

Interactive comment on “Are contributions of emissions to ozone a matter of scale? – A study using MECO(n) (MESSy v2.50)” by Mariano Mertens et al.

Mariano Mertens et al.

mariano.mertens@dlr.de

Received and published: 21 June 2019

Dear reviewer#1,

thank you very much for your review of our manuscript GMD-2019-07. We like to post a short comment to your review, as we see some points you raised differently. After the discussion phase has ended we will provide a full answer. In the following, referee comments are given in italics, our reply's in normal font.

This paper presents an analysis of simulations at various horizontal resolutions, with

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



emissions at various resolutions, and different emissions inventories.

Reply: To be more precise our analysis focuses only on diagnosed ozone contributions and uncertainties of these contributions which arise due to model limitations (e.g. resolution, parametrisation), limited resolution of emission inventories and uncertainties of the emission inventories.

The research is technically sound, and the application of source tagging and attribution is well illustrated. However, the paper does not seem to have any new results. The models and tagging technique used have all been published previously. The majority of their conclusions confirm previous work. Their strongest conclusion seems to be that different emissions inventories making the largest difference in ozone simulations, which I think is well known, but they do not offer any assessment about which might be more accurate. If the authors feel they have more compelling results, then they should make them much clearer.

Reply: First of all thank you very much for honouring our work. Indeed our analysis is very technical and focuses on the impact of technical limitations of models on the results of source apportionment diagnostics. However, we do not agree with reviewer#1 that our manuscript does not show any new results. Clearly, the dependence of simulated ozone concentrations on the resolutions of model and emissions are well known (see p114f, p218ff of our manuscript), and where appropriate we cite previous literature. The focus of our manuscript, however, is not on simulated ozone concentrations but on diagnosed contributions to ozone. We are not aware of any previous publication, which investigates the impact of these factors on the results of a source apportionment (e.g. tagging) method. Further, we are not aware of any similar model system allowing for such an analysis, as it requires a consistent global-regional model chain applying the identical source-attribution method on the global and regional scale. Previous publications applying source attribution on the regional scale (e.g. Dunker et al, 2002, Li et

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



al., 2012, Kwok et al., 2015, Valverde et al., 2016, Karamchandani et al., 2017) considered only the contributions as simulated by the regional model and cannot attribute ozone transported from the stratosphere or across the regional model domain to specific emission categories. In the revised manuscript, we will clarify the focus and the new insights accordingly.

Finally, we would like to remark that publications in GMD are not about presenting new scientific results. Publications in GMD are mainly to document model developments, document experimental set-ups of model simulations, document evaluation of model systems, present model evaluation strategies and to present technical analyses of model systems. We think that our manuscript documents the influence of model and emission inventory resolutions on source attribution results. This is clearly important to assess source apportionment results and their related uncertainties, also for other model systems.

It is not apparent why the authors thought GMD was the best journal for this work. It does not seem to have any new model development, or even quantitative evaluation of the model.

Reply: The main goal of our manuscript is to analyse the impact of technical differences (e.g. model and emission inventory resolutions and/or the applied model) on the simulated contributions to ozone. Accordingly, our research questions are rather technical and focus on the impact of differences due to model limitations and/or differences due to input data. This does not necessarily result in new scientific results, but it is certainly important for other researchers in the same field. Therefore, we chose GMD instead of ACP as journal and choose “development and technical paper” as manuscript type. These type of manuscripts also includes: ‘[...] papers relating to technical aspects of running models and the reproducibility of results’ (GMD website).

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

The paper reads very much like a technical report for MESSy users. For example, it would help the general reader if 'ONEMIS' was defined and explained on p.5.

Reply: Of course the paper should not read as a technical report to MESSy users. Even though the specific results we discuss are only valid for the specific model system and set-up (as it is common for most model studies) the general conclusions (see next paragraph) are also important to other researchers using source apportionment methods in a variety of models (e.g. CMAQ, WRF). As discussed in the next paragraph, we will revise the manuscript in such a way that the general findings, which are important for the whole community, will become more clear.

For the revised manuscript we will carefully check the manuscript again and describe specifics of the MESSy world, which are not defined in detail. For your specific example of ONEMIS on p511f we write: 'Emissions of soil-NO_x and biogenic isoprene (C₅H₈) are calculated by the MESSy submodel ONEMIS (Kerkweg et al, 2006) , which uses the parametrisations of Yienger and Levy (1995) for soil-NO_x, and Guenther et al. (1995) for C₅H₈.' To our understanding this is a definition of ONEMIS. We could of course describe the processes in ONEMIS in more detail, but this would lead in large parts to a reproduction of Kerkweg et al. (2006).

While I see no errors in this work, I feel significant revisions are required to make it suitable for publication. The paper should emphasize new results, not the confirmation of previous results. It would also be valuable to include comparisons to observations, and perhaps then conclusions can be drawn as to how fine does model horizontal resolution need to be to reproduce observations, and to reproduce accurately physical phenomena (e.g., vertical transport) that affect ozone distributions.

Reply: First of all we would like to thank reviewer#1 that she/he generally confirms

that our analysis does not have any errors. As mentioned above, we think that our study offers important new results, which are also important for communities outside the MESSy community. In particular, our research offers insights into uncertainties of diagnosed ozone contributions. These new results are:

- Diagnosed contributions of anthropogenic emissions are rather robust on the continental scale. Differences due to model, model and emission inventory resolutions and anthropogenic emissions are 10 % at maximum.
- Uncertainties of contributions at ground level due to downward transport of ozone are rather large. We find differences of up to 30 % on the continental scale.
- On the regional scale differences in contributions of land transport emissions are rather large and can reach up to 20 % and more, due to different reasons. Therefore high resolved model and high resolved emissions are important for regional assessments of ozone source apportionment.
- Source attribution diagnostics are a valuable tool to better understand inter-model differences.

However, the comment from reviewer#1 also clearly shows that we did not clearly bring up these new results. Therefore, we will highlight them more prominent in the revised manuscript.

We agree with reviewer#1 that a detailed comparison with observations is very valuable. However, ozone contributions cannot be measured directly. Therefore, more complex evaluation strategies involving proxies, which can be measured, are needed. However, this is beyond the scope of this manuscript, because we here focus on the influence of technical aspects and try to estimate uncertainties, which arise only due to technical limitations. In a follow up study we work on a more detailed

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

analysis involving detailed observations of specific measurement campaigns, which are confronted with modelled concentrations and diagnosed contributions to further constrain uncertainties of source attribution results.

Further, we are very thankful for the technical corrections provided by review#1 and will consider them for the revised version and answer them in our full reply.

We are looking forward to your reply,

Mariano Mertens
(on behalf of all co-authors)

Bibliography

Dunker, A. M., Yarwood, G., Ortman, J. P., and Wilson, G. M.: Comparison of Source Apportionment and Source Sensitivity of Ozone in a Three-Dimensional Air Quality Model, *Environmental Science Technology*, 36, 29532964, doi:10.1021/es011418f, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/es011418f>, pMID: 12144273, 2002.

Guenther, A., Hewitt, C., E., D., Fall, R. G., C., Graedel, T., Harley, P., Klinger, L., Lerdau, M., McKay, W., Pierce, T., S., B., Steinbrecher, R., Tallamraju, R., Taylor, J., and Zimmermann, P.: A global model of natural volatile organic compound emissions, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 15 100, 8873–8892, 1995.

Karamchandani, P., Long, Y., Pirovano, G., Balzarini, A., and Yarwood, G.: Source-sector contributions to European ozone and fine PM in 2010 using AQMEII modeling data, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 17, 56435664, doi:10.5194/acp-17-5643-

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



2017, URL <https://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/17/5643/2017/>, 2017.

Kerkweg, A., Sander, R., Tost, H., and Jöckel, P.: Technical note: Implementation of prescribed (OFFLEM), calculated (ONLEM), and pseudo-emissions (TNUDGE) of chemical species in the Modular Earth Submodel System (MESSy), *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 6, 36033609, doi:10.5194/acp-6-3603-2006, URL <http://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/6/3603/2006/>, 2006.

Kwok, R. H. F., Baker, K. R., Napelenok, S. L., and Tonnesen, G. S.: Photochemical grid model implementation and application of VOC, NO_x, and O₃ source apportionment, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 8, 99114, doi:10.5194/gmd-8-99-2015, URL <http://www.geosci-model-dev.net/8/99/2015/>, 2015.

Li, Y., Lau, A. K.-H., Fung, J. C.-H., Zheng, J. Y., Zhong, L. J., and Louie, P. K. K.: Ozone source apportionment (OSAT) to differentiate local regional and super-regional source contributions in the Pearl River Delta region, China, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 117, doi: 10.1029/2011JD017340, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2011JD017340>, d15305, 2012.

Valverde, V., Pay, M. T., and Baldasano, J. M.: Ozone attributed to Madrid and Barcelona on-road transport emissions: Characterization of plume dynamics over the Iberian Peninsula, *Science of The Total Environment*, 543, Part A, 670–682, doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.11.070>, URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969715310500>, 2016.

Yienger, J. J. and Levy, H.: Empirical model of global soil-biogenic NO_x emissions, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 100, 11 44711–464, doi:

GMDD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



10.1029/95JD00370, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/95JD00370>, 1995

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2019-7>, 2019.

GMDD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

