

Interactive comment on “The control of anthropogenic emissions contributed to 80 PM_{2.5} concentrations in Beijing from 2013 to 2017” by Ziyue Chen et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 8 April 2019

It is really a hot topic for assessing the relative importance of meteorological parameters and emission reduction measures on the PM_{2.5} reduction from 2013. There is a similar manuscript on ACPD “Dominant role of emission reduction in PM_{2.5} air quality improvement in Beijing during 2013-2017: a model-based decomposition analysis”. When compared with this one, different conclusions were drawn for the contribution of meteorological conditions to PM_{2.5} reduction in Beijing in from 2013 to 2017. However, this manuscript is far from the publishing criterion of ACP. I suggested rejection of this paper as the following reasons: (1) There are so many typesetting mistakes that I can not listed all of them. The authors could find the attached manuscript that I have labeled. Some mistakes indicated that the authors are not serious for the

C1

scientific papers, such as the character subscript, the citation form of references. I am really confused why such kind of papers can be on the ACPD for open discussion. (2) The figures are made by Excel and in so poor quality, especially for Figure 2, 3 and 4. I really have a suspicion that are the authors know the quality of figures for scientific papers, not only say for ACP. (3) For the whole manuscript, it is just like a primary data analysis report, no discussion and no verification of the results. (4) I am quite disagree that at the last the authors wanted to assess the emission-reduction measures considering both PM_{2.5} and O₃. They should know even for the assessing PM_{2.5} reduction, there existed large uncertainty especially for emission inventory, for subsector sources and for chemical speciations. More scientific questions should be addressed for improving the simulation. It suggested that the authors may be not quite sure about the research shortages on the emission inventory and its adoption on air quality modeling. (5) At last, I strongly suggest the authors carefully read the similar paper on ACPD and find the wide gap between yours and that one. In the future, the manuscripts should be carefully prepared. When you want to submit it to a high quality journal, please write it in a form of paper, not a report. Please also give the research shortages in science, not just say what you do.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/acp-2018-1112/acp-2018-1112-RC2-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2018-1112>, 2019.

C2