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I have read through the manuscript and the very detailed comments from Reviewer #1. The topic of this manuscript is of high interests to both scientific communities and policy makers and this is the first time I have been seen such a review paper discussing reactive nitrogen emission inventories. I agree with Reviewer #1 that this paper omits too many recent inventory studies, and it does not address all objectives claimed in the beginning of the paper. Therefore, I recommend publication after addressing the questions raised by Reviewer #1 and myself.

Specific comments:

I recommend a summary table to list the databases discussed in this paper. The table should include the name and reference of the database, representing year, containing species, as well as the emissions. Summarize three regions in separate tables, if necessary.

Although this paper is focused on three regions, an overview of global emissions would be very helpful for understanding atmospheric N budgets. It will add the value of this review paper. I would suggest adding a section to discuss global inventories before the three regional sections. EDGAR is not the only global inventory dataset addressing reactive nitrogen species. Global datasets can be introduced in this section, and comparisons between global inventories and regional inventories can be then discussed in the following sections.

The three regional sections were organized in different way, which makes the structure of this manuscript unclear. The differences between EDGAR data and European inventory were discussed in Sect. 2, and Sect. 3.2, but EDGAR data was not mentioned in Sect. 3.1, 3.3, and the whole Sect. 4. Emission trends were discussed in Sect. 3.2, 3.3, and 4.2, but missing in other sections. I suggest that the authors report each of three regions in a similar way.

As EDGAR 4 is fresh (only GHG gases are available by now) and rarely validated, and previous EDGAR dataset has been extensively used in scientific communities, I suggest that the authors also compare EDGAR 3 or EDGAR FT2000 with regional inventories. It would be also interesting to see the differences between EDGAR FT2000 and EDGAR 4.

NO emissions from soil are now of great concern. These emissions are usually missing from official inventories, but there are several scientific inventory studies addressing this. I recommend the authors be aware of this part because it might be significant to global and regional NOx budget.

I agree with Reviewer #1 that all the units in this manuscript should be converted to Tg or Gg N. It's difficult to me to follow the numbers with different units.

P12419, L8: I am surprising that RAINS and GAINS database were not mentioned
here. These two databases should be discussed in Sect. 2. In the present manuscript, RAINS dataset was mentioned in Sect. 2.2, but missing in Sect 2.3 and 2.4.

P12419, L25: EDGAR FT2000 should be mentioned here.

P12420, L8: It should be stated that which dataset is used in the comparison (Official submissions or model use).

P12421, L1: I would like to see a percentage difference presented here.

P12421, L9-14: Here EDGAR's estimates were lower than that of EMEP. It's conflict with the previous statement of “EDGAR emissions are (much) higher for all EU27 countries”.

P12421, L17: Again, RAINS and GAINS database should be discussed.

P12422, L5: Please compare with IIASA data.


P12422, L27: which inventory is discussed here?

P12423, L1-3: I would suggest adding GAINS data to this comparison. Also, compare at the sector level if possible, to make this conclusion more convincible.


P12423, L19: How the NEI estimates compared to EDGAR?

P12424, L7: Discussions on regional trend in NOx emissions would be interesting, e.g., Ohio River region, California, etc. . .

P12424, L26: Add the following reference:


P12425, L14: Compare with EDGAR data.

P12426 L3: The authors should revisit this section carefully. Many of recent studies were missing.

P12426, L5: The following inventories should be discussed in this section:

EDGAR;


P12427, L1: Almost all recent studies are missing in this section. This section should be rewritten carefully.

EDGAR4;


P12427, L1: I agree with Reviewer #1 that the satellite observed NOx trends should be discussed in this paper, not only for China, but for all three regions. Therefore, maybe this part can be placed to the Sect. 5.3.

Several additional references for satellite-based NOx emission trends among the world:

P12427, L23: Bai, 1996 and Ma and Zhou, 2000. These two references are not appropriate. They did not address NOx emission trends over China.

P12428, L12: Discuss the following studies:
EDGAR;

P12428, L2: NARSTO assessment report should be mentioned in this section.

P12434, L13: Satellite observed trends can be discussed here. Also, add the following references:

P12438, L20: This section looks weird to me. I could not understand the means of “uncertainties” here. Uncertainties in emission projections? Also, historical emission trends have been discussed in Sect. 5.3. This section and Sect. 5.3 should be restructured.

P 12450: I suggest merging Table 2, 3, and 4 into one table.

Fig. 2, Fig.3 and Fig.7, add IIASA's data.

Fig. 8, Some references are not complete, (Klimont et al., Tian et al.). Re-draw this figure after including the missing studies mentioned above.
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