

Interactive
Comment

***Interactive comment on* “Investigation of the connections between atmospheric new particle formation and organics at an urban site of Beijing” by Z. B. Wang et al.**

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 22 March 2013

This paper and its predecessor, Wang et al. (2011), analyze the same data set and discussing same topic, i.e. new particle formation events observed during the 2008 summer campaign in Beijing, China. The underlying hypotheses of the two papers are different; Wang et al. (2011) considered sulfuric acid as the single precursor of new particles, whereas Wang et al. (2013) suggested organics were at least as important as sulfuric acid. Actually, Wang et al. (2011) indicated the importance of organics at the end of the paper. Thus Wang et al. (2011) and Wang et al. (2013) can be considered as part 1 and part 2 of a single paper. In this context, I expected some critical inter-comparisons of the results of the two studies in the current work. Unfortunately, I did not find them. Thus, after reading the two papers, I’m confused by their separate and

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



inconsistent arguments. Moreover, I wonder what would happen if the authors add another species, e.g. ammonia?

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 13, 3419, 2013.

ACPD

13, C731–C732, 2013

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



C732