Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 6, S2854–S2855, 2006
www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/6/S2854/2006/

Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions

Interactive comment on "Seasonal variation of PM_{10} main constituents in two valleys of the French Alps. I: EC/OC fractions" *by* G. Aymoz et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 3 September 2006

In my opnion the main novelty is the possibility to quantify local OC emissions by way of realting OC to K. A possibility to relate EC to HDV is not fully examined. The autors do not make it clear form the start what the interest of the data is for the general public. In my opinion the MS should focus on the local EC and OC emissions and quantify these better. Then the MS is of interst to a broader audiende; as it is now it is a adatabank It should be a short technical note, meaning brought bakc to a size about half of the current. Also six of the figures are redundant becaue they are not necessary to provide insight. Another issue is the absence of the use of a filterpack for assessing the artefacts in OC sampling. Since the last author is one of the TWO experts on these artefacts in Europe I give it the benefit of the doubt. There is no indication of the blanks

Full Screen / Esc
Printer-friendly Version
Interactive Discussion
Discussion Paper

of the filters, which I like to see mentioned in a next version. Table 2: omit Table 4: redundant

General remarks

Also in a next version a more quantitative relation between HD-traffic and EC as well as K and OC should be provided. This latter issue is very worthwhile because there is very little knowledge on this relation in Europe. While the conclusion section is vague on these both issues, the abstract does not provide any quantitative data, only subjective formulation like significant (?). Hence my suggestion/demand to use the conclusion section as abstract because it is a summary of the study. Actual conclusions are missing and should be given in two to three quantitative sentences.

There are some smaller issues:

Pg 6213, ln 5: “under” the Mont Blanc Tunnel” should be “in”

Pg 6219, line 9/ table 4 when indeed a different sampler is used, and one mot sampling the smaller aerosol, why do the data from Bologna still appear in the table I rather see K as the marker than K+ because what is actually meant here is that K stands for potassium as the marker for biomass source

Pg 6225, ln 20 I do not understand/accept the term any and the reference to unpublished data for this

Finally most references are redundant because the study is a stand-alone investigation at sites that differ completely form all the other examples given and discussed because meteorology completely blocoks transport.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 6, 6211, 2006.

ACPD

6, S2854–S2855, 2006