

Anonymous Referee #2

The authors claim that “the GFR product, which was integrated with the MERSI-2 instrument, exhibited superior judgment accuracy” (Line 102–103), “Consequently, our inventory yielded accurate assessment results and captured the spatial variation and heterogeneity of minor OBB emissions effectively” (Line 358–359), and “the accuracy of the OBB carbon emissions assessment significantly improved” (Line 417–418). In my opinion, these claims are not sufficiently justified in the manuscript. First, the superiority of MERSI-2 over MODIS in detecting active fires is not well explained. MERSI-2 on FY-3D has higher spatial resolution than MODIS in the visible and NIR bands. However, the active fire algorithm mainly uses the mid-infrared band, where both MERSI-2 and MODIS have a spatial resolution of 1km. The authors cited a number of previous papers (such as Dong et al. 2022 and Chen et al., 2022) to show better fire detection accuracy from MERSI-2 than from MODIS. However, these studies were mostly based on comparisons with limited data samples from manual inspection, and are not very convincing to me. Second, there are many limitations in the algorithm that are not mentioned in the manuscript. For example, this study used AGB as the fuel load, completely ignoring the emissions from soil organic matter burning. The omission error of active fires due to cloud cover/thick smoke is also not quantified. Third, this emissions dataset was derived from FY-3D active fires, but many MODIS products are still needed to generate GEIOBB. The use of MODIS products, which include MOD44B, MODIS NDVI, and MODIS land cover type data, may hinder the effect of quantifying global fire emissions after Terra and Aqua are gone. This potential problem should also be addressed in this paper.

We thank the Reviewer for the constructive comments and suggestions. We shall revise the manuscript accordingly, and we address the comments as follows.

1. We added more details about FY-3D to support FY-3D can capture small fires more effectively. Please refer to line 109 and Table 1.
2. Soil organic matter is also a contributor to the total OBB. However, a very small proportion of emissions can be found in most forest and grassland except in peatland burning in Indonesia. After calculation, we found the carbon emissions in Indonesia was very low since the drought and human induced fires detected were very low during 2020–2022.

Additionally, we analyzed the omission error of active fires due to cloud cover/thick smoke.

“The detected active fires were also underestimated due to cloud cover/thick smoke, with an omission error of approximately from 10%–30% (Schroeder et al., 2008; Roberts et al., 2009; Giglio et al., 2006).”

3. In this study, MODIS provide globally commonly used available products including the tree cover, land cover, NDVI to generate OBB emissions worldwide. Other available high-resolution and multi-year products will be used in our study to produce more reliable emission inventory.

Many statements are incorrect or lacking scientific support.

The estimation method and the use of fuel loading (F) are not clearly described. While the authors mention in the manuscript that three data sources, NDVI, TC, and AGB are used for fuel loading, the approach for combining different data streams and forming the fuel loading is embedded in the supporting text only. This formula was

presented without any scientific justification or explanation (there are also some errors in the description of this formula, e.g., 2020 should be corrected to 2010).

We revised according to the reviewer’s comment. We added a description of fuel compliance with fuel loading in the main text and added references related to the formula. We corrected the misdescription in the formula. Please refer to line 145.

“AGB shows a large linear correlation with TC and NDVI (Xingcheng et al., 2017), so we combined the global aboveground and belowground biomass carbon density maps for the 2010 product (https://daac.ornl.gov/cgi-bin/dsvviewer.pl?ds_id=1763) provided by Spawn and Gibbs(2020), annual TC, and NDVI data, and obtained by linear stretching the fuel loading for other years.

$$F(x, t) = \left(\frac{NDVI_{now}}{NDVI_{2010}} + \frac{TC_{now}}{TC_{2010}} \right) * AGB \quad (2)$$

Where NDVI_{now} is the mean value of the month before a single fire event, NDVI₂₀₁₀ is the mean value of NDVI in 2020, TC_{now} is the tree cover in the year of the fire incident, TC₂₀₁₀ is the tree cover in 2020, and AGB is the Above Ground Biomass data in 2010.”

The use of emission factors (EF) is also ambiguously described in the manuscript. In section 2.4, the authors simply listed a table of EFs without indicating the specific data sources. Although references to various studies and some locally measured data are cited, the specific methodology employed to construct Table 1 remains undisclosed.

We add data sources for EF in Table 1. Please refer to Table 2.

Table 2. Emission factor (g/kg) of different species.

Species	Grasslands and Savannas	Woody Savanna or Shrubs	Tropical Forest	Temperate Forest	Boreal Forest	Temperate Evergreen Forest	Crop			
							Maize	Sugar	Sugar	Wheat
C	488.31	489.41	491.77	468.31	478.88	493.18	687.09	323.35	368.04	429.17
CO ₂	1,686 ^a	1,681 ^a	1,643 ^a	1,510 ^a	1,565 ^b	1,623 ^a	2,327 ^c	1,130 ^c	1,177 ^c	1,470 ^e
CO	63.00 ^a	67.00 ^a	93.00 ^a	122.00 ^a	111.00 ^b	112.00 ^a	114.70 ^c	34.70 ^c	93.00 ^e	60.00 ^e
CH ₄	2.00 ^a	3.00 ^a	5.10 ^a	5.61 ^a	6.00 ^b	3.40 ^a	4.40 ^c	0.40 ^c	9.59 ^e	3.40 ^e
NO _x	3.90 ^a	3.65 ^a	2.60 ^a	1.04 ^a	0.95 ^b	1.96 ^a	4.30 ^c	2.60 ^c	2.28 ^c	3.30 ^e
SO ₂	0.90 ^a	0.68 ^a	0.40 ^a	1.10 ^a	1.00 ^b	1.10 ^a	0.44 ^c	0.22 ^c	0.18 ^c	0.85 ^e
OC	2.60 ^a	3.70 ^a	4.70 ^a	7.60 ^a	7.80 ^b	7.60 ^a	2.25 ^c	3.30 ^c	2.99 ^c	3.90 ^d
BC	0.37 ^a	1.31 ^a	0.52 ^a	0.56 ^a	0.20 ^b	0.56 ^a	0.78 ^d	0.82 ^d	0.52 ^d	0.52 ^d
NH ₃	0.56 ^a	1.20 ^a	1.30 ^a	2.47 ^a	1.80 ^b	1.17 ^a	0.68 ^c	1.00 ^c	4.10 ^c	0.37 ^e
NO ₂	3.22 ^a	2.58 ^a	3.60 ^a	2.34 ^a	0.63 ^b	2.34 ^a		2.99 ^f		
PM _{2.5}	7.17 ^a	7.10 ^a	9.90 ^a	15.00 ^a	18.40 ^b	17.90 ^a		6.43 ^f		

PM ₁₀	7.20 ^a	11.4 ^a	18.50 ^a	16.97 ^a	18.40 ^b	18.40 ^a	7.02 ^f
------------------	-------------------	-------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	-------------------

All the value of C were Calculated by CO₂, CO, and CH₄.

^a is average value from (Akagi et al., 2011).

^b is average from (Akagi et al., 2011) and (Urbanski, 2014).

^c is average from (Akagi et al., 2011; Fang et al., 2017; Liu et al., 2016; Santiago-De La Rosa et al., 2018; Stockwell et al., 2015).

^d is from (Kanabkaew and Kim Oanh, 2011).

^e is from (Cao et al., 2008).

^f is from (Li et al., 2007).

Line 27–29: “Moreover, notable seasonal variability characterizes the OBB carbon emissions, with marked increases observed in July and August. This surge in carbon emissions is chiefly attributed to fires in the savanna grasslands, woody savanna/shrubs, and tropical forests of SHAF, SHSA, and NHAF.” The peak burning month for NHAF is in boreal winter months. How can the burning in this region contribute to the surge in carbon emissions in July and August?

We changed the content.

“Moreover, notable seasonal variability characterizes the OBB carbon emissions, with marked increases observed in August and September, and lower emissions in winter. These carbon emissions are chiefly attributed to fires in the savanna grasslands, woody savanna/shrubs, and tropical forests of SHAF, SHSA, and NHAF.”

Line 166: “EF denotes the amount of pollutants released during burning.” This seems not the correct definition or description of the emission factor (EF).

We changed the descriptions of EF.

“EF denotes the amount of pollutants released per unit of fuel burned during burning.”

Line 181–182: “significant spatial variations in the OBB carbon emissions were observed across Africa, and certain regions in the Americas and Asia.”. How do you define ‘significant’? Based on Figure 1, I think the spatial variations in all continents are big.

We changed the content.

“...obvious spatial variations in the OBB carbon emissions were observed across Africa, and certain regions in the Americas and Asia.”

Line 215: “According to GFED”. Which version of GFED data are you using? Please be more specific.

We revised according to the reviewer’s comment. We changed “GFED” to “GFED4.1s”.

Line 230: “This suggests relative homogeneity in the NHAF’s biomass–burning emission sources”. I don’t understand

how did you get this conclusion based on the previous results “In the NHAF, the predominant source of OBB was savanna grasslands (Roberts et al., 2009), contributing 76.14% to the region’s total biomass–burning carbon emissions, averaging 300.21 Tg/year.”

We deleted this ambiguous expression to make it clearer to understand.

Line 233: “...leading to increased OBB and carbon emissions in this region”. In fact in this region (NHAF), the emissions from biomass burning have been decreasing during the past 2 decades.

We deleted this ambiguous expression to make it clearer to understand.

“...are the major factors in this region.”

Line 257–258: “emissions from SHSA decreased at a rate of 105.22 Tg per year from 2020 to 2022, with peak monthly emissions over the 3 years reaching 184.63, 222.12, and 123.98, respectively, consistent with Griffin et al. (2023)”.

Griffin et al. (2023) explored the wildfire CO emissions. But it’s unclear to me which part of your results is “consistent with” with that paper.

We changed the content to make it clearer to understand.

“...emissions from SHSA decreased at a rate of 105.22 Tg per year from 2020 to 2022, with peak monthly emissions over the 3 years reaching 184.63, 222.12, and 123.98, respectively, size and status of emissions consistent with Griffin et al. (Griffin et al., 2023)”

Line 259: “NHAF also exhibited a decreasing trend in annual emissions, ... over the 3 years”. 3 years are too short for deriving meaningful trends in annual emissions.

We changed “NHAF also exhibited a decreasing trend in annual emissions, ... over the 3 years” to “annual C emissions in NHAF also declined, ...over the 3 years”.

Line 316–317: “The top three major emitting regions were SHAF, SHSA, and NHAF, which exhibited emission patterns that aligned closely with global emission trends over time”. The comparison between Figure 5 and Figure 6 does not seem to support this conclusion. NHAF emissions have a very different seasonal cycle than SHAF and SHSA. The interannual variability of emissions in these regions is also different.

We changed “The top three major emitting regions were SHAF, SHSA, and NHAF, which exhibited emission patterns that aligned closely with global emission trends over time” to “The top three major emitting regions were SHAF, SHSA, and NHAF, which were closely associated with global emission trends, representing the main source of the emission peak in August and the emission during the winter months.”

Line 379: “However, the use of FY–3D, which captures data at 14:00, was highly effective in capturing such events.” This is also a statement without supporting evidence. Similar to Terra and Aqua, FY–3D also records data twice a day for a given location and cannot detect short–lived fires. The local time difference between FY–3D and Aqua is only 30 minutes (13:30 vs 14:00), which won’t make much difference in the ability to detect agricultural fires.

We changed the description of FY-3D product.

“Compared to MODIS, FY-3D fire products have been optimized in terms of auxiliary parameters, fire identification and re-identification. Firstly, FY-3D introduces the adaptive threshold and eliminates the limitations by fixed thresholds of MODIS and VIIRS algorithms by automatic identification algorithms for fire spot detection (Chen et al., 2022). Secondly, FY-3D uses a re-identification index reflecting varying geographical latitude and underlying surfaces types, together with the effect by cloud, water, and bare land (Zheng et al., 2020). The integration of multiple influencing factors increases the accuracy of fire detection. For example, the influences of factory thermal anomalies and high reflectance of photovoltaic power plants are greatly removed. Finally, the far-infrared channel employed in FY-3D has a high resolution of 250 m, higher than MODIS with 1 km, resulting in higher accuracy in big fire detection (Zheng and Chen, 2020). Overall, the FY-3D GFR product achieves an accuracy of 94.0% globally, with accuracies of 94.6%, 94.1%, 90.6%, 91.8%, and 92.7% in South-central Africa, East central South America, Siberia, Australia and Indochinese Peninsula (Chen et al., 2022), respectively. Specifically, due to the removal of underlying surface interference in China, the FY-3D achieves accuracies of 79.43% and 88.50% for accuracy and accuracy without omission, respectively, both of which are higher than the accuracies of 74.23% and 79.69% achieved by MODIS (Chen et al., 2022).”

And, we Compared the parameters related to MERSI-II, MODIS, and VIIRS in Table 1.

Table 1. Comparison of parameters related to MERSI-II, MODIS, and VIIRS.

	MERSI-II (FY-3D)	MODIS (AQUA)	VIIRS ((NOAA-20))
Orbit altitude (km)	836	705	824
Equator Crossing time	14:00 LT	13:30 LT	14:20 LT
Swath (km)	2900	2330	3060
Pixel resolution at nadir (km)	1	1	0.75/0.375
Pixel resolution at the edge (km)	>6	4	1.5/0.75
ID MIR Band (s)	21	21/22	M-13/I-4
Spectral range (μm)	3.973-4.128	3.929-3.989 3.940-4.001	3.973-4.128 3.550-3.930
TMAX (SNR-NE Δ T on orbit)	380 K (0.25)	500 K (0.183) 331 K (0.019)	634 K (0.04)
ID TIR Band (s)	24	31	M-15/I-5
Spectral range (μm)	10.300-11.300	10.780-11.280	10.263-11.263 10.500-12.400
TMAX (SNR-NE Δ T on orbit)	330 K (0.4)	400 K (0.017)	343 K (0.03)

There are many citations in this manuscript that do not support the text before the citation. It seems that the authors didn't really read and try to understand these references, but just made the citation based on some related keywords. Below is a partial list of inappropriate citations I have found. Please carefully double check the citations throughout the manuscript.

Line 39: (Hussain and Reza, 2023) is not a good citation here; it studied the detrimental impact on global health by general environmental damages, not specifically from open biomass burning. There are many studies in literature about this topic which can be used for citation here.

Response:

We changed the references.

“and have profound impacts on the global carbon cycle, climate change, and air quality, thus exerting a significant influence on the global environment and human health (Wu et al., 2022).”

Line 40–41: (Estrellan and Iino, 2010) reviewed toxic emissions from open burning. It did not provide evidence for “major fire types worldwide”. So it is also not a good citation.

Response:

We changed the references.

“Forest clearing, accidental fires, firewood burning, agricultural residue burning, peatland burning and straw burning are among the major fire types worldwide (van der Werf et al., 2017, p.1997–2016).”

Line 42: (Manisalidis et al., 2020) is a review of environmental and health impacts of air pollution. It did not talk about the specific impacts from “open burning activities”.

Response:

We changed the references.

“These open burning activities severely impact air quality and ecosystems and exacerbate climate change and air pollution issues (Anon, 2017).”

Line 44: (Ma et al., 2022) studied wildfires in Amazon during 2019 only. The paper does not support the claim “regions worldwide are experiencing a notable increase in fire incidents”.

Response:

We changed the references.

“...the Amazon rainforest fires (Pivello, 2011) ...”

Line 45: (You and Xu, 2023) investigated how delayed wildfires in 2020 promote snowpack melting in the western US. Same as above, this paper does not support the ‘increase in fire accidents’.

We changed the references.

“...wildfires in the United States (Burke et al., 2021) ...”

Line 56: (Lv et al., 2020) studies CO₂ mixing ratio using satellite observations. They used the GFED dataset for CO₂ emissions from biomass burning. This study does not support the previous sentence “Alternatively, a method based on the fire radiative power can effectively enhance the assessment of small fire events, thereby addressing this issue to a certain extent.”

We deleted it.

“... For example, similar approaches have been employed in Fire Emissions and Energy Research (FEER) and the Global Fire Assimilation System (GFAS)”

Line 128: (Spawn and Gibbs, sssss2020). Remove the sssss here.

We Remove the sssss here.

Line 255: (Russell-Smith et al., 2021) focus on opportunities and challenges for savanna burning emissions abatement. It did not provide sufficient evidence to support the conclusion “In August, specific meteorological conditions, such as high temperatures and low humidity facilitated the increased combustibility of biomass, resulting in a peak in carbon emissions”.

We changed the references to support.

“In August, specific meteorological conditions, such as high temperatures and low humidity facilitated the increased combustibility of biomass, resulting in a peak in carbon emissions (Shea et al., 1996).”

Line 297: (Wiggins et al., 2020) presented estimates of fire emissions in the USA using data from the FIREX–AQ mission. It has little connection to the text preceding the citation.

We changed the references to support.

“typically experience high levels of OBB emissions because of the prevalence of both natural and anthropogenic fire activities (Williams et al., 2019; Zheng et al., 2021).”

Line 308: (Thackeray et al., 2022) did study the precipitation change under global warming, but the main topic of this paper was precipitation extremes. It does not support the statement in this manuscript “an overall augmentation in annual precipitation played a key role”.

We changed it.

“... however, an overall augmentation in annual precipitation led to a reduction in the degree of drought (Thackeray et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2023a).”

There are also many cases where the presentation is poorly structured, vague, or inconsistent.

Line 23–26: The presentations of region names within the parentheses are inconsistent; the full name is shown for some regions, but not shown for other regions.

We added full name for other regions.

“72.71 (Boreal North America; BONA), 165.7 (Temperate North America, TENA), 34.1 (Central America; CEAM), 42.9 (Northern Hemisphere South America; NHSA), 520.5 (Southern Hemisphere South America; SHSA), 13 (Europe; EURO), 8.4 (Middle East; MIDE), 394.3 (Northern Hemisphere Africa; NHAf), 847 (Southern Hemisphere Africa; SHAF), 167.4 (Boreal Asia; BOAS), 27.9 (Central Asia; CEAS), 197.3 (Southeast Asia; SEAS), 13.2 (Equatorial Asia; EQAS), and 82.4 (Australia and New Zealand; AUST) Tg”.

Line 27–28: “...notable seasonal variability characterizes the OBB carbon emissions, with marked increases observed in July and August.” Although I understand the meaning of this sentence, it is not well organized. For example, what is the object of comparison when you say ‘marked increase’?

We changed “...notable seasonal variability characterizes the OBB carbon emissions, with marked increases observed in July and August.” to “... notable seasonal variability characterizes the OBB carbon emissions, with marked increases observed in August and September (annual average 441.32 Tg C) compared to other months (annual average 170.42 Tg C).”

Line 41–42: “These open burning activities severely impact air quality and ecosystems and exacerbate climate change and air pollution issues.” In this sentence “severely impact air quality” and “exacerbate...air pollution” are basically referring to the same thing.

We changed it.

“These open burning activities severely impact air quality and ecosystems ...”

Line 46–47: “These fires release substantial amounts of harmful particulate matter and organic pollutants, posing serious threats to air quality and potentially causing health problems”. I don’t understand why this sentence is here. Does it represent the same meaning as the first sentence in this paragraph?

We deleted this ambiguous expression to make it clearer to understand.

Line 51: “The burned area method...”. I believe most readers don’t know what the ‘burned area method’ is. A short definition or introduction to this method needs to be presented here.

We added a short introduction to this method.

“The burned area method demonstrated good accuracy in quantifying larger fire events, which is based on the burned area, the available biomass fuels burned in fields, the fuel-related combustion efficiency, and emission factors.”

Line 52–53: “Shi et al. (2020) estimated OBB emissions in tropical continents from 2001 to 2017 using widely used inventory data, such as the Global Fire Emissions Database (GFED) and the Fire INventory from NCAR (FINN)”. I don’t think Shi et al. (2020) estimated OBB emissions using GFED and FINN, since GFED and FINN are themselves global emissions datasets.

We changed this ambiguous expression to make it clearer to understand.

“Shi et al. (2020) estimated OBB emissions in tropical continents from 2001 to 2017. As well as other open-access

databases, such as the Global Fire Emissions Database (GFED) and the Fire INventory from NCAR (FINN)”

Line 103: “... exhibited superior judgment accuracy”. What is ‘judgment accuracy’ referring to?

We changed the description of FY-3D product. Please refer to Line 109.

Line 117–118: “In contrast, satellite data cover the entire globe and provide surface parameters, thereby enabling biomass estimation.” This is a potentially confusing sentence; Ground observations can also “provide surface parameters and enables biomass estimation”.

We changed it.

“In contrast, satellite data cover the entire globe and provide surface parameters worldwide, thereby enabling biomass estimation.”

Line 126–128: “Global AGB for other years was generated based on the global aboveground and belowground biomass carbon density maps for the 2010 product”. While I now understand the method by reading the SI, the sentence is not very clear in its current form. It’s better to day that in 2010 the Spawn and Gibbs product was used and then say that in other years the AGB was estimated using a scalar based on TC and NDVI. BTW, AGB stands for “above ground biomass”; how did you derive the ‘below ground’ biomass?

We changed it.

“we combined the “global aboveground and belowground biomass carbon density maps for the 2010” product provided by Spawn and Gibbs(2020), annual TC, and NDVI data, and obtained by linear stretching the fuel loading for other years”

The below ground biomass is also provided by “global aboveground and belowground biomass carbon density maps for the 2010” product.

Line 136: “the subsurface condition” should mean the below ground condition, but I suspect that you are referring to ‘surface condition’ here.

We changed “the subsurface condition” to “surface condition”.

Line 171–172: “the EF for the following seven land types were updated”. It’s not clear to me what original EF data were used and what data were used to replace (update) them.

We have changed the previous expression.

“...the EF for the following seven land types of other database were updated:”

We also added the reference of the EF data in Table 2.

Line 178–181: Please combine/simplify these three sentences.

We combined these sentences.

“Taking carbon as an example, the annual carbon emissions from OBB were estimated for the period of 2020–2022

(Figure 1) and the total OBB carbon emissions reached 7760.63 Tg C.”

Line 261: “Cumulatively, these territories represent...”. What are “these territories”. Based on the previous paragraph, they should probably include SHAF and NHAF. But these should be explicitly stated.

We changed “these territories” to “SHAF, SHSA, and NHAF ...”.

Line 317: “Over the past 3 years”. The ‘past 3 years’ can change depending on the reference year. This kind of description should be more specific.

We changed “Over the past 3 years” to “During 2020 to 2022”.

Line 427: What are “substrate types”?

We changed incorrect description.

“To address the varying fire conditions, we performed a detailed subdivision based on different fire types.”

There are other minor issues, including potential errors or typos

Line 60: “MEIRSI-2” should be “MERSI-2”

We corrected it.

Figure 2: If these geographical regions are the same to that in GFED, you probably need to acknowledge/cite the GFED group/paper.

We've added citation information.

Line 269: “intensify both the frequency and frequency of fires in the area”. One ‘frequency’ should be removed or changed to other words.

We removed it.

Line 280: “in the Tropical Eastern North America (TENA) region”. As shown in Figure 2, TENA should be ‘Temperate North America’.

We changed “in the Tropical Eastern North America (TENA) region” to “in the Temperate North America (TENA) region”.

*Line 435–436: “Although the FY-3D GFR dataset is reliable for most OBB events, its resolution of 1 degree...”
Shouldn't the resolution of FY-3D GFR dataset 1 km?*

We changed “1 degree” to “1 km”.

References

Akagi, S. K., Yokelson, R. J., Wiedinmyer, C., Alvarado, M. J., Reid, J. S., Karl, T., Crouse, J. D., and Wennberg, P. O.: Emission factors for open and domestic biomass burning for use in atmospheric models, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 11, 4039–4072, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-4039-2011>, 2011.

Anon: A review of biomass burning: Emissions and impacts on air quality, health and climate in China, *Science of The Total Environment*, 579, 1000–1034, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.11.025>, 2017.

Burke, M., Driscoll, A., Heft-Neal, S., Xue, J., Burney, J., and Wara, M.: The changing risk and burden of wildfire in the United States, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118, e2011048118, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2011048118>, 2021.

Cao, G., Zhang, X., Wang, Y., and Zheng, F.: Estimation of emissions from field burning of crop straw in China, *Chin. Sci. Bull.*, 53, 784–790, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11434-008-0145-4>, 2008.

Chen, J., Yao, Q., Chen, Z., Li, M., Hao, Z., Liu, C., Zheng, W., Xu, M., Chen, X., Yang, J., Lv, Q., and Gao, B.: The Fengyun-3D (FY-3D) global active fire product: principle, methodology and validation, *Earth System Science Data*, 14, 3489–3508, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-14-3489-2022>, 2022.

Fang, Z., Deng, W., Zhang, Y., Ding, X., Tang, M., Liu, T., Hu, Q., Zhu, M., Wang, Z., Yang, W., Huang, Z., Song, W., Bi, X., Chen, J., Sun, Y., George, C., and Wang, X.: Open burning of rice, corn and wheat straws: primary emissions, photochemical aging, and secondary organic aerosol formation, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 17, 14821–14839, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-14821-2017>, 2017.

Giglio, L., Csizsar, I., and Justice, C. O.: Global distribution and seasonality of active fires as observed with the Terra and Aqua Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) sensors, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, 111, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JG000142>, 2006.

Griffin, D., Chen, J., Anderson, K., Makar, P., McLinden, C. A., Dammers, E., and Fogal, A.: Towards an improved understanding of wildfire CO emissions: a satellite remote-sensing perspective, *EGUsphere*, 1–37, <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2023-649>, 2023.

Kanabkaew, T. and Kim Oanh, N. T.: Development of Spatial and Temporal Emission Inventory for Crop Residue Field Burning, *Environ Model Assess*, 16, 453–464, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10666-010-9244-0>, 2011.

Li, X., Wang, S., Duan, L., Hao, J., Li, C., Chen, Y., and Yang, L.: Particulate and Trace Gas Emissions from Open Burning of Wheat Straw and Corn Stover in China, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 41, 6052–6058, <https://doi.org/10.1021/es0705137>, 2007.

Liu, X., Zhang, Y., Huey, L. G., Yokelson, R. J., Wang, Y., Jimenez, J. L., Campuzano-Jost, P., Beyersdorf, A. J., Blake, D. R., Choi, Y., St. Clair, J. M., Crouse, J. D., Day, D. A., Diskin, G. S., Fried, A., Hall, S. R., Hanisco, T. F., King, L. E., Meinardi, S., Mikoviny, T., Palm, B. B., Peischl, J., Perring, A. E., Pollack, I. B., Ryerson, T. B., Sachse, G., Schwarz, J. P., Simpson, I. J., Tanner, D. J., Thornhill, K. L., Ullmann, K., Weber, R. J., Wennberg, P. O., Wisthaler, A., Wolfe, G. M., and Ziemba, L. D.: Agricultural fires in the southeastern U.S. during SEAC4RS: Emissions of trace gases and particles and evolution of ozone, reactive nitrogen, and organic aerosol, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 121, 7383–7414, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JD025040>, 2016.

Pivello, V. R.: The Use of Fire in the Cerrado and Amazonian Rainforests of Brazil: Past and Present, *fire ecol*, 7, 24–39, <https://doi.org/10.4996/fireecology.0701024>, 2011.

Roberts, G., Wooster, M. J., and Lagoudakis, E.: Annual and diurnal african biomass burning temporal dynamics, *Biogeosciences*, 6, 849–866, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-6-849-2009>, 2009.

Santiago-De La Rosa, N., González-Cardoso, G., Figueroa-Lara, J. de J., Gutiérrez-Arzaluz, M., Octaviano-Villasana, C., Ramírez-Hernández, I. F., and Mugica-Álvarez, V.: Emission factors of atmospheric and climatic pollutants from crop residues burning, *Journal of the Air & Waste Management Association*, 68, 849–865, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10962247.2018.1459326>, 2018.

Schroeder, W., Csiszar, I., and Morisette, J.: Quantifying the impact of cloud obscuration on remote sensing of active fires in the Brazilian Amazon, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 112, 456–470, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2007.05.004>, 2008.

Shea, R. W., Shea, B. W., Kauffman, J. B., Ward, D. E., Haskins, C. I., and Scholes, M. C.: Fuel biomass and combustion factors associated with fires in savanna ecosystems of South Africa and Zambia, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 101, 23551–23568, <https://doi.org/10.1029/95JD02047>, 1996.

Shi, Y., Zang, S., Matsunaga, T., and Yamaguchi, Y.: A multi-year and high-resolution inventory of biomass burning emissions in tropical continents from 2001–2017 based on satellite observations, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 270, 122511, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.122511>, 2020.

Spawn, S. A. and Gibbs, H. K.: Vegetation Collection Global Aboveground and Belowground Biomass Carbon Density Maps for the Year 2010, 9810.740697000001 MB, <https://doi.org/10.3334/ORNLDAAC/1763>, 2020.

Stockwell, C. E., Veres, P. R., Williams, J., and Yokelson, R. J.: Characterization of biomass burning emissions from cooking fires, peat, crop residue, and other fuels with high-resolution proton-transfer-reaction time-of-flight mass spectrometry, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 15, 845–865, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-15-845-2015>, 2015.

Urbanski, S.: Wildland fire emissions, carbon, and climate: Emission factors, *Forest Ecology and Management*, 317: 51–60., 51–60, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2013.05.045>, 2014.

van der Werf, G. R., Randerson, J. T., Giglio, L., van Leeuwen, T. T., Chen, Y., Rogers, B. M., Mu, M., van Marle, M. J. E., Morton, D. C., Collatz, G. J., Yokelson, R. J., and Kasibhatla, P. S.: Global fire emissions estimates during 1997–2016, *Earth System Science Data*, 9, 697–720, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-9-697-2017>, 2017.

Williams, A. P., Abatzoglou, J. T., Gershunov, A., Guzman-Morales, J., Bishop, D. A., Balch, J. K., and Lettenmaier, D. P.: Observed Impacts of Anthropogenic Climate Change on Wildfire in California, *Earth's Future*, 7, 892–910, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019EF001210>, 2019.

Wu, M., Luo, J., Huang, T., Lian, L., Chen, T., Song, S., Wang, Z., Ma, S., Xie, C., Zhao, Y., Mao, X., Gao, H., and Ma, J.: Effects of African BaP emission from wildfire biomass burning on regional and global environment and human health, *Environment International*, 162, 107162, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2022.107162>, 2022.

Xingcheng Y. a. O., Tiantian Q. U., Wenjing C., Jun Y. I. N., Yongjin L. I., Zhenzhong S. U. N., and Hui Z.: Estimation of grassland biomass using MODIS data and plant community characteristics, *zgstnyxb*, 25, 530–541, <https://doi.org/10.13930/j.cnki.cjea.160931>, 2017.

Zheng, B., Ciais, P., Chevallier, F., Chuvieco, E., Chen, Y., and Yang, H.: Increasing forest fire emissions despite the decline in global burned area, *Science Advances*, 7, eabh2646, <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abh2646>, 2021.

Zheng, W. and Chen, J.: Fire monitoring based on FY-3D/MERSI-II far-infrared data, *红外与毫米波学报*, 39, 120–127, <https://doi.org/10.11972/j.issn.1001-9014.2020.01.016>, 2020.

Zheng, W., Chen, J., Yan, H., Liu, C., Tang, S., and 国家卫星气象中心, 北京 100081 National Satellite Meteorological Center, Beijing 100081, China: Global fire monitoring products of FY-3D/MERSI-II and their applications, *National Remote Sensing Bulletin*, 24, 521–530, <https://doi.org/10.11834/jrs.20209177>, 2020.