO_2 concentration were identified by the differences between

modeling scenarios with and without MLSCF. For example, in the SZJ standard canyon, the application of MLSCF led to the wind direction at the bottom in street canyon opposite to that at the roof, increasing the upwind concentrations (Figure 8b and Section 3.2 in the manuscript).

However, as you mentioned that since the RLINE is a Gaussian model, we cannot directly calculate the impact of vortex in specific situations on the mixing of concentrations in street canyons. We will make effort on developing another empirical method to estimate effects of the vortex on the mixing of concentrations in the future research, and this is discussed in the **Conclusions** now.

Revisions in Manuscript:

(1) Conclusions, Line 488-490.


However, the influence of the turbulence induced by street canyon effects on the mixing of air pollution was not considered on which we will make effort in the future..

Question 4

NO_x is released by emission sources mainly in the form of NO and then converted to NO₂ by reaction of O₃. The paper mentions that a "two-reaction scheme" was incorporated into RLINE, but it is not explained which photochemical reactions exactly were considered, how this reaction scheme was implemented in RLINE, or in what form NO_x was emitted. Figure 1 suggests that concentrations from vehicles and from background are combined within the "NO_x photochemical scheme". Is the scheme applied separately to the two components? How exactly are they combined?

Response:

Thank you for questions. We apologized those unclear descriptions on the NO_x photochemical reactions in the original manuscript. In general, we used the two-reaction method applied in other studies, such as the SIRANE model (Soulhac et al., 2017). The NO_x photochemical scheme includes two main chemical reactions, namely the photolysis of NO₂ and the oxidation of NO as follows:



During simulation, the NO_x (NO+NO₂) emitted from vehicles is first regarded as an inert

gas and only the primary concentration after diffusion is simulated. Then, assuming a photo-stationary equilibrium condition, the concentrations of NO, NO₂ and O₃ are calculated as follows:

$$\begin{cases} [\text{NO}_2] = (b - \sqrt{b^2 - 4c})/2 \\ [\text{NO}] = [\text{NO}]_b + [\text{NO}_2]_b + [\text{NO}_x]_d - [\text{NO}_2] \\ [\text{O}_3] = [\text{O}_3]_b + [\text{NO}_2]_b + \zeta[\text{NO}_x]_d - [\text{NO}_2] \\ b = k_1/k_2 + [\text{O}_3]_b + [\text{NO}]_b + 2[\text{NO}_2]_b + (1 + \zeta)[\text{NO}_x]_d \\ c = ([\text{O}_3]_b + [\text{NO}_2]_b + \zeta[\text{NO}_x]_d)([\text{NO}]_b + [\text{NO}_2]_b + [\text{NO}_x]_d) \end{cases}$$

where, [NO_x]_d is the primary concentration of NO_x directly simulated by RLINE model when taken as an inert gas. [NO]_b, [NO₂]_b, and [O₃]_b are the background concentrations of NO, NO₂ and O₃ from non-vehicle sources, respectively, which are provided by CMAQ-ISAM model. ζ is the ratio of NO₂ to NO_x in vehicle emissions, with a value of 0.2 (Benavides et al., 2019; Valencia et al., 2018).

We have added a brief introduction of the "two-reaction scheme" in **Materials and Methods** and details in **Supplement Materials (Section 2. NO_x photochemical parameter scheme)**.


Revisions in Manuscript:

(1) **Materials and Methods. Line 165-168.**

In this study, a simplified two-reaction scheme, including the photolysis of NO₂ and the oxidation of NO, was incorporated into the model to characterize the photochemical process of NO_x (details in SI. Section 2), which has been successfully applied to the SIRANE dispersion model (Soulhac et al., 2017).

(2) **Supplement Materials Section 2. NO_x photochemical parameter scheme.**

The NO_x photochemical parameter scheme applied in this study includes two reactions:



Kim et al. compared two-reaction scheme with CB05 gas phase chemical mechanism by incorporated them into SinG model to estimate roadside NO₂ concentration, and found a similar results, while the computing time cost of two-reaction scheme was significantly less than that of the CB05 mechanism (Kim et al., 2018). Therefore, the simplified two-reaction scheme was incorporated into the model in this study to characterize the NO_x photochemical process. During simulation, the NO_x (NO+NO₂) emitted from vehicles is

first regarded as an inert gas and only the primary concentration after diffusion is simulated. Then, assuming a photo-stationary equilibrium condition, the concentrations of NO, NO₂ and O₃ are calculated using the two-reaction scheme, as follows:

$$\begin{cases} [\text{NO}_2] = (b - \sqrt{b^2 - 4c})/2 \\ [\text{NO}] = [\text{NO}]_b + [\text{NO}_2]_b + [\text{NO}_x]_d - [\text{NO}_2] \\ [\text{O}_3] = [\text{O}_3]_b + [\text{NO}_2]_b + \zeta[\text{NO}_x]_d - [\text{NO}_2] \\ b = k1/k2 + [\text{O}_3]_b + [\text{NO}]_b + 2[\text{NO}_2]_b + (1 + \zeta)[\text{NO}_x]_d \\ c = ([\text{O}_3]_b + [\text{NO}_2]_b + \zeta[\text{NO}_x]_d)([\text{NO}]_b + [\text{NO}_2]_b + [\text{NO}_x]_d) \end{cases}$$

where, [NO_x]_d is the primary concentration of NO_x directly simulated by RLINE model when taken as an inert gas. [NO]_b, [NO₂]_b, and [O₃]_b are the background concentrations of NO, NO₂ and O₃ from non-vehicle sources, respectively, which are provided by CMAQ-ISAM model. The unit of concentrations in these formulas is mol/m³. ζ is the ratio of NO₂ to NO_x in vehicle emissions, with a value of 0.2 (Benavides et al., 2019; Valencia et al., 2018). The reaction rates of the photolysis of NO₂ and the oxidation of NO were set to be $k1$ and $k2$ respectively, and calculated as follows (Hurley, 2005):

$$\begin{cases} k1 = 10^{-4} \times \delta \times \text{TSR} \\ k2 = 9.24 \times 10^5 \times \exp(-1450/T) / T \\ \delta = \begin{cases} 4.23 + 1.09 / \cos Z, & 0 \leq Z \leq 47 \\ 5.82, & 47 < Z \leq 64 \\ -0.997 + 12(1 - \cos Z), & 64 < Z \leq 90 \end{cases} \end{cases}$$

where, all parameters were from the WRF model. TSR is the total solar radiation (W/m²). Z is the solar zenith angle (°). T is the ambient temperature (K).

Question 5

A "vertical mixing scheme" is mentioned on page 6, which accounts for the "influence of atmospheric turbulence and building geometry on the vertical mixing" and seems to mix background air from roof level into the street canyons. The scheme requires wind speeds at the surface and at roof level, but it is not entirely clear which winds are used here. From the MLSCF scheme? What is the motivation for using the ratio between wind speeds at roof level and street level to compute the contribution of background air? I can only guess, but decisions like this need to be motivated thoroughly.

Response:

Thanks for your suggestions. For motivation of this scheme, since the settings of vertical

pressure layer in the CMAQ and the WRF model are the same, the concentrations from non-vehicle sources provided by the CMAQ-ISAM model are regarded as the background concentration at the top of the urban canopy layer. If the influence of turbulence changes on the mixing of background concentration is not taken into account, the pollutant concentrations near surface at night stable boundary layer is easy to be significantly overestimated (Benavides et al., 2019).

In this scheme, the wind speed at the roof level is from the WRF model. The surface wind is from MLSCF scheme when the gird receptor is located in the street canyon, and otherwise the logarithmic wind profile is used to calculate the wind speed at the specified height. We have added a brief introduction of the "vertical mixing scheme" in **Materials and Methods** and details in **Supplement Materials (Section 1. Vertical mixing scheme)**.

Revisions in Manuscript:

(1) Materials and Methods. Line 161-163.

In this scheme, the surface wind is from MLSCF scheme when the gird receptor is located in the street canyon, and otherwise the logarithmic wind profile is used to calculate the wind speed at the specified height, and details were showed in SI Section 1.

(2) Supplement Materials Section 1. Vertical mixing scheme.

Since the settings of vertical pressure layers in the CMAQ and the WRF model are same, the concentrations induced by non-vehicle sources provided by the CMAQ-ISAM model can be regarded as the background concentration at the top of the urban canopy layer (UCL). If the influence of turbulence changes on the mixing of background concentration is not taken into account, the pollutant concentration at night stable boundary layer is easy to be significantly overestimated (Benavides et al., 2019). Therefore, we assumed that the concentration relationship between the top of UCL and the near surface is affected by atmospheric stability, local street canyons and building morphology.

In this study, based on the method proposed by Benavides et al. (2019), the ratio of wind speed between the near surface of the road and the top of surrounding buildings was used as a proxy parameter in the model to characterize the turbulence intensity which affects the vertical concentration mixing between the top of UCL and near surface. However, Benavides et al. assumed that the average wind speed in the street canyon was proportional

to the angle between the top wind direction and the central axis of the road, and the logarithmic wind profile to was still used to represent the change of wind speed within UCL, resulting in the influence of the street canyon effect on vertical mixing of background concentration was not considered. In this study, when the grid receptor is located in the street canyon, the MLSCF scheme was used to describe the wind profile within UCL. Otherwise, the logarithmic wind profile was used to calculate the wind speed at the specified height. This parameter scheme mainly calculated the background concentration mixing ratio (fac_{bg}), which was multiplied by the background concentration provided by the CMAQ-ISAM model to estimate the background concentration at the specified height near the ground. Based on the estimated sensible heat flux (H_u , W/m^2) from the WRF model, convective boundary layer ($H_u > 0$) and stable boundary layer ($H_u < 0$) were distinguished, and the effect of building density around the receptor site on fac_{bg} was also considered, as follows:

$$fac_{bg} = \begin{cases} 1 - F + F \times \frac{WS_{sfc}}{WS_{bh}}, & bd > 0.1 \& H_u > 0 \\ \frac{WS_{sfc}}{WS_{bh}}, & bd > 0.1 \& H_u \leq 0 \\ 1 - 5bd + 5bd \times \frac{WS_{sfc}}{WS_{bh}}, & bd \leq 0.1 \& H_u > 0 \\ 1 - 10bd + 10bd \times \frac{WS_{sfc}}{WS_{bh}}, & bd \leq 0.1 \& H_u \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

where, $F = m + \text{abs}(0.25 - bd)$, where m is an empirical parameter with value of 0.1.

Question 6

Why was a resolution of 50 m x 50 m chosen? Note that in Section 2.1 it is suggested that the resolution is only 100 m x 100 m. As mentioned on line 152, the average width of streets in Beijing is about 50 m. Thus, a resolution of 50 m is by far not sufficient to resolve gradients within street canyons.

Response:

Thanks for your reminding, and the original description was misleading. The grid spatial resolution of the hybrid model was 50 m x 50 m rather than 100 m x 100 m. This grid resolution over the whole urban area is limited due to the long computing time at present. Since the addition parameterization schemes applied into the hybrid model, especially for

the MLSCF, the meteorological field of each street needs to be calculated separately, leading to the large computational burden. However, when we focus on the distribution of concentration gradient near the street, the resolution of grid receptors will be improved to several meters level. For example, in Figure 8b and d, the grid resolution near SJZ street was improved to be 2 m. We will make efforts to develop a parallel computing method to reduce the computing time, in order to improve the grid resolution of a relatively large-scale simulation. We have modified the writing and added this discussion in **Conclusions**.

Revisions in Manuscript:

(1) Materials and Methods. Line 115-116.

In our model, a NO₂ pollution map with a high temporal (1 h) and spatial resolution (50 m×50 m) can finally be obtained.

(2) Conclusions. Line 502-505.

On the basis of this study, the following perspectives are proposed for future research: (1) At present, considering the running cost, the grid resolution of area in Beijing 5th ring road and its surroundings can reach 50 m×50 m. We will make efforts to develop a parallel computing method to reduce the computing time, in order to improve the grid resolution of a relatively large-scale simulation.

Question 7

The machine-learning model is rather simple and little convincing. Complex models are often replaced by artificial intelligence methods using neural networks or Gaussian process models, see for example Beddows et al. (2017, doi:10.1021/acs.est.6b05873). A good summary of methods applied in the context of air quality simulations is presented in Conibear et al. (2021, doi: doi.org/10.1029/2021GH000391). Here, a random forest (RF) regression and a MARS approach are used, but these choices are not motivated at all. The RF approach seems to generate quite noisy wind profiles (see Figure 5), but in most cases performs better than MARS. The combination of RF and MARS is referred to as "ensemble learning", but according to page 11, there RF and MARS models have been trained completely independently and there is only a simple switch between the two methods depending on whether the input values are within the range of the predictors used in the training or not. There is a long way from such a simple

approach to "ensemble learning".

Response:

Thanks for your suggestions. As you suggested, the applications of machine learning models on air quality predictions were investigated. In general, Random Forest (RF) and Multivariate Adaptive Regression Splines (MARS) are common machine learning methods which run efficiently on large data sets, and are relatively robust to outliers and noise. Furthermore, compared with other models (e.g. ANN), RF and MARS never require the specification of underlying data model and the complex parameter tuning (Kühnlein et al., 2014), and they can still provide efficient alternatives and generally show a high accuracy in many applications of predicting air pollutant concentrations (Chen et al., 2018; Geng et al., 2020; Hu et al., 2017; Kamińska, 2019). Therefore, RF and MARS are selected in this study, and the validation results with a little deviation (R was 0.99 and median of RE was less than 10%) indicated a good performance of our model (details see Section 3.1). A brief review of the applications of machine learning models, and the advantages of RF and MARS models have been both discussed in the revised **Materials and Methods**. As for another question about the “ensemble learning” used in the manuscript, we agreed that we just combined the results of two different models depends on whether the input value was within the range of predictors or not. We realized that it is not appropriate to name this kind of combination as “ensemble learning”, so the description about our model has been modified in the manuscript.

Revisions in Manuscript:

(1) Abstract. Line 15-16.

A Machine Learning-based Street Canyon Flow (MLSCF) scheme was constructed based on Computational Fluid Dynamic and two machine learning methods.

(2) Introduction. Line 101-103.

We developed a Machine Learning-based Street Canyon Flow (MLSCF) parameterization scheme, which was based on two machine learning methods using wind data from 1,600 CFD simulations.

(3) Materials and Methods. Line 243-254.

Data driven method, such as machine learning and deep learning, is now a successful

operational geoscientific processing schemes and has co-evolved with data availability over the past decade (Reichstein et al., 2019). Specially, these models have been used as computationally efficient emulators of explicit mechanism models, to explore uncertainties (Aleksankina et al., 2019) and sensitivities or replace complex gas-phase chemistry schemes (Conibear et al., 2021; Keller and Evans, 2019). In addition, meta-models (Fang et al., 2005) such as neural networks and Gaussian process (Beddows et al., 2017) are also used to produce a quick to run model surrogate and show reliable performance. Random Forest (RF) (Breiman, 2001) and Multivariate Adaptive Regression Splines (MARS) (Friedman, 1991) are common machine learning methods which run efficiently on large data sets, and are relatively robust to outliers and noise. Furthermore, RF and MARS never require the specification of underlying data model and the complex parameter tuning, and they can still provide efficient alternatives and generally show a high accuracy in applications for predict air pollutant concentrations (Chen et al., 2018; Geng et al., 2020; Hu et al., 2017; Kamińska, 2019).

(4) Materials and Methods. Line 263-265.

We combined the advantages of these two machine learning models and developed the MLSCF scheme to predict wind environment in street canyons and incorporated into the hybrid model, which is discussed in the section 3.1.

Question 8

The introduction section does a fairly poor job in citing relevant literature. Quite many multi-scale air pollution models have been developed recently and also machine learning methods are increasingly used. It is important to place the present study in context and explain where it is different or better than other approaches.

Response:

Thanks for your comments. As mentioned in the above response, a brief review of the applications of machine learning models has been added in the **Materials and Methods**. We have also added a review on multi-scale model in the **Introduction**. Compared with previous studies, the innovation of our model lies in its comprehensiveness, which takes the influence of street canyons, the chemical process, and background schemes into

consideration. In addition, the MLSCF scheme built here is a machine learning based scheme which is suitable for a wide range of street canyon wind environment simulation without huge computational cost.

Revisions in Manuscript:

(1) Introduction. Line 84-96.

Considering the respective strengths and limitations of regional models and local models, several studies have been carried out on coupling of air quality models applicable to different scales (Mu et al., 2022; Lefebvre et al., 2013; Benavides et al., 2019; Kim et al., 2018; Jensen et al., 2017; Mallet et al., 2018; Stocker et al., 2012). Although these models performed accurately in near-road simulation, the influence of street canyons is still hard to be considered. In some hybrid models (Jensen et al., 2017; Mallet et al., 2018; Stocker et al., 2012), OSPM was still applied to calculate concentration levels within the street, where the application of logarithmic wind profile probably overestimated the bottom wind speed in a deep street canyon as abovementioned. Other models simply assumed that in street canyons, wind direction followed the street direction, and wind speed was uniform, which was not sufficient to resolve the concentration gradient within street canyons (Benavides et al., 2019; Kim et al., 2018). Berchet et al. (2017) proposed a cost-effective method for simulating city-scale pollution taking advantage of high-resolution accurate CFD, while the primary NO_x was predicted due to the lack of a chemical module. Therefore, it is essential to build an integrated model to predict long-term and near-road air pollution suitable for the urban complex underlying surface environment..

Question 9

I was confused by the usage of the term "receptor". It seems that a receptor can be a grid point but it can also be any other point in the domain, e.g. the location of a measurement station. This needs to be explained much more clearly and earlier in the manuscript. Note that receptor modelling has quite a distinct meaning in air quality modelling and is usually associated with source-apportionment modeling like chemical mass balance or positive matrix factorization.

Response:

Thanks for your reminding. As you mentioned, the term “receptor” in our manuscript referred to the location where the concentration was predicted by the model. The receptors included both grid receptors and monitor receptors. The grid receptors were set at a spatial resolution of 50 m×50 m, and the monitor receptors were 10 observation stations located in the normal urban environment and 5 near-road monitoring sites. We have revised the writing in the manuscript to avoid misleading. Due to too many revisions, these revisions are not shown in this response. Please see the word with red color in the manuscript.

Question 10

The workflow illustrated in Figure 1 is not entirely clear to me: First of all, the arrow between the boxes "receptors in street canyon?" and "receptor information" likely points in the wrong direction. The most confusing thing is that there is a distinction between "Is a street canyon" and "Receptor in a street canyon". How is it possible that a point can be in a street canyon and at the same time not be inside? Why is there only "road information" needed as input to decide whether we are in a street canyon or not? Shouldn't there also be 3D building data? How the first decision "is a street canyon" is applied is not clear to me at all. Do you choose a road segment and then decide if it is inside a canyon or not? What about points between roads? How do you decide to which road a given point in the city belongs? What about other areas of the city without roads, e.g. parks?

Response:

Thank you very much for suggestion. We apologize for misleading the reviewer about the workflow figure. The box "Is a street canyon" was actually not correct in the workflow and removed in this revision. However, the arrow between the boxes "receptors in street canyon?" and "receptor information" points is in the right direction. In fact, the first criterion is “Receptor in a Street Canyon?”, which is depended on the receptor information (e.g. coordinates of the receptor) and road information (e.g. coordinates and geometry parameters). The 3D building data was processed into the geometry parameters of each road segment as stated in the Section 2.2.1. The coordinates and road width were used to decide whether the receptor is within a street canyon or not. If the receptor is not located within a street canyon, it will be regarded as located in the open terrain area, where the

logarithmic wind profile will be used rather than MLSCF scheme. Now the corrected workflow is shown in Figure 1 in the revised manuscript.

Revisions in Manuscript:

(1) Figures.




Figure 1: The framework of multiscale hybrid model CMAQ-RLINE_URBAN.

Question 11

At many instances in the paper, references to figures, tables and other sections are made in past tense (".. was shown in Figure 1", ".. were discussed in the following section", etc.) but should be in present tense (" .. are shown in Figure 1", " .. are discussed in the following section", etc.)

Response:

Thanks for your advice. We have corrected the tense in **Results and Discussion**. Due to too many revisions, these revisions are not shown in this response. Please see the word with red color in the manuscript.

Question 12

Data and code availability: Both are only available upon request. Code is only available upon "reasonable request". What is reasonable? Why is the code not made accessible more easily? Advancements in science critically depend on open science and open data.

Response:

Thanks for your question. We agreed that advancements in science critically depend on open science and open data. Now the code of MLSCF scheme is open to the public. We have added the expressions and coefficients of MARS model in the **Supplement Materials (Table S2 and S3)**, and the code of both RF and MARS models in the R language are now available on the Github website. We are pleased to share our data and code for the purpose of a scientific research.

Revisions in Manuscript:

(1) Code availability. Line 521-522.

The RF and MARS model for MLSCF are both available on Github (<https://github.com/claus0224/MLSCF-RF-MARS>), and other codes are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

(2) Supplement Materials. Tables

Table S2. Coefficients in V_x fitting of Multivariate Adaptive Regression Splines

Terms	Expression	Coefficients
1	Intercept	0.532
2	$\max(0.5-Vbg_x, 0)$	-0.623
3	$\max(Vbg_x-0.5, 0)$	0.111
4	$\max(2.5-Vbg_y, 0)$	-0.131
5	$\max(Vbg_y-2.5, 0)$	-0.010
6	$\max(0.5-H/W, 0)$	2.315
7	$\max(H/W-0.5, 0)$	-0.259
8	$\max(0.774-z/H, 0)$	-0.812
9	$\max(z/H-0.774, 0)$	2.774
10	$\max(2.5-Vbg_x, 0) \times \max(0.5-H/W, 0)$	-1.103
11	$\max(Vbg_x-2.5, 0) \times \max(0.5-H/W, 0)$	0.249

12	$\max(0.87-Vbg_x, 0) \times \max(0.774-z/H, 0)$	0.481
13	$\max(Vbg_x-0.87, 0) \times \max(0.774-z/H, 0)$	-0.444
14	$\max(2.5-Vbg_y, 0) \times \max(z/H-0.774, 0)$	-1.151
15	$\max(Vbg_y-2.5, 0) \times \max(z/H-0.774, 0)$	-1.139
16	$\max(0.5-Vbg_y, 0) \times \max(0.5-H/W, 0)$	-3.536
17	$\max(Vbg_y-0.5, 0) \times \max(0.5-H/W, 0)$	0.028
18	$\max(0.5-H/W, 0) \times \max(0.774-z/H, 0)$	0.897
19	$\max(H/W-0.5, 0) \times \max(0.774-z/H, 0)$	0.664
20	$\max(Vbg_x-2.5, 0) \times \max(H_l/H_r-1.33, 0) \times \max(z/H-0.774, 0)$	-2.054
21	$\max(Vbg_x-2.5, 0) \times \max(1.33-H_l/H_r, 0) \times \max(z/H-0.774, 0)$	6.242

Table S3. Coefficients in V_y fitting of Multivariate Adaptive Regression Splines

Terms	Expression	Coefficients
1	Intercept	2.117
2	$\max(2.5-Vbg_y, 0)$	-0.812
3	$\max(Vbg_y-2.5, 0)$	0.624
4	$\max(1-H/W, 0)$	0.455
5	$\max(H/W-1, 0)$	-0.335
6	$\max(0.75-H_l/H_r, 0)$	-0.081
7	$\max(H_l/H_r-0.75, 0)$	-0.690
8	$\max(0.079-z/H, 0)$	-14.220
9	$\max(z/H-0.079, 0)$	0.200
10	$\max(0.5-Vbg_x, 0) \times \max(H_l/H_r-0.75, 0)$	0.428
11	$\max(Vbg_x-0.5, 0) \times \max(H_l/H_r-0.75, 0)$	-0.036
12	$\max(2.5-Vbg_y, 0) \times \max(H/W-1, 0)$	0.152
13	$\max(2.5-Vbg_y, 0) \times \max(1-H/W, 0)$	-0.265
14	$\max(2.5-Vbg_y, 0) \times \max(H_l/H_r-0.75, 0)$	0.230
15	$\max(Vbg_y-2.5, 0) \times \max(H_l/H_r-0.75, 0)$	0.109
16	$\max(2.5-Vbg_y, 0) \times \max(z/H-0.079, 0)$	-0.090
17	$\max(2.5-Vbg_y, 0) \times \max(0.079-z/H, 0)$	5.602
18	$\max(Vbg_y-2.5, 0) \times \max(z/H-0.226, 0)$	0.536
19	$\max(Vbg_y-2.5, 0) \times \max(0.226-z/H, 0)$	-2.361
20	$\max(1-H/W, 0) \times \max(H_l/H_r-0.75, 0)$	0.480
21	$\max(H/W, 0) \times \max(H_l/H_r-0.75, 0)$	-0.052

Question 13

Parts of the code seem to be written in Fortran, other parts in R, but it is not clear which. If only CMAQ and WRF are written in Fortran and all other parts in R, then it is not justified to state that a multiscale hybrid model was developed based on Fortran (and R), because there was no development but only application of Fortran code.

Whether the model was implemented on Linux (page 5, line 96) or another platform seems irrelevant to me.

Response:

Thanks for your question. The MLSCF scheme is written in R language. Other parameterization schemes, including surface roughness scheme, UHI scheme, vertical mixing scheme and NO_x photochemical scheme, were all written in Fortran language and then added in to the original RLINE source code. We have revised the description about the development language in the manuscript to make it clearer. And as you suggested, the statement about Linux platform was removed.

Revisions in Manuscript:

(1) Materials and Methods. Line 109-111.

Here, we established the MLSCF scheme based on R language, and modified the code of RLINE model to add other parameterization schemes with FORTRAN language. Finally, a multiscale air quality hybrid model was developed to achieve a high-resolution NO₂ pollution mapping in urban areas.

Question 14

The wind profiles predicted by the MOST scheme presented in Figure 7 look very strange. Apparently, wind speeds reduce to zero at the displacement height, but then jump back to a non-zero value below. Why is this kink in the profile at lower altitude in Figure 7c than in Figures 7a and 7b (despite the higher aspect ratio H/W in case (c) than in (a) and (b)) and why is it not present at all in Figure 7d? Why are the winds at $z/H = 1$ different between the MOST and the MLSCF schemes? Shouldn't the wind at this level be constrained by the same WRF model output?

Response:

Thanks for your question. The differences in kink altitude among Figure 7a-d refer to the calculation of displacement height (d_h). In RLINE model, the d_h is calculated by multiplying surface roughness length (z_0) times a factor which is recommended to be set as 5. Due to the great differences in z_0 (highly depends on the local geometry of buildings) of each street, d_h is also different. Moreover, the height of each street is also different, and

the y axis of Figure 7a-d represented z/h , so the kink altitudes (d_h/h) in different streets of these figures are not comparable. And the Figure 7 mainly illustrates the different predictions of wind speed between MOST and MLSCF schemes. We added the calculation method of d_h in the manuscript to make the statement clearer.

The differences in winds at $z/H = 1$ between the MOST and the MLSCF schemes are mainly because the influence of turbulence in the street canyon on wind at the roof level is considered in the MLSCF scheme. However, in the MOST and MLSCF schemes, the wind environment higher than the roof level ($z/H > 1$) were both from WRF model and remained the same.

Revisions in Manuscript:

(1) Results and Discussion. Line 350-353.

As shown in Figure 7(a)-(d), the wind profile estimated by MOST showed a logarithmic change at the height above displacement height (d_h) (the d_h is calculated by multiplying surface roughness length (z_0) times a factor which is recommended to be set as 5) with a decrease to 0 at d_h , and remained constant below d_h .

Question 15

Figure 8 shows differences between simulations with and without the MLSCF scheme. Why are these differences limited to very narrow lines? It is very difficult to see details in this figure. It would be useful to see a zoom into a subregion.

Response:

Thanks for your question. It is because MLSCF scheme only affects the concentration of grid receptors inside the street canyon. The concentrations of grid receptors outside the street canyon are not affected, so the difference shown in Figure8 is a narrow strip visually. The detailed differences in the spatial distribution of concentrations within in a street canyon has already been described in Figure 8b and d, where the SJZ street was taken as an example.

References:

Aleksankina K, Reis S, Vieno M, Heal MR. Advanced methods for uncertainty assessment and

- global sensitivity analysis of an Eulerian atmospheric chemistry transport model. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* 2019; 19: 2881-2898.
- Beddows AV, Kitwiroon N, Williams ML, Beevers SD. Emulation and Sensitivity Analysis of the Community Multiscale Air Quality Model for a UK Ozone Pollution Episode. *Environmental Science & Technology* 2017; 51: 6229-6236.
- Benavides J, Snyder M, Guevara M, Soret A, Pérez García-Pando C, Amato F, et al. CALIOPE-Urban v1.0: coupling R-LINE with a mesoscale air quality modelling system for urban air quality forecasts over Barcelona city (Spain). *Geosci. Model Dev.* 2019; 12: 2811-2835.
- Bondarenko M, Kerr D, Sorichetta A, Tatem A. Census/projection-disaggregated gridded population datasets for 189 countries in 2020 using Built-Settlement Growth Model (BSGM) outputs. 2020.
- Breiman L. Random Forests. *Machine Learning* 2001; 45: 5-32.
- Chang SY, Vizuete W, Valencia A, Naess B, Isakov V, Palma T, et al. A modeling framework for characterizing near-road air pollutant concentration at community scales. *Science of the Total Environment* 2015; 538: 905-921.
- Chen G, Li S, Knibbs LD, Hamm NA, Cao W, Li T, et al. A machine learning method to estimate PM_{2.5} concentrations across China with remote sensing, meteorological and land use information. *Science of the Total Environment* 2018; 636: 52-60.
- Cimorelli AJ, Perry SG, Venkatram A, Weil JC, Paine RJ, Wilson RB, et al. AERMOD: A dispersion model for industrial source applications. Part I: General model formulation and boundary layer characterization. *Journal of applied meteorology* 2005; 44: 682-693.
- Conibear L, Reddington CL, Silver BJ, Chen Y, Knote C, Arnold SR, et al. Statistical Emulation of Winter Ambient Fine Particulate Matter Concentrations From Emission Changes in China. *GeoHealth* 2021; 5: e2021GH000391.
- Fang K-T, Li R, Sudjianto A. Design and modeling for computer experiments: Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2005.
- Filigrana P, Milando C, Batterman S, Levy JI, Mukherjee B, Adar SD. Spatiotemporal variations in traffic activity and their influence on air pollution levels in communities near highways. *Atmospheric Environment* 2020; 242: 117758.
- Friedman JH. Multivariate adaptive regression splines. *The annals of statistics* 1991; 19: 1-67.
- Geng G, Meng X, He K, Liu Y. Random forest models for PM_{2.5} speciation concentrations using MISR fractional AODs. *Environmental Research Letters* 2020; 15: 034056.
- Heist D, Isakov V, Perry S, Snyder M, Venkatram A, Hood C, et al. Estimating near-road pollutant dispersion: A model inter-comparison. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment* 2013; 25: 93-105.
- Hu X, Belle JH, Meng X, Wildani A, Waller LA, Strickland MJ, et al. Estimating PM_{2.5} concentrations in the conterminous United States using the random forest approach. *Environmental science & technology* 2017; 51: 6936-6944.
- Hurley P. The air pollution model (TAPM) version 3. Part 1. Technical description. Aspendale, Vic. CSIRO Atmospheric Research, 2005.
- Kamińska JA. A random forest partition model for predicting NO₂ concentrations from traffic flow and meteorological conditions. *Science of the Total Environment* 2019; 651: 475-

- Keller CA, Evans MJ. Application of random forest regression to the calculation of gas-phase chemistry within the GEOS-Chem chemistry model v10. *Geoscientific Model Development* 2019; 12: 1209-1225.
- Kim Y, Wu Y, Seigneur C, Roustan Y. Multi-scale modeling of urban air pollution: development and application of a Street-in-Grid model (v1. 0) by coupling MUNICH (v1. 0) and Polair3D (v1. 8.1). *Geoscientific Model Development* 2018; 11: 611-629.
- Kühnlein M, Appelhans T, Thies B, Nauss T. Improving the accuracy of rainfall rates from optical satellite sensors with machine learning — A random forests-based approach applied to MSG SEVIRI. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 2014; 141: 129-143.
- Reichstein M, Camps-Valls G, Stevens B, Jung M, Denzler J, Carvalhais N, et al. Deep learning and process understanding for data-driven Earth system science. *Nature* 2019; 566: 195-204.
- Sarrat C, Lemonsu A, Masson V, Guédalia D. Impact of urban heat island on regional atmospheric pollution. *Atmospheric environment* 2006; 40: 1743-1758.
- Snyder MG, Venkatram A, Heist DK, Perry SG, Petersen WB, Isakov V. RLINE: A line source dispersion model for near-surface releases. *Atmospheric Environment* 2013; 77: 748-756.
- Soulhac L, Nguyen C, Volta P, Salizzoni P. The model SIRANE for atmospheric urban pollutant dispersion. PART III: Validation against NO₂ yearly concentration measurements in a large urban agglomeration. *Atmospheric Environment* 2017; 167.
- Valencia A, Venkatram A, Heist D, Carruthers D, Arunachalam S. Development and evaluation of the R-LINE model algorithms to account for chemical transformation in the near-road environment. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment* 2018; 59: 464-477.
- Wang K, Jiang S, Wang J, Zhou C, Wang X, Lee X. Comparing the diurnal and seasonal variabilities of atmospheric and surface urban heat islands based on the Beijing urban meteorological network. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* 2017; 122: 2131-2154.
- Zhai X, Russell AG, Sampath P, Mulholland JA, Kim B-U, Kim Y, et al. Calibrating R-LINE model results with observational data to develop annual mobile source air pollutant fields at fine spatial resolution: Application in Atlanta. *Atmospheric Environment* 2016; 147: 446-457.
- Zhang X, Just AC, Hsu H-HL, Kloog I, Woody M, Mi Z, et al. A hybrid approach to predict daily NO₂ concentrations at city block scale. *Science of The Total Environment* 2021; 761: 143279.