Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 8, S11346–S11347, 2009
www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/8/S11346/2009/

Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions

Interactive comment on "Ozone production, nitrogen oxides, and radical budgets in Mexico City: observations from Pico de Tres Padres" *by* E. C. Wood et al.

E. C. Wood et al.

Received and published: 19 February 2009

We have found an accidental omission of text on page S10921 of 'Response to referee #2', for which we apologize. The response to the comment about the AMS collection efficiency should read as follows:

p. 15747: the collection efficiency for the AMS is being described as "0.5 for all species." Is this a common assumption for this kind of instrument? Is there a reference for this number?

Yes, a value of 0.5 is commonly used and based on experimental data. This paragraph in section 2 has been revised (w/ two references added):

"Particulate nitrate (vacuum aerodynamic diameters between 60 and 800 nm - 50% cut points) was measured with an Aerodyne compact time-of-flight aerosol mass spectrometer (C-ToF-AMS) with an accuracy of 20% (Canagaratna et al., 2007;Drewnick et al., 2005;Liu et al., 2007). A collection efficiency due to particle bounce of 0.5 was used for all species during the MILAGRO study based on comparisons with other aerosol instrumentation, including a co-located Scanning Mobility Particle Sizer (SMPS; TSI model 3080) and recent laboratory studies (Canagaratna et al., 2007;Matthew et al., 2008). Size distribution measurements from both the AMS and SMPS from this study and previous measurements in Mexico City (Salcedo et al., 2006) indicate that the particulate nitrate measurements discussed here represent PM1 mass loadings."

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 8, 15739, 2008.

ACPD

8, S11346–S11347, 2009

Interactive Comment