

## ***Interactive comment on “Fourteen months of on-line measurements of the non-refractory submicron aerosol at the Jungfrauoch (3580 m a.s.l.) – chemical composition, origins and organic aerosol sources” by R. Fröhlich et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 16 August 2015

#### Overall Comment and Recommendation:

This manuscript presents 14 months of near-continuous, real-time measurements of non-refractory submicron aerosol (NR-PM<sub>1</sub>) by using a time-of-flight aerosol chemical speciation monitor (ToF-ACSM) at the Jungfrauoch mountain site in Switzerland. This is an important study as it provides in depth insights into the sources of organic aerosol as well as seasonal trends at a high elevation site in Europe. Long-term mass and chemical measurements of NR-PM<sub>1</sub> are starting to really take off around the world,

C5957

including sites in Europe, the United States, and southeast Asia. This is an exciting time and this study certainly adds to this growing body of data that will likely be useful to the modeling community that estimate impacts of PM on air quality and climate. The authors find that NR-PM<sub>1</sub> concentrations peak in summer due to increased planetary boundary layer (PBL) air influences and lower concentrations in winter. The largest fraction is from organic compounds and in transient months sulfate can be rather high at this site. Interestingly, from backward air trajectory analyses, the authors find that sulfate is elevated from the south but organics are dominant from all cardinal directions. The major source of organic aerosol at this site is low-volatility oxidized organic aerosol (LV-OOA), where LV-OOA 1 is assigned to a background type and LV-OOA 2 is assigned to vertically transported type mostly seen in summer. BBOA was only seen during a rare regional event in summer 2013 and during winter. The authors will likely be interested in papers coming from the Surratt Group at the Look Rock, Tennessee USA mountain site using the quadrupole ACSM. One of these papers was just published in ACP (Budisulistiorini et al., 2015) and the other one that presents yearlong data will appear soon in ACPD (Budisulistiorini et al., 2015). It seems many of the findings, such as aged OOA and some infrequent BBOA events, are shared by both mountain sites. Overall, the data presented in this study will be of interest to the atmospheric chemistry community and should be published in ACP. However, I kindly ask that the authors address the specific and minor comments below before publication.

#### Specific and Minor Comments:

- 1.) Page 18227, Line 11: delete ".e.g.," as this is not necessary.
- 2.) Page 18227, Line 14: insert hyphen between "high" and "time"
- 3.) Page 18227, Line 19: delete "of"
- 4.) Page 18227, Line 19: insert "of sampling" after the word "weeks"
- 5.) Page 18227-18228: The authors may want to include in their citation here for 1

C5958

year studies a 1 year study in both Atlanta, GA, USA and Look Rock, TN, USA by Budisulistiorini et al., 2015 (ACPD). This paper is in press for ACPD. Here are the details -

S. H. Budisulistiorini, K. Baumann, E. S. Edgerton, S. T. Bairai, S. Mueller, S. L. Shaw, E. M. Knipping, Avram Gold and J. D. Surratt (2015). Seasonal Characterization of Submicron Aerosol Chemical Composition and Organic Aerosol Sources in the Southeastern United States: Atlanta, Georgia and Look Rock, Tennessee. Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., in press.

6.) Page 18228, Line 18: Change "gasphase" to "gas-phase"

7.) Page 18229, Line 3: comma needed after "Furthermore"

8.) Page 18230, Line 1: UTC or local time?

9.) Experimental: The authors are confident a naifion dryer is not needed for sampling???

10.) Backward air trajectories: I

'm curious, how accurate are the backward trajectories if 10 days is used? Why not a shorter time scale? I would think the meteorology is highly dynamic at this site, so 10 days of backward trajectory analysis seems quite ambitious to me. The authors need to justify this selection.

11.) Page 18237, Line 4: You mean "Following sections?" Sounds like this came directly from a PhD thesis.

12.) Page 18239, Line 4: Delete "also"

13.) Aerosol Acidity: Based on recent studies from GA Tech groups (Hennigan et al., 2015, ACP; Guo et al., 2015, ACP), using neutralization degree is no longer a good proxy to estimate aerosol acidity. It is better to use thermodynamic models, such as ISOROPPIA, to do this using ACSM inorganic data and meteorological data as inputs.

C5959

I would revise this.

14.) Page 18242, Line 4: It is not clear to me what does "non-FT" mean. Is it concentrations during injection layer (IL) or else?

15.) Page 18242, Line 17: Delete "suggesting that"

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 15, 18225, 2015.

C5960