

## ***Interactive comment on “Up/Down trend in the MODIS Aerosol Optical Depth and its relationship to the Sulfur Dioxide Emission Changes in China during 2000 and 2010” by S. Itahashi et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #4**

Received and published: 9 November 2011

Review on “Up/down trend in the MODIS aerosol optical depth and its relationship to the sulfur dioxide emission changes in China during 2000 and 2010” written by Itahashi et al.

This manuscript is about an analysis of the inter-annual variations of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from China between 2000 and 2010. Authors insisted that the SO<sub>2</sub> emissions should increase at a rate of 12.7%/yr until 2005, and have then decreased at an average rate of -3.9%/yr. In order to prove this, authors analyzed fine-mode AOD (AOD<sub>f</sub>), REAS SO<sub>2</sub> emissions, CMAQ modeling with the REAS SO<sub>2</sub> emissions, and SO<sub>2</sub> VCDs (SO<sub>2</sub> VCDs from Gottwald and Bovensmann, 2011). This paper is dealing with an interesting

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

and important topic in the air quality of East Asia. Also, the topic is suitable for ac&p. Therefore, it can be published on ac&p, but it also needs several modifications and improvements, before its publication on ac&p.

Major comments: The topic being handled in the manuscript is important, but this reviewer has four main questions on this work:

1. What is the real use of the CMAQ modeling? The CMAQ modeling was performed only until 2005. Thus, it could not show (or reproduce) the decreasing trend from 2006 to 2010. Then, what is the point of using the CMAQ model in this study? This reviewer recommends to remove it from the analysis. Or, alternatively authors may be able to use only the SO<sub>2</sub> bottom-up emission data in this analysis.

2. Authors primarily analyzed AOD<sub>f</sub> in this study, but this reviewer think that a direct quantity to be analyzed is NOT AOD<sub>f</sub>, BUT SO<sub>2</sub> VCD. This is because the relation between AOD<sub>f</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> emissions is much more indirect than that between SO<sub>2</sub> VCD and SO<sub>2</sub> emissions. For example, SO<sub>2</sub> is oxidized first through homogeneous and heterogeneous reaction pathways to be converted into sulfate, but still AOD<sub>f</sub> is not sulfate (even if sulfate is a main contributor to AOD<sub>f</sub>). Therefore, this reviewer strongly recommends that authors should use the SO<sub>2</sub> VCD (from GOME, OMI, and SCIAMACHY) as a primary variable and AOD<sub>f</sub> as secondary variable in the analysis.

3. The choice of the four study regions in Fig. 1 is somewhat arbitrary. Why did not authors choose the Yellow Sea, even if it is the best region to monitor these increasing/decreasing trends of the SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from China? Why is the number 1 box (region) so small? Why did not authors work over the whole East China Sea? This reviewer thinks that the Sea of Japan (box3) would be influenced more by the Korean emissions. Therefore, this reviewer recommends that authors analyze the changing trends of the SO<sub>2</sub> VCD and AOD<sub>f</sub> over the four large boxes, for instance, the Yellow Sea, East China Sea, Sea of Japan, and remote Pacific Ocean.

4. This reviewer is not sure that authors are aware of the GAINS-ASIA projection (by

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



IIASA). According to the GAINS-ASIA projection, the SO<sub>2</sub> emissions from China are expected to decrease approximately from 2015 (although it has a little plateau after 2005). Authors should make some comments on this, too.

Some specific comments: 1. Page 21973, line14-16: To use AOD<sub>f</sub> in this study, authors should show a more detailed analysis about the relations between sulfate and AOD<sub>f</sub> (possibly, from their CMAQ modeling results).

2. Page 21976, line 2-4: Again, the SO<sub>2</sub> emissions are more directly related with SO<sub>2</sub> VCD than AOD<sub>f</sub>.

3. Page 21978, line 17-1: In this reviewer's best knowledge, the CMAQ model does not contain the stratospheric chemistry. The contributions of stratospheric particulate species to AOD<sub>f</sub> would be small. Authors should re-write this sentence.

4. Page 21979, line 13-18: AOD<sub>f</sub> from MODIS and AOD<sub>f</sub> from CMAQ should be compared each other more clearly, even though it was shown briefly in Fig. 2(a) and (b).

5. Page 21981, line17: Again, if authors analyze the SO<sub>2</sub> VCDs, then authors can also analyze the increasing/decreasing trends over CEC (over the land. This reviewer believe that it can produce more direct and concrete evidences on the authors' points in this manuscript.

6. Page 21989, Fig. 1: Color scheme should be improved. A pink-like color for >80 Kt/yr grid is not very suitable for such high SO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

7. Page 21990, Fig. 2: Characters and scale bars inside the panels are too small to read. Again, why were 3-year averages calculated in Fig. 2(a), but 6-year averages in Fig. 2(b)? How did authors calculate the changes in AOD<sub>f</sub> in Fig. 2(c) and (d)? Subtraction or division? Authors have to explain.

8. Page 21991-21992, Fig. 3 & Fig. 4: Again, characters in Fig. 4 are too small to read. Two figures should be replaced or re-plotted, with the major points 2 & 3 above.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

