

Interactive comment on “Generation of hydrogen peroxide from San Joaquin Valley particles in a cell-free solution” by H. Shen et al.

H. Shen et al.

canastasio@ucdavis.edu

Received and published: 21 December 2010

Generation of hydrogen peroxide from San Joaquin Valley particles in a cell-free solution

H. Shen 1, A. I. Barakat 2, and C. Anastasio 1
1 Department of Land, Air and Water Resources, University of California, Davis, One Shields Avenue, Davis, CA 95616, USA
2 Department of Mechanical and Aeronautical Engineering, University of California, Davis, One Shields Avenue, Davis, CA 95616, USA

MS No.: acp-2010-544

Answers to Anonymous Referee #1

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Q: Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? Generally yes, but there are a few issues: Wang et al. 2010 cited in the paper should be included in the group professing that copper is a major contributor to ROS on pg. 21377 line 4. One could also argue that the text around line 19-23 would include more references to the ROS-Cu connection than just “Our findings” since others have also found this relationship. The fact that a handful of groups have reached the same conclusion from quite different angles strengthens the conclusion greatly.

A: We thank the reviewer for the comments. We’ve added a reference to the Wang et al. 2010 paper on pg. 21337 where we talk about copper as a major contributor to ROS. We also included some references to past in vitro and in vivo work showing a ROS-Cu connection to strengthen our conclusion (see Page 21338 lines 26-27).

Q: Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated? A few clarifications—no combinations or eliminations.

Pg. 21337: last sentence of paragraph 1: if the values are valid (i.e. above the detection limit) being “small” isn’t an explanation for a lack of a correlation when one is expected. I don’t know what the explanation might be, but it doesn’t seem reasonable to dismiss the lack of a correlation between copper and ROS formation for the Westside data set.

A: We agree with the reviewer that valid small values don’t explain a lack of correlation. We removed the second part of the sentence (“but this is probably because the rates of HOOH formation are very small”).

Q: 2nd paragraph pg. 21337 I think that a correlation in the field sample data between a transition metal and ROS formation is a necessary condition to support a link. Formation of ROS in a test tube from a solution of a purified metal salt adds power to the field observation, but absence of one does not negate it, as particles are very complex

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

and not necessarily accurately represented by simple solutions.

A: We believe that our quantitative approach is more useful than correlations in determining the importance of individual PM components for the cell-free production of ROS. However, we agree that the combination of the two approaches is even more powerful in examining the mechanisms for ROS production.

Q: Pg. 21340 line _15 point out that ascorbate isn't the only relevant reductant

A: "Asc is not the only reductant in human lung lining fluid" was added at the end of section 2.2.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 10, 21323, 2010.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper