

Interactive comment on “Particle size distribution of nitrated and oxygenated polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (NPAHs and OPAHs) on traffic and suburban sites of a European megacity: Paris (France)” by J. Ringuet et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 5 July 2012

Why were the samplings done at different times for the studied sites? How do you explain the comparison?

The samplings were done continuously, this is not clear. How many samplings were done and at which intervals?

The authors should be careful when comparing Table 1, since they are dealing with two completely different devices, although some data have shown similar results. This might be due to the fact that concentrations are very low and/or near detection limits.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive
Comment

Item 2.4, the authors mention reference Albinet et al., 2006. However, under section References, there is two references Albinet et al., 2006. In point 2.4, I did not understand if the recovery rates were obtained in the present study or in the study by Albinet et al., 2006. They must be quoted for NHPAs and OPAH.

The authors should explain in Table 1 the reason for increased concentrations of 1NP; 9NA; 9,10-Ant and of the increased uncertainties of 3-Nphen; 4-NP; Benz-one and others.

The authors should improve Figure 2. Its present configuration makes reading very difficult.

Why have the authors summed 2+3-NFI to apply to the 2+3-NFI/1-NP ratio? This should be explained.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 12, 14169, 2012.

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