Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 12, C1303–C1306, 2012
www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/12/C1303/2012/

Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions

Interactive comment on "Seasonal cycle and source analyses of aerosol optical properties in a semi-urban environment at Puijo station in Eastern Finland" *by* A. Leskinen et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 5 April 2012

Review on "Seasonal cycle and source analyses of aerosol optical properties in a semi-urban environment at Puijo station in Eastern Finland" by A. Leskinen

General comments:

The authors give an overview and statistical analysis of in-situ measured optical properties at Puijo, Finland. Optical properties were related to local sources of pollution and to long range transport using trajectory analysis. The measurement site at Pujio seems to be a good place for such a study.

At some points it is difficult to follow the discussion and the conclusions of the authors. E.g., it is hard to follow the discussion on the source analyses without having a map.

The reviewer thinks, that the authors should show a map with the location of the measurement sites, the surroundings, and the sectors for aerosol classification. A map should be part of this manuscript, although it is given in the cited literature (Leskinen et al., 2009).

The case study on cloud effects on aerosol optical properties is interesting. The question arises, why only two of in total 260 cloud events were investigated. It seems that this part of the study is in an early stage.

Specific comments:

Page 4720, lines 20-23: It should be noted that this results is based on a case study of only two cloud events.

Page 4720, lines 23 to 27: The abstract is not the right place for an outlook for further investigations.

Page 4721 line 12-13: The reference Althausen et al. (2009) is a description of the PollyXT instrument; which is not used in the present study. The authors should give a reference with a more general overview on the retrieval of optical properties from LIDAR.

Page 4721 lines 23-26: The authors should be careful, since he value of the scattering Angström exponent also depends on the refractive index. For example, when absorption increases, the scattering Angström exponent is not a good measure of size. (see Bond et al. ,2009, page 869, section "2. The correction may. . .")

Page 4732 section instrumentation: The authors should give a discussion on uncertainties and detection limits of MAAP and nephelometer. Values for instrumental uncertainties are used later in the manuscript (page 4732).

Page 4724 line 21. In Mueller et al. (2011) the wavelength of MAAP was determined to be 637 nm. The calibration of MAAP was referenced (c.f. Petzold et al 2004) to a wavelength of 670 nm. Therefore in Müller et al., section 4.2 a further correction factor

ACPD
12, C1303–C1306, 2012

of 1.05 was suggested when reporting absorption coefficients at the true wavelength of 637 nm.

Page 4726 lines 5-6: The correction given by Anderson and Ogren (1998) is often misunderstood. The choice between the two sets of corrections (no-cut and submicrometer cut) does not depend on the inlet configuration. If the aerosol mass is prevailing in the fine mode and a PM10 inlet is used, then the submicrometer correction should be used. In Fig. 5 in Mueller et al. (2011) a plot with correction factors for both corrections versus the Angstroem exponent is shwon. That plot indicates that the Angström exponent can be used to decide which set of corrections is the proper one.

Page 4726 line 21: Why the negative Angström exponents are ruled out?

Page 4726 line 26: What is the reason for using the Angström exponent calculated from wavelengths 700 and 450 nm and not from wavelengths 700 and 550 nm?

Page 4728: Is the classification according to trajectories taken from Leskinen et al. (2009). If yes, then it should be stated.

Page 4730 line 10: "...of 0.13$\pm$14 at 550." without brackets

Page 4730 lines 25-28: Can the authors give values for the period with forest fires. Is the scattering significantly higher compared to periods without forest fires?

Page 4731 line1 11-12: What does it mean 'similar effect'. You are comparing intensive (Angström) and extensive (sca. and abs. coefficients) properties. I would expect a higher scattering Angström exponent and lower scattering coefficients.

Page 4734 lines 4-7: "A similar behaviour. ..." is misleading. The trajectory distributions for sectors 0-45°, 45-155°, and 155-215° are very different from the northwesterly sector (245-360°).

Page 4734 line 10-13: I can not follow that conclusion. The trajectory distribution for sector 0-45° is "distributed more evenly" compared to other sectors, but the influence

ACPD

12, C1303–C1306, 2012

from Artic/Kola air masses is still very high.

Page 4734 line 18: typing error "..low-level. . ." ?

Page 4734 lines 20-21: A statistical analysis of a larger number of cloud events would be interesting. Why are not more events discussed?

Page 4735 line 7: The authors should give values. How large are the differences?

Figures 1 and 2: The authors should think about improving the presentation style of the figures. The use of up and down triangles for the extreme cases is perturbing.

Figure 4: unit for scattering coefficient is missing

Figure 7a: unit for absorption coefficient is missing

More references:

Bond, et al. (2009). "Truncation and Angular-Scattering Corrections for Absorbing Aerosol in the TSI 3563 Nephelometer." Aerosol Science and Technology 43(9): 866-871.

Müller, et al., (2011). "Characterization and intercomparison of aerosol absorption photometers: result of two intercomparison workshops." Atmospheric Measurement Techniques 4(2): 245-268.

Müller, et al. (2011). "Design and performance of a three-wavelength LED-based total scatter and backscatter integrating nephelometer." Atmospheric Measurement Techniques 4: 1291-1303.Design and performance of a three-wavelength LED-based total scatter and backscatter integrating nephelometer.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 12, 4719, 2012.