

Title: EURODELTA-Trends, a multi-model experiment of air quality 1 hindcast in Europe over 1990-2010.

General comment:

The manuscript provides detailed information of the experiment set up. The experiments look reasonable. However, it is very difficult to understand the anticipated results based on the current information. As described in the journal website, results should be provided for model experiment description papers.

http://www.geoscientific-model-development.net/about/manuscript_types.html#item4

“Should include sufficient descriptions/figures of model results to give an overview of the project.”

However, the manuscript does not provide any results. Without results, it is not easy for referees to provide further meaningful comments on the experiments.

Specific comments:

Line 12 in page 3: the “(” should be removed.

Line 39-40 in page 3: the sentence is not completed.

Line 32 in page 6: what does the “perfect” mean? I assume the authors refer to “better”.

Line 34-35 in page 8: What is the reason to rely on observation-based boundary for most experiments?

Line 18 in page 9: The ammonium trend based on NO_x is not necessary true, as NH_4 is also affected by NH_3 emission which is expected to maintain at a constant level in the future, while NO_x is expected to reduce.

Line 34 in page 9: “The air concentration” should be “The air pollutant concentration”.

Line 18 in page 12: The referee cannot agree this requirement based on two reasons. First, if users use the data, they should cite the corresponding publications. This should provide enough credits for the authors. Second, the findings of other studies may not be agreed by the authors. This may not be appropriate to include the authors’ names on a paper that has findings against the authors’ understanding. Therefore, this requirement should be modified such as “users of these data should cite this paper”.