

Interactive comment on “Anthropogenic influence on biogenic secondary organic aerosol” by C. R. Hoyle et al.

J.-L. Jimenez

jose.jimenez@colorado.edu

Received and published: 15 October 2010

I realized that a sentence in my previous comment was not written correctly. The first full paragraph on page C8626 of my previous comment should read instead:

"In any case the non-fossil fraction of urban OA may be more far important than the authors seem to acknowledge, and needs to be estimated directly in any study attempting to use ^{14}C data in urban areas for source apportionment. E.g. if in an urban area 50% of the aerosol OC is non-fossil, many readers of this paper will assume that this 50% of OC is biogenic SOA (a different crowd will assume this 50% OC is from biomass burning) and the other 50% is urban OC. However if 25% of the POA and a similar fraction of the SOA is due to cooking and another 10% of the POA and SOA to other urban sources of non-fossil carbon (which is not unrealistic, given the previously cited

C8719

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



papers), a quick calculation shows that only 23% of the OC would be due to non-urban non-fossil sources, while 76% would be due to urban sources. Again, these effects need to be accounted for explicitly in methods such as the one proposed in this paper."

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 10, 19515, 2010.

ACPD

10, C8719–C8720, 2010

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C8720

