

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 #3

Received and published: 25 July 2005

These comments are made to clarify my review in response to the ACPD editor's comments on this manuscript.

I would like to make it clear that I do not fault the editor for waiving the initial review

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

process in that this and the companion paper do not superficially appear to be of poor quality. In this case I believe the review process has done exactly what it is supposed to - highlight important concerns regarding these manuscripts at the stage of online review. At this point my recommendation is that these papers are not appropriate for publication.

The editor has responded to two comments made by the reviewers and asked for comments.

Point 1) Predominantly technical papers are suitable for ACP.

My personal opinion is that technical papers can be suitable for publication in a scientific journal but they must expand the knowledge in that field in the same way a scientific paper would. In this case this paper simply does not do this. First, it is more correctly a review of the AMS literature and not an original work. The specific comments by the other reviewers would seem to support this claim in that the topics tackled in this paper are appropriate for a group of AMS users but do little for the atmospheric science community in general. Second, the overall content of this paper is poor. As an example a central topic is comparison of two co-located AMS instruments but the authors never correctly performed this comparison in that the two instruments had two different inlets to which the authors appear to attribute all errors. This level of quality is below the ACP standard.

Point 2) 'Splitting' papers is appropriate for ACP.

Again, my personal opinion is that the editor is correct in that comprehensive manuscripts are normally superior but that sometimes splitting a paper is required for scientific and/or editorial reasons. In this case my concern is that these papers have not been split for either of these reasons but instead to multiply the number of publications from this field mission at the expense of scientific quality. This paper reads as the 'Experimental' section of a whole manuscript whereas the second reads as the 'Introduction'. Those topics of scientific interest are treated only briefly with reference

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

to at least two other 'in preparation' papers. As such neither of these papers is of the quality required for a peer reviewed publication.

I defer to the editor on this matter but my recommendation is these papers be rejected and that the authors be encouraged to write a single quality scientific paper that encompasses the whole of what was learned during the Mexico City campaign using these AMS instruments. I simply can not understand why 4+ publications would be required to describe the operation and results from two copies of the same instrument during a short duration field experiment.

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

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper