Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 8, C4006–C4007, 2016
www.geosci-model-dev-discuss.net/8/C4006/2016/

Geoscientific Model Development Discussions
Open Access
EGU

Interactive comment on "InMAP: a new model for air pollution interventions" *by* C. W. Tessum et al.

C. W. Tessum et al.

tess0050@umn.edu

Received and published: 13 February 2016

Comment:

Firstly, I hope I have not erred, but here is the derivation.ÂăÂăStarting with Tessum et al., eqn. 3 (simplifying to one direction, letting fw,e=1), and dividing by ïĄĎt: [equation omitted] First, let the west cell be the iâĂŘ1 cell and the east cell be the i+1 cell.ÂăÂăThen put the Upos and Uneg terms together: [equation omitted] Now add and subtract [equation omitted] (the two middle terms): [equation omitted] Rearranging gives: [equation omitted] Multiply the numerator and denominator of the first term by ïĄĎx: [equation omitted] The authors may wish to consider if the last term may have some numerical/physical issues in some cases.ÂăÂăÂă I do believe that if you have the first term using (Upos+Uneg)/2, you get: [equation omitted] This leads to a central difference form for both advection and diffusion.ÂăÂăBoth the first order ad-

Full Screen / Esc
Printer-friendly Version
Interactive Discussion
Discussion Paper

vection and central difference advection adds increased numerical diffusion, on top of the diffusion from the first term, and the advection term is not dependent upon the concentration in the i cell.ÂăÂăThe authors might consider dividing their solution to four periods, and during each period use the different combinations of Upos , Uneg , Vpos and Vneg.ÂăÂăThis would remove the large diffusion term introduced in the current method, though the advection approach used is still diffusive.ÂăÂăThey might consider using a higher order advection scheme that is less diffusive.ÂăÂăThey should also consider making FA equal to 1 to maintain concordance with the original equation and have the correct asymptotic behaviour.ÂăÂăÂă Whichever approach is chosen, it should be tested against cases with a known solutions.

Response:

We thank the reviewer for this derivation and comment. We have redesigned InMAP's advection scheme to address these issues and have added an additional test comparing InMAP and WRF-Chem predictions of a single source of nonreactive PM2.5.

Changes:

We have redesigned the InMAP advection scheme and updated the manuscript text and figures accordingly. We have also added a test of InMAP performance against WRF-Chem for a single point source of nonreactive particles.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 8, 9281, 2015.