Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2020-90-SC1, 2020

Geoscientific Model Development Discussions
Open Access
EGU

Interactive comment on "Prioritising the sources of pollution in European cities: do air quality modelling applications provide consistent responses?" *by* Bart Degraeuwe et al.

Alain Clappier

clappier@unistra.fr

Received and published: 7 July 2020

This paper presents a comparison between the results obtained with two different set up of the SHERPA Source Receptor Relationship (SRR): S-CHIMERE and S-EMEP. Each of these two SHERPA configurations is used to compute the impact of different emission reductions (per activity sectors, per areas and per precursors) for 150 cities in Europe. The authors compare all the impacts provided by the two SHERPA configurations to evaluate the variability resulting from the use of two model systems (CHIMERE and EMEP). This work is without any doubts very interesting because it provides information about the robustness of model results which could be directly

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

used by decision makers to design abatement strategies. The authors take advantage of the capacity of SHERPA to simulate a very large number of scenarios concerning spatial as well as sectorial emission reductions. 150 cities have been considered and 100 scenarios have been computed for each of these cities. As far as I know, SHERPA is the only tool able of such performances and it is the first time that so many cities and scenarios have been tested. This is why I think that the most interesting results of this article concerns the analysis of all cities and all scenarios (graphic of figure 5 and map of figure 6). The graphic of figure 5 and the map of figure 6 shows that a large part of the impacts computed by the two SHERPA configurations are closed to each other. 67% of the 150 cities are evaluated as Fair, Good or Very Good (Pearson coefficients above 0.85 in figure 5). Moreover, these cities are located in the largest part of Europe (all Europe except the Iberian Peninsula, southern Italy, extreme North Europe and some points like Milan or Lyon). It indicates that the results are robust, which may reassure decision-makers. Unfortunately, even if two models give similar results, they can both be wrong. For this reason, a diagnosis of good robustness remains difficult to exploit. On the contrary, large differences between the results of two models shows that, at least, one of the models is wrong. In such case, the information provided by the comparison may worry decision-makers but become very valuable for model developers and data providers. Observing the map of figure 6 shows clearly that the Iberian Peninsula and the southern Italy are not well simulated by at least one of the SHERPA configurations. This should encourage the developers of CHIMERE and EMEP to control their models and their data in these regions. I advise the authors to insist on this point which seems to me one of the major contributions of their work. But the evaluation of the difference between two CTM like EMEP and CHIMERE required some wariness. Indeed, SHERPA does not reproduce exactly the results of a CTM generating some errors which will be probably different for EMEP and CHIMERE. The differences which appear between EMEP and CHIMERE will be amplified or damped by SHERPA. So that, high differences between the two SHERPA configurations could hide low differences between EMEP and CHIMERE and vice et versa. This problem

has not been commented and is even not mentioned in this article. I advise the authors to address this point. I suppose they can easily refer to the SHERPA accuracy that have been estimated in their previous publications. The authors use the Pearson correlation to evaluate the differences between the two SHERPA configurations which is perhaps not the best statistical indicator. The Pearson coefficient does not spot situations where the results of one of the models are proportional to the other. Let suppose, for example, that the results of one of the models is constantly twice the results of the other model. The Pearson coefficient will then be equal to 1. I advise the author to use another indicator, like the RMSE, it will probably not change their conclusions but should avoid the problem just mentioned. Then, it could be interesting to evaluate (even roughly) a threshold above which the differences observed between the two SHERPA configurations reflect significant differences between the two systems of models EMEP and CHIMERE. This would help locate the areas where the differences between EMEP and CHIMERE are proven with near certainty.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2020-90, 2020.