

Interactive comment on “Seven year particulate matter air quality assessment from surface and satellite measurements” by P. Gupta and S. A. Christopher

F. Dentener (Editor)

FRANK.DENTENER@JRC.IT

Received and published: 3 March 2008

Reviewer 1 has let me know that he has no further comments to the manuscript.

For completeness: here are the comment that were provided in the quick review of the paper.

=====

This is a very good paper that requires publication in ACP. It is well written but the grammar could be improved at a few instances. A few quick comments:

p. 9, line 6; and p. 21, line 13: a wind speed of 50 km/hour (13 m/s) is quite a lot, at

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



least for the boundary layer over land and even over the ocean it is high. Although later in the paper the authors investigate the effect of pixel size, I recommend that a brief comment is added and the average wind speed measured over the site is added to the text.

p. 13, line 16: ‘high humid conditions’;: replace by ‘high relative humidity conditions’; RH determines particle size, not concentration.

p. 17, line 13: why are meteorological parameters not added? Would these improve the outcome?

p. 19, line 21: I suggest to remove the last digit here and in the remainder of the text and the tables, it has no significance.

p. 21, line 9: I cannot believe that sampling a larger box would significantly change the heterogeneity of the type of aerosols over scales of up to 0.5 degree, unless in the presence of point sources. The heterogeneity of the surface is usually a much larger problem.

p. 22, line 6-8: I suggest to reformulate this sentence, it is not clear to me what is meant

p. 22, lines 11-14: the first and second sentences seem to contradict each other.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 8, 327, 2008.

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