

Interactive comment on “Long-term Particulate Matter Modeling for Health Effects Studies in California – Part II: Concentrations and Sources of Ultrafine Organic Aerosols” by Jianlin Hu et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 27 December 2016

General Comments: This manuscript presents results of concentrations and sources Ultrafine Organic Aerosols from 9 years chemical transport model simulations, which is important for health effects studies. The presentation quality is excellent and no major scientific problems with the presentation. I only have some minor concerns, which are listed below.

Specific comments:

1. In model evaluation, the authors claim that their calculated monthly MFB and MFE meet Boylan and Russel, (2006) standard. It is better to point out the standard in manuscript.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



2. Emission inventory is a key part in air quality modeling, but the authors do not write much about emission inventory (based on which year, what the sectors are, and etc.). Besides, the simulation period is as long as 9 years. It is better if the authors can consider the changes in emissions over this period.

3. The authors compared ratio from model to CMB derived ratio. Are the CMB derived ratios 100% reliable? How is its uncertainty? And it is also better to introduce the CMB method in the manuscript.

4. The authors discuss the impact of vapor wall losses on SOA concentrations. How will it affect model evaluation? In Figure 1, model overpredicts OA at some sites. After vapour wall losses correction, model may mismatch with observations.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., doi:10.5194/acp-2016-903, 2016.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)