

Interactive comment on “Real-Time Aerosol Optical Properties, Morphology and Mixing States under Clear, Haze and Fog Episodes in the Summer of Urban Beijing” by Rui Li et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 16 February 2017

General comment: This manuscript investigated the aerosol optical properties and morphologies in a typical urban site of Beijing for one month during summer of 2012. The investigation combined the optical properties with the morphologies provided very useful information about the aging effects of aerosol on their optical properties, confirming that the internally mixed particles formed by aging biomass emission during the wheat harvesting period in the region greatly increased the absorption coefficient. However, the presentation of the manuscript is suggested to be improved before publication. Specifics: 1.The English thorough the whole manuscript should be improved by a native English speaker. 2.More recent reports about the influence of agricultural activities including biomass burning on the regional air quality are encouraged to be

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



cited. 3. Abstract: Line 12-16, the sentences are suggested to be replaced by “Aerosol optical properties and morphologies were measured by TEM, CRDS, a nephelometer and an aethalometer in a urban site of Beijing from 24 May to 22 June”. The clear, haze and fog episodes just occurred during the sampling period, it didn’t need to mention them in the abstract. The phrase of “sampled from...” is not correct in English grammar. The instruments were used for measuring the aerosol properties, but not for investigating the corresponding changes of the aerosol properties. Line 16- 17, the sentence is meaningless, because the individual episode was mentioned in the following sentences. Line 17-18, the phrase of “which are mostly externally mixed” is not clear, and hence suggested to be changed as “and the particles were mostly mostly externally mixed”. Line 20-21, the comma before which should be deleted, because the phrase is used for modifying the EP-4. Line 21-22, “industry-induced haze (EP-1) and biomass burning- induce haze (EP-5)” is suggested to be changed as “the industry-induced pollution episode (EP-1) and biomass burning- induce pollution episode (EP-5)”. Line 22-24, The two sentences seemed to be independent, lack of logic, and thus, the two sentences are suggested to be replaced by “Compared with the EP-2 and EP-4, the AOD values and the size distribution of particles during EP-1 and EP-5 were much greater because of relatively high particle concentrations”. Line 25-26, the sentence was suggested to be replaced by “In contrast to the EP-1, a large fraction of soot which sticks to KCl, sulphate or nitrate particles was detected during the EP-5”, implying the evident influence of severe crop residue combustion. Line 26-28, the sentence was suggested to be replaced by “Additionally, evident enhancement of light absorption was observed during the EP-5, which was mainly ascribed to both BC acceleration and other absorbing substances”. Line 28-31, the sentences are better replaced by “However, soot was found mostly internally mixed with sulphate and nitrate during a soot fog episode (EP-3), resulting in evident enhancement of light absorption”. 4. Introduction: Line 44-47, any kind of particles in the atmosphere have scattering effect, why did you only stress on inorganic salts and light-color organic carbon? The sentences is better replaced by “inorganic salts and light-color organic carbon have a “cooling effect”

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

on climate due to decreasing permeation of solar irradiation onto the Earth's surface through solely scattering sun light". There are still some sentences in the section being needed to be improved. 5.Results and discussion: Line 266-267, the sentence of "the north wind was relatively clean and the time was insufficient for a heavy accumulation" is not proper and clear. Wind can be only described by speed and direction, and hence the sentence is better replaced by "the air parcel from the North was relatively clean". What's "the time" in the latter half sentence"? Line 282, the title of "Optical parameter variation" is better replaced by "The variation of aerosol optical characters". Line 324, the title of "TEM analysis" is suggested to be "Morphology and chemical composition of aerosols". Line 319: "Especially when air masses moved from south direction to the sampling site aerosols were influenced by heavy soot-sulfate-OC-mixed pollution". How did you draw the conclusion? Line 388: Are you sure haze and fog episodes had a high possibility of collision just due to the heavy particle loading? You should add relevant reference to confirm your deduction. Line 390, the title of "Optical properties related to morphological of aerosols" is better replaced by "the relationship between the aerosol optical properties and morphologies "

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., doi:10.5194/acp-2016-976, 2017.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

