

Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., referee comment RC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-2022-11-RC2>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on amt-2022-11

Anonymous Referee #2

Referee comment on "Comment on "Comparison of ozone measurement methods in biomass burning smoke: an evaluation under field and laboratory conditions" by Long et al. (2021)" by Noah Bernays et al., Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss.,
<https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-2022-11-RC2>, 2022

Table 1 in Long et al. lists the Thermo Scientific model 49i monitor that was used in their study as having been equipped with a MnO₂ catalyst. This is also mentioned in their text, section 2.1.2. first sentence. To the best of my knowledge, this has been and still currently is the default, and only configuration, in which this monitor can be purchased from Thermo Scientific. I cannot trace from where Bernays et al. got the information that the monitor used by Long et al. had a different, i.e. a MnCl₂ scrubber. I don't remember ever seeing an ozone UV absorption monitor that used an MnCl₂ scrubber. This is an important piece of missing information. This certainly needs to be clarified by Bernays et al. before their comment should be accepted for final publication. Furthermore, Long et al. should be given an opportunity to comment on this question.