

Editorial suggestions for “Impact of biomass burning on surface water quality in Southeast Asia through atmospheric deposition: field observations” by P. Sundaramal et al. (manuscript ACP-2010-153)

Editorial Comments

This manuscript should be carefully reviewed for grammatical correctness. Editorial changes to improve grammar and clarity that I suggest follow.

In line 3 on p. 7749, “millions” should be “million”.

In line 9 on p. 7749, insert “air pollution” before “sources”.

In line 11 on p. 7749, insert “the” before “southern”.

In line 12 on p. 7749, insert “on” before “regional”.

In line 3 on p. 7750, “the lowest readability” could be phrased “a sensitivity”.

In line 16 on p. 7751, “part” could be replaced by “portion”.

In line 15 on p. 7753, a hyphen could be substituted for the space in “quasi laminar”.

In line 24 on p. 7754, insert “the” before “wet”.

In line 25 on p. 7754, delete the first “rate”.

In line 7 on p. 7755, “high” is an ambiguous word choice. Perhaps you mean “substantial”. Also, suggest changing “at this time period” to “then”.

In line 8 on p. 7755, suggest adding “would occur, as evidenced” after “atmosphere”; delete “followed” and “would be observed”.

In line 16 on p. 7755, suggest changing the beginning of the sentence “The maximum TSP concentration observed in Singapore during the 2006 smoke haze event ($\sim 140 \text{ ug/m}^3$) was greater than that during the 1997-1998 haze events ($\sim 110 \text{ ug/m}^3$; Balasubramanian et al., 1999)”. The second half of this paragraph is unnecessarily detailed and is not clear or easy to read.

In line 11 on p. 7757, “5-days” should be “5-day”.

In line 13 on p. 7757, “continues” should be “continuous”.

In line 17 on p. 7757, “5-days” should be “5-day”.

In line 18 on p. 7757, “in” should be “at”.

In line 26 on p. 7757, drop “land origin”.

In line 27 on p. 7757, change “higher” to “high”. Also, suggest changing “others” to “another air mass travelled”. Insert “the” before “Indian” and delete “origin”.

In line 29 on p. 7757, insert “at SJI” after “concentration”.

In line 9 on p. 7758, change “mass” to “masses”.

In lines 20 & 22 on p. 7758, delete “in the order of”; a range is a definite number, not an estimate.

In line 24 on p. 7758, change “day” to “days”. Also on line 24, I suggest changing “shows” to “indicates” as ratios by themselves cannot show that smoke was a significant source of nutrients.

In line 25 on p. 7758, change “water in” to “waters of”.

In line 26 on p. 7758, I suggest changing “order of occurrences” to “ranking”.

In lines 7 & 8 on p. 7762, I suggest ending sentence as “non-hazy periods was quantified for a coastal water location in SEA.”

In line 11 on p. 7762, change “haze” to “hazy” in both locations and “increasing” to “enhanced”.

In line 12 on p. 7762, change “may” to “could”.

In line 13 on p. 7762, change the beginning of the sentence to “The ranking of the N and P specie concentration ratios comparing hazy to non-hay days was ...”.

In line 17 on p. 7762, change “shows” to “indicates”.

In line 20 on p. 7762, change “into” to “to”.

In lines 26 & 27 on p. 7762, I do not recall seeing where “Singapore’s coastal water quality degradation during haze episodes” was documented.

In line 12 on p. 7763, change “Established monitoring sites” to “Establishing monitoring sites”. What type of monitoring sites? It seems that both coastal and interior sites would be needed to address atmospheric deposition to the watershed and that the water chemistry of both coastal streams and seawater would be needed.

In line 17 on p. 7763, change “act as highly significant sources” to “acts as a highly significant source”.

In line 19 on p. 763, change “water” to “waters,”.

In line 27 on p. 7763, insert “a” before “eutrophication”.

In line 13 on p. 7766, change “?” to “fl”.