

## ***Interactive comment on “On the time-averaging of ultrafine particle number size spectra in vehicular plumes” by X. Yao et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 9 September 2006

- 1) Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of ACP? Yes
- 2) Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? Yes.
- 3) Are substantial conclusions reached? See comments below.
- 4) Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? Yes.
- 5) Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions?  
See comments below.
- 6) Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? N/A

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

7) Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution?

Zhang and Wexler Atmospheric Environment 38(38): 6643-6653, 2004, and Zhang et al., Atmospheric Environment 38(38): 6655-6665, 2004, proposed the idea that gas/particle partition may explain the evolution of particle size distributions near free-ways. The authors should give credit to their early investigations.

8) Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? Yes.

9) Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary?

Yes.

10) Is the overall presentation well structured and clear?

Yes.

11) Is the language fluent and precise? The authors should proofread the manuscript such as the last sentence of the first paragraph on Page 6830.

12) Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used? The description of “a<sub>1n</sub>”, “b<sub>m</sub>” and “b<sub>mn</sub>” should be introduced in the text.

13) Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated? No.

14) Are the number and quality of references appropriate? Yes.

15) Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate? N/A

Additional comments: Since ELPI was employed in tandem with EEPS in the field measurement and ELPI has similar time resolution as EEPS, the authors should compare the results from the two instruments. Did they agree with each other? Did the average of ELPI data demonstrate the similar trend as the authors found in EEPS? If not, why?

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

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper