

***Interactive comment on “PTR-MS measurements of non-methane volatile organic compounds during an intensive field campaign at the summit of Mount Tai, China, in June 2006” by S. Inomata et al.***

**S. Inomata et al.**

ino@nies.go.jp

Received and published: 25 March 2010

We thank valuable comments and suggestions from the anonymous referee #3. Responses to the comments and suggestions are given below. We reflected these responses in a revision of the manuscript.

**Specific Comments:**

1. We have added a table (Table 1, new table number) according to the referee's comment.

C11732

2. We believe that  $\text{NO}_y$  detected by our system is gaseous species.

3. According to the referee's comment, we have tried reducing the length of the experimental part using a table (Table 2, new table number) that includes principal parameters for PTR-MS operation. Since other parameters, source current,  $U_4$ ,  $U_5$ ,  $U_1$ , and  $U_{NC}$ , were the same as previously reported (Inomata et al., 2008), we omitted them to reduce the length of the experimental part.

4. We recognize that the background signals were obtained in the dry conditions during the field observation. Therefore, we examined humidity dependence of the background signals in the laboratory and confirmed that no significant humidity dependence of the background signals at the masses listed in Table 1, as mentioned in text. The background signals in the dry conditions obtained during the field observation were subtracted from the observed ion signals, and the ion signals were converted to the mixing ratios by using the detection sensitivity and the humidity dependence determined in the laboratory.

Since the background signals for all masses were stable during the observation, the efficiency of the zero-air supply in removing VOCs was, at least, stable during the observation.

The species with the detection limits of 10 pptv is acetonitrile and its mass number of the protonated molecule is 42. Background signals at even mass numbers are usually small compared with those at odd mass numbers. The averaged background signals at 42 were  $0.4 \pm 0.4$  ( $2\sigma$ ) ncps for 1-s integration. Therefore, the detection limits for 10-s integration were calculated to be 10 pptv ( $= 0.4(\text{ncps})/\text{sqrt}(10)/12.8$  (ncps/ppbv)).

We thank the referee for the information of the catalytic converter. We will try to use it to take the background signals in ambient air in future.

5. It seems to me that the referee misread the unit of the water vapor concentration used in Inomata et al. (2008); not 30 “ppmv” but 30 “mmol/mol”. The range of the water

C11733

vapor concentration is similar to the typical ambient level.

6. When the point at about 1.5 ppbv was removed, the slope became  $1.8 \pm 0.9$  and the correlation coefficient ( $r^2$ ) became 0.40. Although the data shows more scattering as pointed out by the referee, reasonable agreement was still obtained.

With regard to monoterpenes, we have revised the sentences as "There is little correlation between  $\Sigma$ monoterpenes and M137 (Fig. 2(e)). The data of  $\Sigma$ monoterpenes (M137) will not be discussed in the following sections." Therefore, we have deleted the data of  $\Sigma$ monoterpenes (M137) in Fig. 3(d).

7. We obtained a positive relationship between *n*-nonanal and M143 and between *n*-decanal and M157, however the slopes were  $2.6 \pm 2.0$  for *n*-nonanal ( $r^2 = 0.13$ ,  $n$  (data number) = 10) and  $8.6 \pm 5.2$  for *n*-decanal ( $r^2 = 0.71$ ,  $n = 7$ ). There are many kinds of isobaric and isomeric compounds for *n*-nonanal and *n*-decanal, probably resulting in the slope larger than 1. These data are not more informative than the fact that *n*-nonanal and *n*-decanal were measured during the campaign by means of other techniques as mentioned in text.

8. We have revised discussion with regard to the  $O_3$  diurnal profile as "The net  $O_3$  production rate was estimated by a box model to be 51 ppbv  $d^{-1}$  during the 16-30 June period (Kanaya et al., 2009). This rate is large enough to explain the observed  $O_3$  increase shown in Fig. 3(b) ( $\sim 30$  ppbv). These suggest large influence from local photochemistry on the observed diurnal  $O_3$  profile. On the other hand, it is interesting to note that the mixing ratios of not only  $O_3$  but also CO started increasing in the early morning and reached a maximum in the early afternoon (Fig. 3(b)). This suggests a substantial role of the PBL development in shaping the profiles of these species. Hence a part of the daytime increase in secondary products like  $O_3$  and  $NO_x$ , are likely caused by the development of PBL.  $O_3$  itself and/or the  $O_3$  precursors were likely transported from the ground surface to the top of Mt. Tai, resulting in the increase of  $O_3$  as seen in Fig. 3(b)."

C11734

9. We have replotted the diurnal variations of  $NO_x$  and  $NO_y$  in the same y-scale in Fig. 3(c), indicating that a fraction of  $NO_x$  in  $NO_y$  was very small (less than 10%).

#### Technical Comments:

1. We have revised the figures according to the referee's comment.
2. Since we have no experimental data with regard to naphthalene and methyl-substituted naphthalenes, we have removed the sentences "The peaks at  $m/z$  129, 143, and 157 were... $C_8-C_{10}$  aldehydes/ketones in the study."
3. We have revised this according to the referee's comment.
4. The sentence was removed in the revised manuscript.
5. We deleted "is predominant".

#### References

Inomata, S., Tanimoto, H., Kameyama, S., Tsunogai, U., Irie, H., Kayana, Y., and Wang, Z.: Technical Note: Determination of formaldehyde mixing ratios in air with PTR-MS: laboratory experiments and field measurements, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 8, 273–284, 2008,  
<http://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/8/273/2008/>

Kanaya, Y., Pochanart, P., Liu, Y., Li, J., Tanimoto, H., Kato, S., Suthawaree, J., Inomata, S., Taketani, F., Okuzawa, K., Kawamura, K., Akimoto, H., and Wang, Z. F.: Rates and regimes of photochemical ozone production over Central East China in June 2006: a box model analysis using comprehensive measurements of ozone precursors, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 9, 7711–7723, 2009,  
<http://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/9/7711/2009/>