

***Interactive comment on “Critical assessment of the current state of scientific knowledge, terminology, and research needs concerning the role of organic aerosols in the atmosphere, climate, and global change” by S. Fuzzi et al.***

**S. Fuzzi et al.**

Received and published: 22 March 2006

Response to Referee#1 (The comments of the Referee are numbered, responses follow below each comment)

We would like to thank the Referee for the careful review of the manuscript and for the useful comments and suggestions.

1) The other two reviewers have already made comments and I shall try not to repeat. Nevertheless, I believe the comments on the abstract and the uniqueness of this paper

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

compared to Kanakidou et al. (2005) are very important ones that it would be okay to re-emphasize again here. In particular, a very clear discussion of how the current paper is unique from Kanakidou et al. (2005) is needed.

In the Interactive comment published by S. Fuzzi on behalf of all co-authors we have already outlined that this paper is not aimed at providing a comprehensive literature review on the issue of organic aerosol (as, for example, the review by Kanakidou et al., published earlier in 2005 on this same journal), but instead wants to be problem-oriented and forward-looking, addressing more conceptual aspects, as e.g. the issue of common terminology, and prioritising issues connected to organic aerosols and their effects on the environment and climate, providing the basis for future international collaborative efforts on this extremely complex subject.

2) Page 11735-11736, section 2.3 & 2.4: The reason for defining “primary and secondary aerosol particles” and “primary and secondary aerosol components” separately is not clear. My impression is that these two sections described something very similar.

An extensive response to the Reviewer’s concerns has already been provided by U. Poeschl in his Interactive comment published on 15 January 2006. The section has been rewritten.

3) Page 11735, section 2.4: “secondary components are substances formed in the atmosphere by chemical reaction of gaseous precursors”. The authors only consider the organic matters that formed via gas-phase chemical reactions as secondary aerosol components. However, secondary aerosol components can also be produced via heterogeneous and multiphase reactions of organic particles. They are aged components but it is not clear if they are considered primary or secondary. Furthermore, if primary aerosols can contain secondary components via gas phase condensation of reaction products, would it be simpler to include aged components as secondary too?

An extensive response to the Reviewer’s concerns has already been provided by U. Poeschl in his Interactive comment published on 15 January 2006. The section has

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

been rewritten.

4) Page 11739, line 10-15: The authors already define “Primary and Secondary” in the previous section. Hence, there is no need to repeat this information.

This sentence has been simplified, as suggested, making reference to the discussion in other parts of the manuscript.

5) Page 11739, Q1: The authors may want to elaborate on their choices of the proposed classification listed in Table 1. In addition, it would be useful to discuss what “Distinguishing Characteristics” are known and what are poorly understood in the literature. This may also help in relating Tables 1, 3, and 4 better.

Table 1 and the text underlying it have been extensively changed for this purpose.

6) Page 11740, line 22-29: The authors propose that class 1 and 6 can be potentially important for atmospheric aerosols. It would be useful to list any future research efforts to reduce their uncertainties in the “bottom up” estimates.

To this end we have modified Table 2.

7) Page 11750-11751, “Open questions and research priorities for organic aerosol aging”: As the authors mentioned, the aging processes of organic aerosols can lead to modification of the physicochemical properties of organic aerosols. Hence, I suggest that more research efforts should be made to study the effect of the aging processes on the change of the physiochemical properties, such as hygroscopicity and CCN activity, of organic aerosols because these properties may greatly influence the direct and indirect radiative forcing of atmospheric aerosols.

We believe this point is already addressed in Question #1 (Q1) concerning aerosol aging.

8) Page 11755, While wettability is an important issue, recent studies have shown that the phase of organic aerosols before activation and the presence of trace amount

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

of inorganic salts can also significantly alter the ability of organic aerosols to form cloud droplets (Bilde and Svenningsson, 2004) Reference: Bilde, M., Svenningsson, B. (2004) CCN activation of slightly soluble organics: importance of state of mixing and particle humidity history. Tellus, 56B, 128-134.

A sentence has been added to the revised manuscript following this comment.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 5, 11729, 2005.

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper