

Interactive comment on “Primary sources of PM_{2.5} organic aerosol in an industrial Mediterranean city, Marseille” by I. El Haddad et al.

s. gilardoni (Referee)

sgilardoni@gmail.com

Received and published: 23 December 2010

The paper presents a source apportionment study of fine aerosol mass in a European urban site heavily affected by industrial emissions. The source apportionment is performed with the Chemical Mass Balance (CMB) approach. The main primary sources include vehicle emissions and industrial emissions. Nevertheless, primary carbon represents less than 25% of the organic carbon, and the non-apportioned carbon fraction is assigned to secondary sources. This conclusion will be further illustrated in the companion paper.

General Comments

The referee appreciates the use of Principal Component Analysis to preliminary identify

C11546

the most relevant fine aerosol sources and to define the number of sources to use in the CMB model.

Moreover, the paper highlights uncertainties and limitations of the CMB method, pointing out the need of an extended discussion of the source apportionment results. Nevertheless, to improve the readability, I would suggest to divide the content of section “Results and discussion” into three sections: “CMB method set up”, “Results”, and “Discussion”.

It is sometimes difficult to understand if the scope of the paper is the apportionment of the fine aerosol mass or the carbonaceous aerosol mass. I would suggest to clarify why the authors focus on the carbonaceous fraction in the “Results and discussion” section.

The low sugar content would indicate that spores are not a significant contributor to primary biogenic aerosol particles (PBAP) in Marseille, although previous studies identified spore emissions as one of the main source of PBAP, even in urban areas (Jia et al. 2010, Bauer et al. 2008). How would you comment that vegetative detritus represent 2% of OC and other submicron PBAP are not observed?

The discrepancy between fossil carbon from ¹⁴C measurements and from CMB model in figure 7b looks larger when the concentration of PAH is higher (figure 4a). Is this correct? How would you explain this?

To calculate the fraction of non-fossil carbon from the fraction of modern carbon the authors used the reference value of 1.1 according to Levin and Hesshaimer, 2000. Measurements performed in 2006 (Levin et al. 2008) suggest that the correct reference value for this study would be 1.05. The use of an incorrect reference value would lead to an underestimation of the non-fossil carbon and an overestimation of the fossil carbon. This might explain partially the difference between ¹⁴C measurements and CMB results.

C11547

Moreover the reference value of 1.05 is correct for atmospheric CO₂ and biogenic particles (PBAP and secondary biogenic aerosol) but is inadequate to describe biomass burning particles (Lewis et al. 2004).

Minor Comments

Page 25442 line 17 replace ml with mL

Page 25443 line 8 replace ml with mL

Page 25452 line 2 replace a priori with a priori

Page 25458 line 10 remove parenthesis.

Inconsistent tense in the experimental section.

Captions: Figure 2 alpha-pinene

Figure 5 Ambient

References:

Bauer, H., Schueller, E., Weinke, G., Berger, A., Hitzenberger, R. and Marr, I., and Puxbaum, H.: Significant contributions of fungal spores to the organic carbon and to the aerosol mass balance of the urban atmospheric aerosol, *Atmospheric Environment*, 42, 5542–5549, 2008.

Jia, Y., Bhat, S., and Fraser, M. P.: Characterization of saccharides and other organic compounds in fine particles and the use of saccharides to track primary biologically derived carbon sources, *Atmospheric Environment*, 44, 724–732, 2010.

Levin, I. Hammer, S., Kromer, B., and Meinhardt, F.: Radiocarbon observations in atmospheric CO₂: determining fossil fuel CO₂ over Europe using Jungfrauoch observations as background, *Science of the Total Environment*, 391, 211–216, 2008.

Lewis, C. W., Klouda, G. A., and Ellenson, W. D.: Radiocarbon measurements of the biogenic contribution to summertime PM_{2.5} ambient aerosol in Nashville, TN, *Atmospheric Environment*, 38, 6053–6061, 2004.

spheric Environment, 38, 6053–6061, 2004.

Interactive comment on *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 10, 25435, 2010.