

## ***Interactive comment on “Receptor modeling of near-roadway aerosol mass spectrometer data in Las Vegas, Nevada, with EPA PMF” by S. G. Brown et al.***

**S. G. Brown et al.**

sbrown@sonomatech.com

Received and published: 2 December 2011

Referee #1 (posted by Alberto Escrig) As I stated in my quick report, in my opinion the manuscript is good. The suggestions of the reviewers/editor appear to have contributed to improving it further. However, there still remains one point that I wish to raise. The authors compare the resolved factors with known source profiles by means of correlation coefficients. The authors appear to have used the “default” centred Pearson coefficients ( $r_{\text{c}}^2$ ). Paatero showed the benefits of using the uncentred ones in this very same forum (Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions, 8, S2059–S2068, 2008). I do not recommend the use of either the centred or the uncentred

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

correlation coefficients. This is not because of the centring, but because of the scaling. Let us assume that only three species were measured. Let  $f = [0.5 \ 0.2 \ 0]'$  be one of the resolved factors. A known source profile might be  $[0.5 \ 0.2 \ 0.001]$ , for example. Then both the centred  $r_{E2}$  and the uncentred one are as high as 0.999998. These results would indicate that there is excellent agreement. Let us now imagine that the source profile is that of road dust: 50% SiO<sub>2</sub>, 20% Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, 0.1% Cu, say. The tracer species is seen to be missing in the factor: the resolved factor does not represent road dust at all! In receptor modelling of air pollutants, trace species are as important as the major species. Using unscaled correlation coefficients actually ignores this fact: it is like doing unscaled PCA. I am not saying that the manuscript has any mistaken interpretations; nor am I asking for any changes. I just wish to point out that the different scales of the species need to be considered when comparing source profiles via correlation coefficients.

\*\*\*\*\* response The reviewer is quite correct that using “default” centered Pearson correlation coefficients could give biased results, especially with data that vary over orders of magnitude. To alleviate our own concerns regarding blindly using correlation coefficients, we also examined the scatter plot of each correlation we reported, to ensure that such a scenario as the reviewer outlines did not occur. We have added text in the manuscript that details this effort, since it is indeed a critical step to understand the data underneath the regression statistics, and should be followed in these types of analyses. We appreciate the reviewer raising this issue, as erroneous conclusions can easily be reached when using typical regression analyses.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 11, 22909, 2011.

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