

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

1) This paper presents key scientific questions and research priorities regarding atmospheric organic aerosols, based on the discussion at the workshop organized by IGBP-IGAC/iLEAPS/SOLAS. The main topical areas are sources, formation and transformation, physical and chemical properties, and atmospheric modeling of organic aerosols. Further, the authors propose universally applicable terms and definitions to describe

atmospheric organic aerosols. As described in this paper, extreme complexity of organic aerosols makes it very difficult to clarify their role in the atmosphere. It is therefore important to discuss future research strategies from several different viewpoints as presented in this paper.

We would like to thank the Referee for the appreciation of our paper and the useful comments and suggestions.

2) While individual scientific statements in this paper are sound and highly valuable, this manuscript needs revision from the following two points. First, this paper has not been edited sufficiently and thus the format and the construction are not well organized. For example, although the title of section 5.1 on page 11756 is “outstanding issues for future research,” the content on the page does not include any scientific statements, but it is merely an explanation of the current status of research and the current understandings. Further, identical subjects are explained repeatedly in different sections, which makes the manuscript wordy. For instance, importance of the assessment of sampling artifacts is stated at least five times, on p11746 lines 1-5, p11748 lines 15-16, p11751 lines 14-16, p11753 lines 8-12, and p11757 lines 1-2.

We have extensively revised the paper to avoid as much as possible repetition of the same concepts and to rationalise the structure of the manuscript. In particular, all research questions have been grouped in a separate paragraph at the end of the paper. Still, the organisation of the manuscript in (a) sources of OA; (b) formation transformation and removal of OA; (c) physical, chemical and mixing state of OA; (d) atmospheric modelling of OA and the need of having these sections internally consistent imply also the necessity to repeat the same concepts in the different paragraphs. Section 5.1 has been entirely rewritten on the basis of the comment

3) Second, there are several issues that are not addressed sufficiently in this paper. For example, in terms of the budget of organic aerosols, deposition processes must be as critical as mission/formation and transformation (as pointed out briefly in section 6.1), in

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

particular on global scale. However, there is no discussion on depositions in sections 3 and 4. Another issue that may be worth emphasizing is mixing state of organics. Many organics in aerosols are internally mixed with inorganics, and it is related to most of the issues discussed in this paper. Research priorities regarding the mixing of organics and inorganics are worth addressing, for instance in section 5.

The issue of aerosol deposition is addressed in section 6 of the manuscript but while this is definitely an uncertainty in the OA budget, at the same time it is not specific to organic aerosol only. This is rather a more general problem applicable to all kind of aerosols and a more extensive discussion is clearly beyond the focus of the present paper. The issue of mixing state of organics has been emphasised in different parts of the manuscript.

4) Abstract: The initial half of the abstract is not explained in the main body of this paper. Further, I do not think that the last sentence in the abstract is necessary.

Abstract has been entirely rewritten based on reviews.

5) Section 2.4: In molecular levels, it is often discussed if organic compounds are primarily emitted or secondary formed in the atmosphere. In this case, “secondary” does not always mean gas-to-particle formation but it potentially includes transformation of organics within the particles. It is not clear in this paragraph if these secondary organic compounds formed in the condensed phase are categorized as primary- or secondary aerosol components.

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

6) Section 2.6: As described above, many organic components are internally mixed with inorganics. For this reason organic and inorganic particles can not be separated in many cases, and the definition of terms “organic aerosols” and “organic aerosol

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

particles” are not obvious. A brief explanation to this point may be necessary.

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.

7) Section 2.6: This section only explains the assignment of carbon to OC and EC. I recommend adding an explanation on the difference between organic carbon and organic matter (related to Q7 on p11748); the latter involves oxygen, hydrogen and other heteroatoms as well as carbon atoms. In addition, some explanation on the detection of IC (carbonate carbon) by the carbon analyzer may be necessary.

The Section has been rewritten.

8) Page 11739, lines 10-16: What the authors explain in this paragraph is not clear. On pages 11734 and 11735, authors distinguish primary organic aerosol “components” from primary organic aerosol “particles”. Is the issue explained in this paragraph is about only “components”, or both “components” and “particles”?

For the sake of clarity, this sentence has been simplified making reference to the discussion in other parts of the manuscript.

9) Page 11742, lines 25-26: It is not clear if this sentence is based on results from previous studies or on authors’ speculation.

A reference has been added.

10) Page 11746, line 12: What does OPM stand for?

Changed to particulate organic matter.

11) Page 11755, lines 6-7: I read the paper by Cziczo et al. [2004] but I did not find a sentence explaining that less efficient water uptake by organics is the reason that organics were not efficient as ice nuclei.

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

While the paper by Cziczo et al. [2004] does discuss hygroscopicity as a possible factor in affecting ice nucleation (their Paragraph 8, lines 5-10), they also mention other possibilities. For this reason the sentence was omitted in the revised manuscript.

12) Page 11756, lines 20-23: It is not clear if this sentence is based on results from previous studies or on authors' speculation.

A reference has been added.

13) Page 11756, lines 23-26: Add references.

References have been added.

14) Page 11757, Research Priorities: Among R1-R5, R5 is the only suggestion that might relate to "physical" properties of organics aerosols. Aren't there any suggestions on studies of hygroscopicity and optical properties of organic aerosols, which the authors discuss in detail on pages 11753-11755?

An additional R6 has been added following this suggestion

15) I basically agree the revision of Table 1. However, isn't it necessary to add other primary sources such as road dust and meat cooking [e.g., Schauer and Cass, 2000], which are not necessarily included in industrial POA in the revised table?

An extensive response to the Reviewer's concerns has already been provided by U. Poeschl in his Interactive comment published on 15 January 2006. Table 1 has been modified according to the suggestions received.

16) Page 11740, line 22: Change "2 thorough 6" to "2 through 5".

Text has been changed due to a different classification scheme in the revised version of Table 1.

17) Page 11745, lines 5-6: Replace a, b, and c with 1, 2 and 3, respectively.

Done

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

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper