

Interactive comment on “Comparison of aerosol properties from the Indian Himalayas and the Indo-Gangetic plains” by T. Raatikainen et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 1 June 2011

The authors describe meteorological as well as aerosol data from two Indian measurement sites: one semi-urban and one more remote site at higher altitude. The similarities and differences in the data sets are discussed both in a long term and a short term perspective.

The paper presents a lot of different data parameters. It is generally very well written, and the scientific content is relevant for ACP. However, a significant part of the main conclusions as well as the data presented has been published before, in papers referred to in this work. Of course, it is almost inevitable to in one way or another relate to old data and old conclusions, but in my opinion, this paper has way too much direct overlap with previous studies.

I cannot recommend publication of this paper. There are simply too much old conclusions in relation to what is new. I would suggest the authors to write a significantly shorter version (a few pages), focusing more on the boundary layer evolution, which connects the two sites, as can be nicely seen in figure 8. Although this is an interesting finding, it is a too small part of this paper.

Specific comments.

P 11420 row 11: “found from” should be “found in”

P 11420 row 21 “two years long” should be “two year long”

P 11421 row 15: “only a brief” should be “only brief”

P 11422 row 10. Should be “from a PM_{2.5} inlet”

P 11422 row 24: “Minimum data coverage was not required..” What do you mean by “enough data points”? Please be specific.

P 11426 row 4: Why do you set the density to 1 gcm⁻³, is this based on something or just a guess?

P 11426 row 12: “wind speeds are slightly lower during winter”. Is this really statistically significant?

Page 11428 row 16. Delete “even”

P 11429: Define q-value when it is first introduced.

Page 11430 delete the sentence “Averaging, however, helps a lot”.

Page 11431 row 15: “these size ranges are detected independently by the Gual Pahari DMPS units. This means that the data coverage for the size fractions is actually slightly higher than the original 16%”. I do not understand this at all. Please explain what you mean.

P 11432 row 11: “The both” should be “Both”

P 11432 row 12: “measures absorption” should be “measures the absorption”.

Supplement page 1 row 5: “it is already” Delete “already”.

Supplement page 1 row 16: “coefficients over” should be “coefficients above”.

Supplement 4.3 Excluding all points where PM10 was lower than BC seems dangerous, when you have a very noisy signal. This should not be a problem when averaging, I think.

Figures:

Figure S4. Legend is hardly visible. Please move it.

Figure S7. Legend is hardly visible. Please move it.

Figure S14. I suggest excluding some of the top values, to better use the plot area. Now it is very hard to read, since so many values are close to the x-axis.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 11, 11417, 2011.