

Interactive comment on “Physico-chemical characterization of urban aerosols from specific combustion sources in West Africa at Abidjan in Côte d’Ivoire and Cotonou in Benin in the frame of DACCIWA program” by Aka Jacques Adon et al.

Aka Jacques Adon et al.

adonjacks@gmail.com

Received and published: 15 January 2020

hello Please find the article corrected according to the recommendations of the reviewers and the answers of the reviewers. Thank you and cordially

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2019-406>, 2019.

C1

Dear Editor,

Hereafter is enclosed the revised version of the manuscript “Physico-chemical characterization of urban aerosols from specific combustion sources in West Africa at Abidjan in Côte d’Ivoire and Cotonou in Benin in the frame of the DACCIWA program” by Adon et al. In this new version, we took into account all the comments made by the referees. Following their advices, we totally changed the structure of the paper. We would like to thank them for their effort to review this paper. In our opinion, the paper is well improved.

Thanks also for your understanding for the delay that you gave us to allow this revision.

Reviewer Comments

REVIEWER 1

Main comments

This paper presents valuable data for an understudied region, which is mainly attributed to logistical difficulties associated with obtaining data. Therefore, the authors must be commended in presenting this dataset that warrants interest from an international audience. In addition, comprehensive data analysis and processing were conducted on the collected dataset from which the authors draw insightful deductions.

However, unfortunately there are too many text and language errors throughout the manuscript. I extensively reviewed the manuscript up until the Results section (detailed comments indicated in the attached PDF file) with approximately 80% of the comments (124 comments in total) relating to text and language issues. Therefore, I suggest that the authors address each of these comments made and also apply these comments/suggestions to the rest of the manuscript in order to improve the manuscript. In its current format, the large number of text and language errors clouds the review/critical evaluation of the science presented in this paper. I will continue with my review of the manuscript as soon as all the text and language problems are addressed by the authors. In addition to the comments related to text and language in the manuscript, certain comments also relate to the general structure of the paper and scientific matters that must also be addressed by the authors.

Following this advice, paper structure was totally changed. The ‘Methodology paragraph’ is improved including important details which were asked by the reviewers. Then, a paragraph presents the ‘main results’ specie by specie. A ‘discussion’ paragraph is proposed, focusing on the main striking features obtained site by site, the inter-annual variability of aerosol composition in each site and the comparison of our results with literature data. Due to these change, most of comments have been taken into account. We only kept in the following, the important questions that we resolved in the new version. English was improved all along the text.

Fig. 1.

C2