

Interactive comment on “Identification and characterization of aging products in the glyoxal/ammonium sulfate system – implications for light-absorbing material in atmospheric aerosols” by C. J. Kampf et al.

C. J. Kampf et al.

hoffmant@uni-mainz.de

Received and published: 21 June 2012

The authors want to thank referee #3 for his valuable comments and specifically respond to each of them below:

Referee #3, 1.: The authors state in the introduction p. 6237 line 22 that ‘Imidazoles were identified as major products from the reaction of dicarbonyl compounds and ammonium ions.’ but this is not accurate for all cases. Galloway et al., (2009), and Trainic et al., (2012) show that the contribution of C-N compounds to the total organic mass is

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



only approximately 0.5% and 0.1%, respectively.

Reply: The word “major” has been removed from the sentence to avoid potential inconsistencies.

Referee #3, 2.: In section 3.5 p. 6246 line 19, the authors state about similar conditions to those mentioned in the introduction that ‘However, the formation of imidazoles under these conditions was reported to be of minor importance..’. This is indeed in agreement with the cited papers, and therefore the authors should make this point clearer both in the introduction and in the conclusions sections, and in general throughout the paper.

Reply: What we wanted to point out with the term “of minor importance” was that imidazoles apparently don’t contribute much to SOA from mass perspective. However, due to their strong absorption capabilities they seem to be responsible for the majority of changes in aerosol optical properties, which were observed in chamber experiments, see Shapiro et al. (2009).

Referee #3, 3.: Inferring about the optical properties of atmospheric aerosols from reactions in solution is problematic. The conditions present in heterogeneous reactions between aerosols and gas phase glyoxal are very different than in the bulk solution. As the authors state, the bulk is a better representative of reactions occurring in cloud droplets. Additionally, there are questions regarding the humidity dependence of the reactions as well as questions about the stability of the products measured upon drying. Therefore, in p. 6246 line 3: ‘In ambient aerosols the number of potential reaction partners is much higher and an identification of appropriate tracer compounds is necessary to estimate the organic carbon production or the impact on aerosol optical properties from distinct precursors.’ The authors should either remove the part in the sentence which refers to aerosols or emphasize that they are in high ambient RH conditions, such as in clouds or the vicinity of clouds.

Reply: The sentence has been changed to “In the ambient atmosphere the number of potential. . .”

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Referee #3, 4.: p. 6238 line12: 'The purpose of this paper is to further complete the understanding of the product spectrum of the reaction of glyoxal and ammonia in aqueous aerosol mimics' should be 'the reaction of glyoxal and ammonium sulfate' since some products are specific to the reaction of glyoxal with ammonium in the presence of sulfate and are not observed in other ammonium solutions (Noziere et al., 2009).

Reply: Has been changed according to the suggestion of the referee.

Referee #3, 6.: p. 6242 line 10: '(see Supplement for more details)' – state specifically where in the supplements (page, paragraph, figure, etc).

Reply: The corresponding section in the Supplement is named "Determination of the molar absorbtivity coefficient of BI". A reference of the page in the Supplement has been added to facilitate its findability.

Referee #3, 7.: p. 6244 line 6: 'Our values for IC tend to be a bit lower' – could the authors give a quantitative evaluation, perhaps state the percent difference between the values for IC, and their cause?

Reply: The authors thank the referee for his thorough reading. Actually, the mean value for IC at 213 nm is ~2% smaller, which is well within the measurement uncertainty. Therefore, we removed the corresponding sentence from the revised manuscript.

Referee #3, 8.: p. 6245 lines 1-16: this paragraph discusses unidentified structures of low polarity products. I suggest the authors either do some further analysis which will enable characterization of the products. If no such analysis is available, the authors should consider whether this paragraph is necessary. It is my suggestion to delete this paragraph and state only that a functional group containing C-N bonds was identified.

Reply: These paragraphs were intended to provide a potential direction for future research and are not meant to provide a final characterization of the observed low polarity products.

Referee #3, 9.: p. 6247 lines 5-7: 'As a consequence, certain organic multiphase

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

processes, e.g. the uptake and further reactions of organics and ammonia leading to secondary lightabsorbing products (formation of brown carbon), can be expected to be strongly enhanced.’ – Can the authors give a quantitative estimate of the enhancement – by how much? Have the authors conducted experiments under such conditions or they may be able to extrapolate from their findings?

Reply: We agree that a more quantitative statement would be useful for atmospheric scientists, however, we consider the application/extrapolation of the results presented here in physico-chemical or atmospheric models to be beyond the scope of the manuscript.

Referee #3, 10.: p. 6248 lines 23-27: ‘Especially in regions with conditions potentially favoring the formation of imidazoles, i.e. a higher pH value and high ammonium ion concentrations in aerosols (e.g. reported by Kulshrestha et al. (1998) and Parashar et al. (2001)Northern India), this influence could be very strong.’ Same comment as the one above.

Reply: See comment above.

Technical comments:

Referee #3, 11.: p. 6239 line 16: ‘2-(1H-imdazol-2-yl-)’ should be ‘2-(1H-imdazol-2-yl)’ ‘-1H-imidazole’ should be ‘1H-imidazole’ ‘(2,2’-bisimidazole, 2,2’-biimidazole, BI)’ should be ‘2,2’-bisimidazole, 2,2’-biimidazole, (BI)’

Reply: The missing “l” in the first “imidazole” has been inserted.

Referee #3, 12.: p. 6243 line 18: ‘(11±1) %’ should be ‘11% (±1)’

Reply: Has been changed to 11 % (±1 %).

Referee #3, 13.: p. 6249 line 1: ‘as reported e.g. by See et al., 2006)’ should be ‘as reported by See et al., (2006)’

Reply: Has been corrected.

Referee #3, 14.: Figures 4, 5, and S11: Authors should use different markers and line-styles in order to dedifferentiate between the different parameters shown in the figures.

Reply: Markers in Fig. 4 and S11, as well as line-styles in Fig. 5 have been changed to improve readability. The figure captions have been changed according to the adjustments.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 12, 6235, 2012.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper