

Interactive comment on “Carbonaceous aerosols at urban influenced sites in Norway” by K. E. Yttri et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 5 January 2009

General comments

The manuscript presents a series of carefully-conducted measurements investigating the composition and sources of carbonaceous aerosols at urban sites in Norway. The paper adds significant information to the present knowledge of sources of organic carbon in aerosols in Scandinavia and general knowledge on how to perform this type of investigation in order to avoid artefacts and mis-interpretation of results. Generally the results are presented and discussed well, but some tables and figures must be enlarged or made clearer.

Specific comments

Title: urban influenced sites in Norway - this does not seem to be correct English.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Suggestion: sites influenced by urban emissions or urban areas.

Abstract: The last sentence should be clarified.

Experimental:

I suggest including a few central parameters of the EC/OC analysis method e.g. split temperatures.

Why is potassium written with capital P?

Results and discussion

p19495 line 18: Subraminian -> Subramanian

p19497 | 1: "favorable meteorological conditions" authorities and doctors might argue that such conditions are un-favorable. I suggest to use stagnant or another more meteorological term.

p19497 | 6: hard to compare. It is unclear what the authors mean. Please add a few more details to clarify why such measurements should not be compared.

p19499 | 3. It is not clear what the authors mean by the sentence: However, the source-reconciliation used by Hedberg. Please add more information to support the statement.

p19500. Was least squares orthogonal regression used for these calculations? Please clarify.

p19500 | 5-7. The sentence should be clarified. Especially the wording #if anything# is unclear.

p19500 | 11. Could this good relationship be due to the contribution of particles with diameters <2.5 micrometres to PM10?

p19501 | 18 Kerbside -> Curbside.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



p19502 | 8. Add a reference to Table 5 here.

Conclusions

line 1 #It is shown# Please use a more general term or in the present study. The last sentence is not clear - what corresponds to 6.7%?

Tables and figures

Tables 1 and 3 are too small to read.

Table 2. Include a sentence describing OC-B and OC-FF (as p 19494 line 20) since these abbreviations may not be familiar to most readers.

Table 5. Please consider the number of decimals for slopes and intercepts. Is the uncertainty really this low? In addition the table is easier to read with fewer decimals.

Figures 4 and 5 should be clearer and larger. Figure 5 caption: no intercept -> no intercept

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 8, 19487, 2008.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper