

Interactive
Comment

***Interactive comment on* “Changes in particulate matter physical properties during Saharan advections over Rome (Italy): a four-year study, 2001–2004” by G. P. Gobbi et al.**

Dr. Kishcha (Referee)

pavel@cyclone.tau.ac.il

Received and published: 2 April 2013

Comments on the manuscript “Changes in particulate matter physical properties during Saharan advections over Rome (Italy): a four-year study, 2001 - 2004” by G.P. Gobbi, F. Angelini, F. Barnaba, F. Costabile, J.M. Baldasano, S. Basart, R. Sozzi, and A. Bolignano.

The present study deals with the analysis of the contribution of Saharan desert dust to PM₁₀ surface aerosol concentrations in Rome, Italy. This is an experimental study based on a relatively large number of lidar measurements (703 days) in Rome and daily PM₁₀ measurements in three monitoring sites during the four-year period 2001 –

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive
Comment

2004. In addition, the authors analyzed the capability of the BSC-DREAM8b regional dust model to predict dust events having the presence of dust near the surface. This was carried out by comparing modeled dust concentrations with lidar measurements in Rome. The impact of desert dust on PM₁₀ records was estimated as the exceedance of PM₁₀ measurements on dusty days over PM₁₀ measurements on non-dusty days. The paper is clearly presented. The obtained results are interesting. Specifically, the current study has shown that the combined use of modeled dust forecasts with lidar measurements is important to effectively monitor desert dust presence and to estimate its contribution to PM levels. The authors have suggested an improved approach for estimating background PM₁₀ concentrations. I recommend the manuscript for publication.

The authors may consider the following critical aspects: 1. With respect to the percentage of dusty days and dust ground contacts, the correspondence between modeled dust forecasts and lidar observations was noticeably better during the first three individual years 2001/2002/2003 than in the last year 2004 (Table 2). It is worth discussing possible causal factors for the large discrepancy in 2004.

2. The authors studied seasonal variations of dust contribution to PM₁₀ concentration (Fig. 3). Did they find any seasonal variation in the discrepancy between modeled dust forecasts and lidar observations, with respect to the percentage of dusty days and dust ground contacts?

3. According to Fig. 3, one can see that the number of dust events in summer is higher than in winter. It is worth discussing possible reasons why the average dust contribution to PM₁₀ in summer is lower than in other seasons?

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/13/C906/2013/acpd-13-C906-2013-supplement.pdf>

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

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

