

Interactive comment on “

Photoacoustic optical properties at UV, VIS, and near IR wavelengths for laboratory generated and winter time ambient urban aerosols” by M. Gyawali et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 30 October 2011

The authors present photoacoustic, integrating nephelometer and extinction measurements at UV, visible and near infrared wavelengths for laboratory and ambient aerosols. Salt, incense, and kerosene soot aerosols were used in the laboratory as surrogates for purely scattering and for absorbing aerosols with weak and strong spectral dependence. Ambient aerosol measurements were performed at an urban site during 4 weeks in winter. The absorption and scattering measurements were accompanied by

C11044

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



PM2.5 and PM10 mass analyses as well as by the measurement of different gaseous pollutants. In addition to these measurements the authors present results of t-matrix calculations for the spectral optical properties of aggregated black carbon particles. Although the presented UV photoacoustic method and the collected data might represent a contribution to the field, the scientific discussion in the context of related work is poor and the drawn conclusions are mostly speculative. I agree with Reviewer #1 that the paper lacks a relevant story and needs a major revision before it can be recommended for publication.

In the following I will give some suggestions how to improve the manuscript.

1. The lab study was meant to calibrate and validate the new 355 nm PA instrument. A presentation of the results of this laboratory study in terms of instrument precision, accuracy and detection threshold is important to value the ambient measurements. This also requires a detailed instrument description. So, I suggest to move the supplementary material (instrument description and calibration) to the main paper. Instrument accuracy and the detection threshold of the instrument should be given in this new section.
2. I totally agree with Reviewer #1 that the T-matrix section should be removed from the paper since it does not give any useful result for the interpretation of neither the laboratory data nor the ambient measurements.
3. The first sentence of the Abstract claims that first laboratory and field PA measurements are presented in the paper. This statement is obviously not true as it has already mentioned in the short comment by Tibor Ajtai. Ajtai et al. (2010) presented a novel photoacoustic instrument with two absorption measurements in the UV (at 266 nm and 355 nm). The instrument was calibrated and validated in a laboratory study with black carbon aerosol in a very similar fashion as it was done in the present work. Ajtai et al. (2011) then applied this instrument in a field study, and interestingly, also at an urban site under wintry conditions. The authors should relate their laboratory calibration work

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

and ambient measurement results to these papers.

4. The extend in length due to the addition of a more detailed instrument and calibration section can be saved by confining the ambient data representation to the most relevant results, i.e. the spectral optical data and their diurnal variations.

References

Ajtai, T. et al. (2010). A novel multi-wavelength photoacoustic spectrthe measurement of the UV–vis_NIR spectral absorption coefiñAcient of atmospheric aerosols. *Journal of Aerosol Science*, 41, 1020–1029.

Ajtai, T. et al. (2010). Inter-comparison of optical absorption coefiñAicients of atmospheric aerosols determined by a multi-wavelength photoacoustic spectrometer and an Aethalometer under sub-urban wintry conditions. *Journal of Aerosol Science*, 42, 859–866.

Interactive comment on *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 11, 25063, 2011.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper