

Interactive comment on “Carbonaceous aerosol AAE inferred from in-situ aerosol measurements at the Gosan ABC super site, and the implications for brown carbon aerosol” by C. E. Chung et al.

C. E. Chung et al.

eddy@gist.ac.kr

Received and published: 28 March 2012

We (paper authors) thank this reviewer for many constructive suggestions. Before we start to work on the manuscript revision, we would like to ask some questions on the paper writing issues raised by the reviewer.

“In my opinion, the text of the manuscript needs to be copy edited by a native English speaker to conform to acceptable standards of scientific publications. For example, lines 5-12 on page 4510 are completely extraneous.”

==> Why did the reviewer feel that the lines 5-12 are extraneous (irrelevant) here? Coating can amplify BC absorption. In other words, coating amplifies BC MAC. In the C1025

ambient atmosphere, some BC particles are not coated at all, some are coated by thin shells and some are coated by thick shells. This variation (i.e., not coating, thin coating and thick coating) should contribute further to the wide range of ambient BC MAC, shouldn't it?

“Other examples of problem text are - a. “When a particle is coated during aging the entire particle is surrounded by a coating shell”, 4509-20”

==> We wrote “When a BC particle is coated during the aging, the entire . . .” Would the sentence read correctly if we remove “during the aging”?

b. “Alexander (2008) identified different kind of BrC particle”, 4511-5

==> Is the problem is about the word “identified”?

c. “We use BrC to refer to absorbing organic material, while BrC aerosol is used as such” 4511-20

==> Is the issue about clarity? Here we are distinguishing between material and aerosol. We are saying that BrC refers to absorbing organic material and not absorbing organic aerosol.

d. Lines 17-20 on Page 4512 are poorly written.

==> Can the reviewer elaborate on this?

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 12, 4507, 2012.