

***Interactive comment on “PM measurement campaign HOVERT in the Greater Berlin area: model evaluation with chemically specified particulate matter observations for a one year period” by M. Beekmann et al.***

**M. Beekmann et al.**

Received and published: 3 November 2006

Answer to Referee 1 :

The authors thank the referee for thorough reading of the paper and for useful spelling remarks. All “Detail” suggestions have been incorporated in the paper.

In particular, measurement sites have been described in a more consistent manner. Improvement of wording as proposed by the referee has been incorporated into the paper. Figure 2 has been completed with x-titles and panels for EC and OC which have been omitted (probably in the production process).

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

The referee raised some points concerning table 3.

Difficult understanding : In Table 3, column 6 denotes the ratio between normalised simulated EC and observed EC. The slash indicating the ratio between both terms was omitted in the papers on-line version. It will be added again in the revised version. The slope in the scatter plot representing both these terms is also given (Column 6).

Why only not only use the averages ? Slopes between normalised simulated EC and observed EC are shown in addition to averages, because both informations are complementary. The benefit of the slope is to normalise out a possible offset in both terms. Slope depends on the variability and correlation between both terms. That is why both average ratios and slopes are kept in table 3.

Applicability to other sites : The normalisation procedure with NO<sub>x</sub> can only be applied to “near source” sites, and thus has not been applied to rural sites.

Créteil, France, 3/11/06 Matthias Beekmann on behalf of the coauthors

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 6, 7285, 2006.

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