

## ***Interactive comment on “Annual variations of carbonaceous PM<sub>2.5</sub> in Malaysia: influence by Indonesian peatland fires” by Y. Fujii et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #3**

Received and published: 18 September 2015

This paper discussed the annual variation of carbonaceous P2.5 in Malaysia using sample collected in Petaling Jaya, Klang Valley. This study focussed on the influence of Indonesian peatland fires on the annual variation using various molecular markers generally accepted as associated with biomass burning. Monthly hotspot and air quality data were used to support the chemical characterisation.

The paper is of interest in this region as most of recent publication in Klang Valley has focussed on the PAHs and not so much on molecular markers for biomass burning, in particular attempting to assess the influence of Indonesian peat fires. And their results clearly show the influence of IPF during the SW Monsoon

Specific comment:

C6987

1. Calculation of CPI values: why not use the more commonly used equation as suggested by Bray and Evans (1961) ? denominator should include both the -1 and +1 even C-number.

2. C27 has been suggested as a possible indicator of IPF; C<sub>max</sub> at odd carbon number in the region of C25-33 is generally accepted as plant wax origin but can it be so source specific? Some study has shown that C<sub>max</sub> can change with burning.

3. C<sub>max</sub> at 26 accounts about 75% during NE monsoon - ithe authors suggestd that C22-26 is indicative of petrogenic sources; C<sub>max</sub> at 26 seems a little higher than the usual C24? Factor A2 in table 2a showed dominance of C22-24 not C26 ? Factor S3 even though showed higher value for C26, but relative to C22-24, much lower. Please clarify

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 15, 22419, 2015.

C6988