

## ***Interactive comment on “Quantifying pollution inflow and outflow over East Asia through coupling regional and global models” by M. Lin et al.***

**M. Lin et al.**

m1in26@wisc.edu

Received and published: 17 April 2010

### *Authors Response to Short Comments*

*We thank Wing Lin for the thoughtful comments that we believe have helped us to strengthen the manuscript.*

*Below we include the original comments (shown in black), and we respond to each comment line-by-line. **Our responses are shown in bold.***

The overall contents are well presented. The author has demonstrated the advantages of using finer resolution models (i.e., WRF-CMAQ) on the issue of long-range transport

C1785

studies. However, a few places may need some touch ups and improvements.

1) The title of the paper “Quantifying pollution inflow and outflow over East Asia through coupling regional and global models” may not represent well the contents of the paper. I realized that the author has coupled MOZART with CMAQ (using MOZART as the boundary conditions for CMAQ) to study the inflow and outflow over East Asia. However, the major focus of the paper have been on the advantages of WRF-CMAQ over MOZART for the March episode along with the Asia outflow results from those simulations. Very little or near nothing on the discussion of the coupled model. The “coupling term” has seems mislead to the audience.

» **Agreed. We changed the title to: “Quantifying pollution inflow and outflow over East Asia in spring with regional and global models”**

2) Pg. 129, line 15. The argument of “O<sub>3</sub> production tends to be in the NO<sub>x</sub>-limited regime in MOZART” is wrong. The author has used the reason “Total emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> are 15% lower in MOZART, which leads to a relatively higher VOC/NO<sub>x</sub> ratio in the global model.” Although NO<sub>x</sub> is 15% lower, however, that does not translated to “NO<sub>x</sub> limited regime in MOZART”. According to the Table 1, the calculated VOC/NO<sub>x</sub> ratios in both MOZART and CMAQ are similar. It should be noted that most of East Asia studies have shown the East Asia is more VOC limited. Therefore, such writing is confusing. Unless, the author has more data or analyzes to support such argument. Otherwise, this writing is not justified.

» **We agreed that most studies for East Asia have suggested that ozone formation over this part of the world is likely in the VOC-limited (NO<sub>x</sub>-saturated regime). The sentence of “O<sub>3</sub> production tends to be in the NO<sub>x</sub>-limited regime in MOZART” has been cut. But we do think the ozone formation chemical formation regimes associated with the VOC-to-NO<sub>x</sub> ratio in MOZART will affect the ozone response to foreign emissions. For example, MOZART emits much lower NO<sub>x</sub> emissions in the urban areas of Tokyo, Seoul and Beijing than CMAQ (Figure**

C1786

S1), and it gives lower ozone response at these megacities than CMAQ. To further support our discussion on the influence of chemical regimes on the ozone response, we have conducted a new sensitivity test using the CMAQ model to assess the relative role of direct long-range transport of O<sub>3</sub> vs. local production driven by PAN decomposition on the total response of EA O<sub>3</sub> to EU emissions reductions. Our results show that NO<sub>x</sub> released from EU PAN decomposition contributes up to approximately 50% of total O<sub>3</sub> responses in subsiding plumes at mountain observatories, and the chemical regime where the subsiding PAN decomposes determines the O<sub>3</sub> production efficiency.

» We added a new subsection (section 4.2) presenting the findings described above.

3) Figure 7 at Pg. 150. It is unreasonable to use 20% perturbation with a factor of 5 to represent a full impact from Europe to East Asia since the nature of non-linearity in O<sub>3</sub> chemistry. Some researchers (Wu et al. and Akimoto et al.: : Can't remember which year) have shown the O<sub>3</sub> remained in linear relationship when 20% to 35% foreign reduction (i.e., NO<sub>x</sub>) is imposed. I believed that the linear relationship between O<sub>3</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> will not maintain when 100% of European emissions reduction is used. If the author want to continue to use the factor of 5 as the 100% of EU enhancement to East Asia, he/she should first demonstrate such technique is a good approximation or able to find some papers to support his/her argument. If the author can not prove that, this approximation should not be accepted since it is not scientifically sound. Therefore, this result could most likely be a wrong representation of the output result and may lead to over exaggerate the contribution of European enhancement to East Asia.

» We agreed that the response of ozone to emission reductions is not linear. Thus, we re-made relevant figures for the discussion of EU enhancement (Figure 7, 8 and 9), and restricted our discussion in the text to the response to a 20% decrease in European emissions.

---

C1787

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 10, 109, 2010.

C1788