

## ***Interactive comment on “To what extent can aerosol water explain the discrepancy between model calculated and gravimetric PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>?” by S. G. Tsyro***

**J. Putaud (Referee)**

jean.putaud@jrc.it

Received and published: 12 November 2004

Another short comment on this manuscript... I'd just like to repeat here what I already mentioned to the author S. Tsyro: PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> mass concentrations measured gravimetrically at 50% and 20% RH, as well as PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> full chemical composition have been measured since January 2002 at the JRC-Ispra EMEP station. Data for 2002 are available from our web page <http://ccu.ei.jrc.it/ccu/> and data for 2003 will be delivered soon. Trying to reproduce the PM mass concentrations measured at 20 and 50% RH at JRC-Ispra would be (I believe) worthwhile. However, there is a lack of information regarding the hygroscopicity of particulate organic matter, a large part of which has been shown to be water soluble at some sites. I guess that anyway the

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

EMEP model won't be able to calculate the amount of water soluble organic carbon in a next future. Therefore, wouldn't the suggestion to consider shifting from wet (50% RH) gravimetric measurements to dry measurements of PM mass concentrations at the EMEP stations be a good conclusion for this work?

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 4, 6025, 2004.

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper