

Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., author comment AC1
<https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-2021-439-AC1>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Reply on RC1

Ying Wang et al.

Author comment on "Measurement of enantiomer percentages for five monoterpenes from six conifer species by cartridge-tube-based passive sampling adsorption–thermal desorption (ps-ATD)" by Ying Wang et al., Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-2021-439-AC1>, 2022

The authors sincerely thank this reviewer for their comment on our contribution.

With regard to the fact that we do not attempt to explain or otherwise contextualize the results of the enantiomeric ratios, this is because that subject is beyond the scope of this work. Indeed, we hope to publish this contribution in Atmospheric Measurement Techniques, which is first and foremost a methods journal, and not a forum for discussion of biochemical matters.

Second, because all the compounds possessed essentially the same molecular weight, there is no reason to believe that active sampling would have resulted in any differences in the enantiomeric ratios.

Last, with regard to measuring actual concentrations, it is true that calibrations of the passive sampling rates would have permitted estimations of the concentrations of the target analytes in the sample vials. However, those concentrations would also have been subject to a number of variables including: a) length of time that each sample was in its vial; b) sample mass to vial volume ratios; and c) sample age and other dispositional characteristics of the samples. Thus, making such estimates did not seem worth the required effort.