

## ***Interactive comment on “A synthesis of carbon dioxide emissions from fossil-fuel combustion” by R. J. Andres et al.***

### **I. Enting (Referee)**

ian.g.enting@gmail.com

Received and published: 20 February 2012

This is a valuable (indeed vital) contribution to the RECCAP exercise and I recommend publication. Section 1 introduces the issues very well.

I would endorse a number of the points made in Glen Peters' review (Biogeosciences Discuss 9, C120–C129), in particular

- ‘fossil fuel combustion’ as a shorthand for a wider class of sources – others have used the term ‘industrial’

Minor points.

C134

1. p 1307. Typeset +/- as  $\pm$
2. p 1307: citation of Enting and Rayner refers to the Enting/Ryaner/Ciais paper listed in the references (now published as discussion), but probably better to reference (Enting et al, 2012 and references therein)
3. p 1312. it is puzzling to have the variability described as a second derivative. Is ‘second moment’ what is really meant?
4. p 1321/Fig 5. It would seem that figure 5 would be much clearer if the vertical (Normalized FFCO<sub>2</sub> emissions) axis used a logarithmic scale.
5. p 1321 suggest ‘FFCO<sub>2</sub> emissions are held constant’ becomes ‘FFCO<sub>2</sub> emissions are commonly held constant’ (e.g. Enting et al, Tellus 47 B, 35–52 (1995) is an exception to the common practice).
6. p 1333. suggest: ‘that biospheric fluxes in Asia would shift ..’ becomes ‘that estimates biospheric fluxes in Asia would shift ..’ — it is the estimates that (might) shift, not the fluxes.
7. p 1354 inconsistent capitalisation of van Aardenne in Olivier et al references.
8. p 355 Keeling, not Keelinf as third author of Rafelski paper.
9. P1362: fig 2: missing comma between IEA and EIA.
10. thoughtout: inconsistency in accents for Le Quéré.