

Interactive comment on “Measurement of carbonaceous aerosol with different sampling configurations and frequencies” by Y. Cheng and K.-B. He

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 20 April 2015

This manuscript continues to be rather poor in English writing. Thus, making it difficult to understand and provide constructive comments. The “Abstract” is very confusing and difficult to follow with statements like “(denuded vs. ubdenuded)” and “frequencies (24 vs 48 h averaged)”. It is not clear what is “operationally defined value of the thermal optical method”? There are number of such confusing statements. A disagreement of 15% is well within the analytical uncertainty of EC measurement on thermal-optical analyzer. It sounds rather absurd to refer 24h sampling as low frequency sampling. Overall the manuscript needs substantial revision and improvement in English writing. It lacks the desired level of scientific merit and unacceptable in its present form.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

