

Interactive comment on “Atmospheric aging of small-scale wood combustion emissions (model MECHA 1.0) – is it possible to distinguish causal effects from non-causal associations?” by Ville Leinonen et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 14 March 2020

Leinonen et al. have developed a first-of-its-kind semi-empirical model to simulate the gas- and particle-phase evolution of organic species while aging emissions from wood combustion. They comment on model performance and discuss the advantages and disadvantages of using such a model to assess causality between the predictors and outcomes.

There are several key deficiencies in this manuscript and I do not recommend publication of this manuscript to GMD. The primary deficiency of this manuscript is that the methods and application for the MECHA model are very poorly described and are very

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



hard to follow (assuming I represent the average researcher within the atmospheric modeling community). I suspect if the methods need to be described and published in a more appropriate journal and that this manuscript should focus primarily on the application to aging of wood combustion emissions. For instance, sections 2.2 to 2.5.4 were quite abstract. A lot of technical terms were introduced (e.g., causal discovery algorithm, causal graph) but there wasn't a detailed explanation of how its use applies to the application explored in this work. Another deficiency is that the technical communication is grammatically incorrect in a lot of places, which it makes it hard to follow the authors' train of thought. Overall, it was very hard to assess the scientific merit of this work.

It is also quite likely that I am not well versed with this type of modeling (to me, the model appears to be one where one solves a set of differential equations on aggregated variables, which are factors from the gas and particle instrument data, to fit coefficients that can reproduce the observed data; a related question then is how was the model trained and tested?). If that is true, I might not be well-suited to review this manuscript.

Regardless, I feel confident that the average reader of this journal is going to be hard pressed to understand the model and the key findings from this work.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2020-13>, 2020.

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