

Interactive comment on “Comparison of analytical methods for HULIS measurements in atmospheric particles” **by C. Baduel et al.**

d. voisin

didier.voisin@ujf-grenoble.fr

Received and published: 10 June 2009

We thank the reviewer for his very thoughtful and detailed review. In our response below, reviewer comments are stated in italics and our response follows.

there are several more methods in use within the HULIS aerosol research community; besides, only aerosol samples from a winter campaign in a valley in the French Alps were analysed in the present study. To conclude from this that the DEAE isolation procedure should be recommended is not warranted. This conclusion should be downplayed

We agree that several other extraction methods are used for HULIS in the community, and that our conclusion as to the recommendation of the DEAE procedure should

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



be downplayed. We did specify that in our revised manuscript, as explained in our answer to reviewer 1. It is also true that the samples we used in our comparison are fairly homogeneous, and do not represent the true diversity of natural aerosol samples. Yet, it should be stressed that these valley samples are impacted by biomass burning, which emits a lot of phenolic compounds that are mixed with HULIS in many extraction schemes.

Most Table headings and some Figure captions should be more explicit (give somewhat more detail)

We have paid special attention to this remark, and extended headings and captions, while also trying to keep them within reasonable lengths

Sloppy references

We want to thank the reviewer for his very thorough attention in pointing those to us. We of course did take every correction into account and will take better care of those in the future

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 9, 6787, 2009.

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