Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 6, S4896–S4897, 2006 www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/6/S4896/2006/ © Author(s) 2006. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons License.



ACPD

6, S4896-S4897, 2006

Interactive Comment

Interactive comment on "Nucleation and growth of new particles in Po Valley, Italy" by A. Hamed et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 28 November 2006

General comments:

The manuscript submitted by Hamed and co-workers on the topic of nucleation and growth of new particles in Po Valley, Italy present a comprehensive data set of measured and calculated aerosol characteristics and the relationship between several parameters with the formation of new particles. The analysis of the aerosol and other data are in a very satisfying way, however the interpretation of the gained results are at some points weak. Although the authors cited a good amount of relevant articles during their discussion a more specific and deeper interpretation including the findings of earlier works would be desirable. I hope that the authors improve for the final version the interpretation and discussion part throughout the manuscript and support the publication of this manuscript under ACP after minor revisions.

Specific comments:

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

FGU

Page 9604, line 12: it should be mentioned here that the formation rate is for particles < 3 nm

Page 9604 line 18: if the authors use the word recently then they should also cited recent publications which are available and not publications from 87 and 98

Page 9605 line 5: a reference is needed at this point to confirm this statement

Page 9606 line 25: change: This work was part of the QUEST (Ě.

Page 9619 line 27: the authors should read the article from Bonn and Moortgat again and consider rewriting this paragraph

Page 9633 table 1: why the authors give for NO2 and O3 two ranges

Page 9633 table 1, line NO2: 0-50pp is incorrect and should be probably 0-50 ppb

Page 9641 figure 3: it is unclear and confusing that the frequency in this figure is calculated only by using measured days - the monthly frequency should be calculated using the whole amount of days per month so that it is comparable with other stations. According to this the relevant numbers in the text has to be changed too.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 6, 9603, 2006.

ACPD

6, S4896-S4897, 2006

Interactive Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

EGU

S4897