Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., doi:10.5194/acp-2016-764-RC1, 2016 © Author(s) 2016. CC-BY 3.0 License.





Interactive comment

## Interactive comment on "Comparison of key absorption and optical properties between pure and transported anthropogenic dust over East and Central Asia" by Jianrong Bi et al.

## Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 13 October 2016

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



spectively, while corresponding values are  $0.921\pm0.021$ ,  $0.723\pm0.009$ ,  $1.521\pm0.025$ , and  $0.00364\pm0.0014$  for TDU. The results of this paper are valuable and hold promise of improving accuracies of Asian dust characteristics in present-day remote sensing applications and climate models. Overall, both the English-written and grammar are well and appropriate for publication. I recommend this manuscript is accepted and published in the Journal of ACP (Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics) after minor modifications.

Suggestion: 1.How to distinguish and separate the natural and anthropogenic contributions for climate variability, has become one of the most intractable problems in current global climate change. The authors proposed two threshold criteria to identify two types of Asian dust: Pure Dust (PDU, ïĄą<ïĂřiĂőiĂš) and Transported Anthropogenic Dust (TDU, 0.2<ïĄą<ïĂřiĂőiĂű), and explore the key absorption and optical properties. These results are encouraging and helpful to update the essential parameters of Asian dust in current remote sensing applications and climate models. As mentioned in the manuscript, it is still a huge challenge to discriminate between natural and anthropogenic components of dust aerosols by using current technology, AERONET products or in-situ measurements. However, the reviewer encourages the authors to explore detailed morphology, mineralogy, and chemical compositions by means of in situ measurements, laboratory analysis, active and passive remote sensing methods (e.g., multi-wavelength lidar, AEROENT, MODIS) as well as model calculations in the future work. âĞŠãĂĂThe authors don't need to response this.

Minor comments: 1. Abstract, Page 2, line 54: "OPAC" âĞŠ Change to "Optical Properties of Aerosols and Clouds (OPAC)". When an abbreviation firstly appears in the manuscript, please give the full name.

2. Page 3, line 80: "are about 6 times larger than at 660 nm" âĞŠ Change to "are about 6 times larger than that at 660 nm"

3. Page 4, line 114: "theory calculation" âĞŠ Change to "theoretical calculation"

## ACPD

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



- 4. Page 8, line 209: "compared to" âĞŠ Change to "compared with"
- 5. Page 8, line 219: "literatures" âĞŠ Change to "literature"
- 6. Page 9, line 247: "linked to" âĞŠ Change to "linked with"
- 7. Page 17, line 494: "PUD" âĞŠ Change to "PDU"

Please also note the supplement to this comment: http://www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/acp-2016-764/acp-2016-764-RC1supplement.pdf

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., doi:10.5194/acp-2016-764, 2016.

## **ACPD**

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

