

Mediterranean nascent sea spray organic aerosol and relationships with seawater biogeochemistry, Freney et al., ACP_2020_406

Dear Editor/ reviewer,

This was an oversight on our behalf and we missed this sentence in the abstract. This sentence has been removed.

Thank you again for taking the time to review the manuscript.

Best wishes

Comments to the Author:

Thank you very much for the careful revision of your manuscript according to the reviewer's comments. However, the abstract of the manuscript needs also to be corrected accordingly, as noticed by the reviewer (see comments). After this last correction the manuscript can be published in ACP.

kind regards,

I appreciate the revisions that were made by authors and responses are sufficiently ok to proceed with a publication, subject to one final revision.

The abstract (lines 44-46) states that 'Filter-based analysis of the submicron SSA showed that the non-refractory organic mass represented on average only 40% of the total organic mass, which represents approximately 22% of the total sea spray mass.' – to my understanding, the 'refractory OM' was derived from filter-ACSM comparison and not the filter-based analysis as stated above. I will not go again into the argument that the discrepancy between filter OM and ACSM OM does not necessarily mean refractory OM (especially that the largest discrepancies, i.e. 'refractory OM', occur for the periods where the agreement between total volumes of filter/DMPS and ACSM is good).

The data show that ACSM measured ~40% of the filter OM, but this should not be attributed to 'refractory OM' in the abstract.