

# ***Interactive comment on “Can a regional-scale reduction of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> during the COVID-19 pandemic be detected from space? A case study for East China using satellite XCO<sub>2</sub> retrievals” by Michael Buchwitz et al.***

## **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 5 November 2020

**General comments** The authors prepared an analysis of available satellite CO<sub>2</sub> observations to quantify impact of CO<sub>2</sub> emission reduction in early 2020 on the amplitude of the regional XCO<sub>2</sub> anomaly observed over East China. The analysis is made without detailed transport modeling and thus has to rely on the magnitude of the regional mean CO<sub>2</sub> concentration enhancements. Positive outcome of the analysis is that the change in the regional CO<sub>2</sub> difference relative to the background was possible to detect, and the negative one was that the uncertainty appears to be of the same order as signal. Authors cite weak signal, large variability in observation/cloud coverage and

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



impact from biospheric fluxes on XCO<sub>2</sub> as complicating factors. The elaborate analysis is a valuable addition to a body of evidence on capability of global carbon observing system to detect the short and long-term changes in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and sinks. The paper is well written and can be published after applying minor revisions and technical corrections.

#### Detailed comments

Introduction. Authors can use opportunity to mention more recent publications on the topic, complimentary to this study (Chevallier et al. 2020; Tohjima et al. 2020; Zeng et al. 2020)

L205-210 Not clear if the CarbonTracker-derived scaling of XCO<sub>2</sub> to FF emissions helps correcting for year to year variability in wind speed, or it is a climatology. Need to clarify. It can be mentioned Zheng et al, 2020b used transport model for a similar purpose.

L336 The DAM method is not supposed to extract exclusively anthropogenic emission contributions to XCO<sub>2</sub>, it is better to revise the sentence accordingly.

L355-362 The discussion gives impression that the satellite observation/retrieval errors are most important, while the contribution of the short and long-range transport including both biogenic and fossil signals is not explicitly mentioned, while it is likely to contribute to differences between different time periods, especially across GOSAT products

L365 If errors do not scale with the inverse of the square root of number of observations, then those may be not random enough.

#### Technical corrections

L92 Suggest checking reference format: Sussmann and Rettinger, 2020, or (2020)

L770 Zheng et al. paper status changed to published.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

## References

Chevallier, F., Zheng, B., Broquet, G., Ciais, P., Liu, Z., Davis, S. J., et al. Local anomalies in the column-averaged dry air mole fractions of carbon dioxide across the globe during the first months of the coronavirus recession. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47, e2020GL090244, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL090244>, 2020.

Tohjima, Y., Patra, P.K., Niwa, Y. et al. Detection of fossil-fuel CO<sub>2</sub> plummets in China due to COVID-19 by observation at Hateruma. *Sci Rep* 10, 18688. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-75763-6>, 2020.

Zeng N., Han P., Liu D., Liu Z., Oda T., Martin C., Liu Z., Yao B., Sun W., Wang P., Cai Q., Dickerson R., Maksyutov S. Global to local impacts on atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> caused by COVID-19 lockdown. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.13025>, 2020

---

Interactive comment on *Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss.*, doi:10.5194/amt-2020-386, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

