

Interactive comment on “Characterization of ambient aerosols in Mexico City during the MCMA-2003 campaign with Aerosol Mass Spectrometry – Part I: quantification, shape-related collection efficiency, and comparison with collocated instruments” by D. Salcedo et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 15 July 2005

This manuscript is not appropriate for publication in the Journal of Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics. The primary subject concerns the evaluation of instrumentation and presents nothing of scientific relevance to the community who reads ACP. As a reminder to the author, in the title page of ACP:

"Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics (ACP) is an international scientific journal dedicated to the publication and public discussion of high quality studies investigating the Earth's atmosphere and the underlying chemical and physical processes. It covers the altitude range from the land and ocean surface up to the turbopause, including the troposphere, stratosphere and mesosphere." "The main subject areas comprise atmospheric modelling, field measurements, remote sensing, and laboratory studies of gases, aerosols, clouds and precipitation, isotopes, radiation, dynamics, biosphere interactions, and hydrosphere interactions."

The current manuscript is neither a study that investigates the Earth's atmosphere and the underlying chemical and physical processes nor is its subject one of those listed as germane to the themes of ACP. The article, in itself is moderately well-written and vaguely understandable, but it is heavily burdened by minute details that lend little to the final conclusions that can be summarized as 1) two AMS's agree pretty well and 2) the mass measured by the AMS plus the BC deduced from light absorption measurements can explain the majority of PM_{2.5}. This is hardly a scientific revelation and certainly contributes little to a better understanding of the physical processes that govern the production and evolution of aerosol particles in Mexico City. The material contained in this paper is also largely irrelevant to the second paper contributed by this same author since the conclusions drawn in Part I are not a prerequisite for understanding or interpreting the material presented in the part II paper.

In addition to strongly recommending that this paper be rejected, I also can not recommend that it be included in a much abbreviated form in the Part II paper that this author has also submitted. There is no justification for submitting this aerosol characterization study in two parts and the current manuscript should be withdrawn and submitted to a more suitable venue that caters to instrumentation papers that lack scientific relevance.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 5, 4143, 2005.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Print Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)