

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “A physical modeling approach for identification of source regions of primary and secondary air pollutants” by J. C. F. Lo et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 29 August 2006

In a first comment to the editor I noted already the poor English.

Here are a few more comments related to the content:

Page Comment

2 Poor visibility cannot be "evidence " of ozone levels

3 Last but one sentence obscure

4 Scale missing in Fig. 1

5 Four key papers explaining the method are in press or in revision, thus unavailable

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

5 "4 by 4 emission sources" = obscure

6 PM is mostly not a "primary pollutant"

6 Where do the weighting factors come from?

7 Where do the Mx come from?

7 It is incorrect to assume that primary particles "undergo few changes between source and receptor"

7 The following sentence is incorrect as well

8 Disregarding organics in the specific setting discussed by the authors is a grave simplification

9 Unclear labelling within Fig. 2

10 The contribution of local and regional sources is controlled by the author's assumptions

13 To me, the results do not "demonstrate the importance and usefulness..." because they are largely controlled by assumptions

In summary I do not recommend the publication in acp

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 6, 6467, 2006.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)