



Interactive comment on “Modeling and computation of effective emissions: a position paper” by R. Paoli et al.

R. Paoli et al.

paoli@cerfacs.fr

Received and published: 25 June 2011

1) Common response to the three referees. We agree that validation is a critical task for atmospheric models. In addition to validation, verification is another important ingredient to assess the quality of physical models or computational methods as those described here. We added a new section (Sec. 6 in the revised version of the paper) to discuss these problems.

Specific comments

Typos: We corrected the typos and rephrased some sentences.

Page 138: However, in many large line-shaped sources, such as aircraft, ships or motorways, and large point sources, such as big factories of power plants, the emissions

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



result in local concentrations up to several orders of magnitude larger than background concentrations (Schlager et al., 1997, 2006).

Page 143: We added at the end of Sec. 1 some details about the differences between the methods in (we also added the new Tab. 3 summarizing the main features of each method).

Page 145: ok we mentioned dilution.

Section 4.2: we rephrased; yes “mass” not emissions at line 6, page 154.

Page 158: LES (Large-Eddy Simulation) was introduced at page 144 line 7.

Page 160: we clarified (we mean “leads to ozone production”).

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 4, 137, 2011.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper