

I recommend this paper to be rejected for two reasons:

1. Severe self-plagiarism. I just get a chance to read the Wang *et al.* [2013] paper. This paper appears to largely copy the text from the Wang *et al.* paper, without any modification. I don't think this can be allowed on ACP, or any other journals. I will just give a few examples here. I am sure there are other examples but I would rather not to go any further. I am also surprised that this level of plagiarism was not detected by the iThenticate.

Example 1: Page 25945 Line 18:

*“2.2 Assessment of biogenic and anthropogenic contributions to isoprene*

*In urban areas, isoprene has both biogenic and anthropogenic sources (Borbon *et al.*, 2001; Wang *et al.*, 2013). Several studies have quantified isoprene in vehicle exhaust (Duffy *et al.*, 1999; Borbon *et al.*, 2001), and measurements in temperate urban winter periods have revealed a strong correlation between isoprene and common vehicle exhaust tracers, such as 1,3-butadiene, alkenes and carbon monoxide (Reimann *et al.*, 2000; Borbon *et al.*, 2001; McLaren *et al.*, 1996). The results indicate that anthropogenic sources of isoprene in the investigated cities were mainly a result of vehicle exhaust. Considering that anthropogenic isoprene has a strong correlation with vehicle.”*

**This is the exact same as Section 2.4 in Wang *et al.* paper.**

Example 2: Page 25946 Line 21

*“The MIR method can be used to estimate the potentials of individual VOCs for O<sub>3</sub> formation. Although the initial reactivity of a VOC with OH in the kOH reactivity method does not directly reflect OFP, it is involved in the production rate of organic peroxy radicals and implies the potential for formation of subsequent products. In the study, both the MIR method and the kOH reactivity method were utilized. The OFPs and OH reactivities of individual VOCs were calculated by multiplying individual VOC concentrations measured at PKU by their corresponding MIR and kOH (reaction rate constants of VOCs with OH radical), as shown in Table 1.”*

**Please see the section 2.3 in Wang *et al.***

Example 3: Page 25952 Line 4:

*“Although the emission strength and reactivity of a precursor are important for the secondary pollutant formation potential, the timing of release is also critical from the perspective of photochemistry. The midday surge of biogenic isoprene could produce a much larger loss and more efficient production of midday ozone and/or secondary pollutants because the midday peak of isoprene is almost concurrent with the peak of OH, a condition that could maximize photochemical reactions (Lee and Wang, 2006).”*

**This is exactly the same as a paragraph in Section 3.3.2 in Wang *et al.***

2. Scientific content. The authors simply replace the observation dataset in Wang *et al.* with their measurements in Beijing. However, I don't see any insightful analysis, novel concept

or ideas. The whole paper is rather weak. The only difference between this paper and Wang et al., is the discussion on the possible causes that lead to high ozone in Beijing. But I don't see any in-depth discussion on that.

Overall I don't think this paper is suitable for publication in ACP.

#### Reference

Wang, J.-L., C. Chew, C.-Y. Chang, W.-C. Liao, S.-C. C. Lung, W.-N. Chen, P.-J. Lee, P.-H. Lin, and C.-C. Chang (2013), Biogenic isoprene in subtropical urban settings and implications for air quality, *Atmos. Environ.*, 79(0), 369-379, doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2013.06.055>.