

Anonymous Referee #2

General comments, round 2:

Although the authors made some valid clarifications, and did take my advice on toning down their certainty about whether the WSON has a marine source based on the evidence they had, many of my main concerns were incompletely addressed, and so I suggest further revision before acceptance into *Biogeosciences*. If the authors cannot fully address my concerns, then I will at that point suggest rejection.

Please note that in the responses the authors frequently told me they changed the text and figures according to my suggestions, but they often did not show the new figures or text, making it impossible for me to evaluate how well my concerns were addressed. In the next version, I ask that the authors please either provide a copy of the new manuscript or clearly provide the new text/figures to make it easier to evaluate the changes to the new manuscript.

As a quick side note for the authors: if they are not aware of it already, they might be interested in the following recently published paper I recently became aware of, which might be of relevance to their work:

Altieri, K. E., M. G. Hastings, A. J. Peters, S. Oleynik, and D. M. Sigman (2014), Isotopic evidence for a marine ammonium source in rainwater at Bermuda, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 28, 1066–1080, doi:10.1002/2014GB004809.

My comments are shown below in italics (black for first review, blue for second review). The author's responses below are in black non-italicized font.

Specific comments:

The most important comments are regarding the marine WSON source hypothesis. At all 3 sites I find that the evidence provided for the marine WSON source hypothesis needs more support to be valid.

Tropical N. Atlantic: p. 11370, line 4: The two final statements in this section need more evidence: a) "Marine sources seem to control the fine mode WSON concentration levels, since significant correlation of WSON was found with ss-SO₄²⁻ ($r^2 = 0.6$, $p < 0.001$, $n = 15$)" and b) "The highest concentration of WSON was observed on 3 August (Fig. 4), when the air mass back trajectory had marine origin (Fig. 3b)." For statement a), I remind the authors that correlation does not equal causation, so perhaps a better wording would be something like, "high ss-SO₄ values were associated with high WSON values ($r^2 = . . .$)". But even if the wording is changed, I still don't think one can really say that marine sources control the fine mode WSON at this site based only on the WSON/ss-SO₄ association. First, a correlation of 0.6 still typically incorporates a great deal of variability. Secondly, the sample size is relatively small ($n=15$). Thirdly, assessments based on correlation coefficients alone can sometimes lead to false associations due to outliers. For this third reason, the r^2 values by themselves are not

particularly useful for the reader. Therefore, if the authors want to discuss the association between WSON and ss-SO₄, I suggest adding a new figure showing the actual data the correlation is based on.

Finally, and most importantly, because correlation does not equal causation, it is important to show that other data sources were closely monitored to rule out other WSON sources on the days that had high WSON and high ss-SO₄ in combination. Because WSON can be transported long distances, there needs to be more evidence to make a compelling case for a large marine WSON source, particularly their hypothesis seems to directly contradict others studies that found low total WSON on clean marine days, including in the same study region of the tropical North Atlantic (e.g., Lesworth et al., 2010; Zamora et al., 2011) (not to mention the author's own findings at Amsterdam Island, where WSON was low even though upwind Chl a concentrations were still relatively high).

We agree with the reviewers statement that "correlation does not equal causation" and tried to be very cautious throughout the manuscript, however the WSON fraction is a complex mixture of compounds and almost unknown. During this study the only available tool to have some robust results regarding the sources is the correlation with known tracers. It is true that there are many things to be done in the future research, regarding the speciation of WSON fraction.

I understand that this is all the data the authors may have, but if correlation is all the authors have to draw conclusions from, then the correct amount of caution must be applied when interpreting the data to avoid misleading readers. In the first review I suggested repeatedly that they plot the data, which gives people an idea of what degree of influence outliers may have, but that was not done. I also suggested that they show that other data sources were closely monitored to rule out other WSON sources on the days that had high WSON and high ss-SO₄ in combination, which would make using the correlations more valid. That was also not done satisfactorily, see point below.

The sentence "Marine sources seem to control the fine mode WSON concentration levels, since significant correlation of WSON was found with ss-SO₄ (r²=0.6, p<0.001, n=15) was replaced with the phrase: "Marine sources seem to contribute to the fine mode WSON concentration levels, since high ss-SO₄ values were associated with high WSON values (r²=0.6, p<0.001, n=14). Insignificant correlations were found between fine mode WSON and continental traces such as nss-Ca²⁺ and nss-SO₄".

This change is mostly satisfactory (pending that outliers did not drive the already somewhat poor correlation, again please show the data), but just saying that there were insignificant correlations between nssCa²⁺ and nssSO₄ is not as helpful as saying what these concentrations actually were, and putting those concentrations in context of what one would expect in clean marine conditions. "Traces" should be changed to "tracers".

For statement b), I would not call that trajectory “purely marine” because it goes right by the coast of Africa where dust storms routinely blow and where pollution from northern Africa and Europe frequently mix in. In fact, when I looked at the AOD, true color, and CALIPSO aerosol subtypes for that day, it seems that there was a great deal of dust in the atmosphere above the sample (see Figures 1-3 in the supplement attached), which may have impacted the results, as dust is known to carry WSON. To me, this casts strong doubt on whether this was truly an example of a “purely marine” day and so this argument should not be used to support the hypothesis of a marine WSON source. If this sample, which the authors said was the sample with the highest concentration of WSON, was removed from the WSON-ssSO₄- plot because of the likely interference from high dust concentrations, what would the resulting r and p value be?

Indeed in Figures 1-3 in the supplement attached by the reviewer it seems that there was dust in the atmosphere during the sample collection. Although, this dust event seems not to be recorded by the sample, since in Fig. 2 on 3th August the nss-Calcium concentration (in coarse mode) is lower comparing with the whole sampling period. Note that we were very cautious in our interpretation and we never used the word “purely marine” in this section. The sentence was replaced by this “The highest concentration of WSON was observed on 3 August (Fig. 4), when the air mass back trajectory indicate marine origin although influence from continental sources (dust) cannot be totally ruled out (Fig. 3b).

The authors have a good point that a coarse mode nss-Ca⁺ concentration of ~3 nmol/m³ is relatively small compared to what one would expect if dust were a substantial component. Out of curiosity, what was the filter color for that day? If reddish-tan dust was not visually apparent on the filter, that would be another way to strengthen the argument that dust was not present in high concentrations. One way or another, in the revised sentence above, I'd change “(dust)” to (e.g., dust), because some influence of other aerosol sources cannot be ruled out either.

The authors did not answer my question of how the WSON-ssSO₄ plot would look if this anomalous data point were removed because of possible interference from dust concentrations. I wish this had been done, as it would have made it easier for me to evaluate the strength of their argument.

South Atlantic: p. 11371, l. 3: “When the ship crossed the episode- A area (Fig. 6), air masses had pure marine origin with extremely low BC levels.....” First, there was no clear definition for how a sample was determined to be “pure marine,” so it is important to define that in the methods section.

As far as I can tell though, in the South Atlantic a “pure marine” sample was defined from a combination of back trajectories, BC concentrations, and DMS levels, and at the other two sites, “pure marine” was defined only back trajectories. At minimum, that inconsistency should be noted and discussed. However, for the following reasons, I don't think the authors really have the basis to define air masses “pure marine” based on their current criteria anyway, and I strongly suggest rewording the sections that contain this phrase.

We agree with reviewer's comment "there was no clear definition for how a sample was determined to be "pure marine". In his work in Science, Andreae et al., (2007) suggested that, "Aerosol concentrations approaching pristine conditions are mostly found over the oceans, especially in the Southern Hemisphere, where large expanses of open ocean and a low density of population and industry contribute to keeping the human impact at minimum. The natural aerosol over these remote ocean regions consists mainly of a mixture of sea salt particles, organics, and sulfates from the oxidation of biogenic dimethylsulfide; some mineral dust and smoke from wildfires may also be present". The text with the reference was inserted in the manuscript.

For Amsterdam Island the definition of "pure marine" is not based only on trajectories but also on the extremely low levels of anthropogenic tracers such as BC and CO measured there (See also in the manuscript; page 11366, line 8-12). "The pristine marine conditions prevailing at Amsterdam Island and the very low level of local contamination from the scientific base have been documented for many atmospheric compounds such as CO, hydrocarbons, radon, black carbon and total aerosol number concentration (Williams et al., 2001, Sciare et al., 2009)." Finally as we understand that definition of "pure marine" is a subtle issue for this reason the phrase "pure marine" was replaced by the phrase "pristine oceanic"

Perhaps I should clarify. I was hoping the authors could clearly state the quantitative values of BC, CO, etc. used to call an air mass "pure marine" for each site, and since the data for this classification was not consistent between sites, it would have been good if authors had actually discussed what the differences were in the text and how that might influence the results. The above quote from Andreae et al. (2007), which essentially says that clean conditions are often, but not always, found in the S. Hemisphere, does not clarify the methods, nor does changing the term "pure marine" to "pristine oceanic". The original sentence (page 11366, line 8-12) that the authors point back to in their response is generally helpful for the one site it relates to (Amsterdam Island), but it still does not provide quantitative information for any of the sites.

Regarding the terms "pure" and "pristine": both imply that there were no other aerosol sources other than marine. The authors should either prove they had a good way to ensure that these terms are accurate, or find a more suitable description for the air masses being described.

First, back trajectories alone are problematic because air masses are constantly mixing and the older the back trajectory, the more error there is. For example, at least one of the other days in the tropical North Atlantic that was defined as having a "pure marine" source from a back trajectory actually likely had another significant dust WSON source (see my point in the comment above). The BC criteria, meanwhile, were unspecified and unsubstantiated. Please quantitatively define what is meant in the sentence above by "extremely low BC levels" and also please define the cutoffs that constituted "pure marine" air.

"extremely low BC levels" come from the comparison of that concentration with the

whole sampling period, however the phrase "extremely low BC levels" was replaced with the phrase "lower BC levels (11.1 ± 15.7 ng/m³) comparing with the average concentration observed during the sampling period (27.2 ± 15.7 ng/m³)"

Ok

While using BC as a tracer is helpful, it must be used in combination with other components before calling an air mass "pure marine". For example, dust is known to occur in the Southern Hemisphere (e.g., Johnson et al., 2010, Gasso et al. 2010; Gaiero et al., 2013) and that cannot be accounted for from BC alone. If DMS concentrations were also used to determine "pure marine" samples, that method would also be flawed, because while high DMS concentrations do indicate that an air mass passed over productive marine DMS sources, they don't tell one what other sources of WSON might be in the air mass concurrently.

This issue was addressed above and pure marine is now replaced by "pristine oceanic"

I don't see how this issue was addressed above- pure marine means the same thing as pristine oceanic, and the reader is still left not knowing whether dust could have influenced the sample. One way they could address this concern is by looking at satellite or lidar observations, or qualitatively observing filter color, or providing nss-Ca concentrations if they are available, for example. Alternatively, if none of those options are available or acceptable to the authors, they can change the wording from pristine oceanic to something less specific.

The three following points below are related to this issue:

South Atlantic: p. 11371, l. 1: "The evaluation of biogenic activity as primary source of atmospheric organic nitrogenous compounds was based on DMS, since it is considered as an indicator of marine biological activity (Sciare et al., 1999)." As mentioned, while DMS can indicate biological activity, it cannot be used to assess whether biological activity is the main source of WSON.

We agree with the reviewer and the sentence was corrected as following "The evaluation of biogenic activity as possible source of atmospheric organic nitrogenous compounds was based"

Ok

South Atlantic: p. 11371, l. 3: "When the ship crossed the episode- A area (Fig. 6), air masses had pure marine origin with extremely low BC levels and the measured WSON average concentration was 11.3 ± 3.3 nmol N m⁻³. These samples presented high average contribution of WSON to TDN (84 %), which indicates an important role of the marine biological activity in the biogeochemical cycle of organic nitrogen." Because the authors have not convincingly shown that there are no other sources of WSON in the air, I don't think they have the basis to claim that the WSON is from a marine source and not some other source.

The sentence was reworded based on the previous discussion as following: “These samples presented high average contribution of WSON to TDN (84 %), which could indicate an important role of the marine biological activity in the biogeochemical cycle of organic nitrogen

Ok, but why not discuss other possible sources? If BC is low, maybe you could check if dust is observable by satellite? If not, that might provide further substantiation for your hypothesis.

South Atlantic: p. 11371, l. 8 and Table 1: “For the samples collected over the middle southern Atlantic atmosphere, which is considered as remote marine area, the average concentration of WSON was much lower (1.1 ± 1.2 nmol N m⁻³) corresponding to 43 % of TDN.” I notice from Fig. 6 that in some parts of these remote regions where WSON is low, DMS concentrations were equally high (e.g., from Jan 23-25) as the DMS levels when WSON levels were high (in the 11.3 ± 3.3 nmol N m⁻³ range). This information casts doubt on the marine WSON source hypothesis.

We already addressed the concerns of the reviewer in the questions above. Note that during this study as influence from remote marine area is considered the period from 26-29 Jan (n=4). The DMS was low during that period (Fig.6), so the phrase "which is considered as remote marine area" was replaced by the phrase "which is considered as remote marine area, with low biogenic activity".

Ok, but the authors should clarify in the text that only these specific days were considered, and they should say why they only considered this subset. I am curious as to why days previous to January 26 were not considered. It would also be nice if they could point out this “remote marine area, with low biogenic activity” in Figure 5 as suggested in the my first review.

Can the authors look at satellite data from this time period to see if there were other recognizable WSON sources during the episode A period?

The authors did not address this question and did not say why they did not.

I am also unclear about which days were binned into “S. Atlantic Ocean, High Chl a marine area” and “middle S. Atlantic, Marine remote” in Table 1 and the samples discussed in the above text from the paper. Please a) clearly define what days were in each period,

This was done, and is ok

b) indicate on Figure 5 where remote vs. non-remote days were located,

This suggestion was not addressed, and the authors gave no reason for not doing so.

and c) explain the criteria for this binning. Based on Fig. 5, much of the cruise took place in high Chl a regions, and so I am unsure why the authors separated out “High Chl a”

and “remote” periods, and I also think the term “High Chl a” in Table 1 might be a bit misleading. An alternative wording could be “Highest Chl a period”?

The discrimination was based on the concentration levels of DMS and not on the levels of Chl-a. The changes have been done accordingly in Table 1.

If the discrimination was based on the concentration levels of DMS and not on the levels of Chl-a, then why were the two periods described in the new Table 1 as “marine remote” and “marine area with highest Chl a period”? Can the authors please actually specify that “discrimination was based on the concentration levels of DMS and not on the levels of Chl-a” in the text and specifically describe what DMS concentration cutoffs were used to discriminate between “marine remote” and “marine area with highest Chl a period” in Table 1? I find this wording confusing, and probably some other readers will be confused as well unless this is clarified.

Regarding the binning, how did the authors deal with days with low WSON but high DMS - were these days included or excluded, and why?

This point was not satisfactorily addressed

For Fig. 5, (this is only a suggestion), it would be interesting to plot SeaWiFS Chl a along the track against WSON, DMS, and BC; that might make it easier for the reader to understand why the authors binned the days as they did.

WSON (nmol N m ⁻³)	Location	Sampling period	D _a (μm)	Fine	% to TDN	D _a (μm)	Coarse	% to TDN
North Hemisphere								
E. Mediterranean *	Marine with anthropogenic influence	2005-2006 (n=65)	PM _{1.3}	11.6±1 4.0	13	PM _{1.3-10}	5.5±3.9	13
Tropic Atlantic Ocean	Marine with Sahara dust influence	16 Jul-4 Aug 2006 (n=18)	<2	0.9±1	5	>2	6.3±3.8	14
South Hemisphere								
S. Atlantic Ocean	marine area with highest Chl a period	30-31 Jan 2007(n=4)	PM _{2.5}	11.3±3 .3	84	-	-	-
middle S. Atlantic	Marine remote	26-29 Jan 2007(n=4)	PM _{2.5}	0.8±1. 1	43	-	-	-
Indian Ocean (Amsterdam Isl.)	Marine remote	2005 (n=42)	PM _{2.5}	0.8±1. 4	32	PM _{2.5-10}	0.2±0.4	35

Suggestion not taken, but that is ok given that they were not discriminating based on Chl a.

Amsterdam Island: p. 11372, l. 18: “Significant correlation was also found between coarse mode MS and coarse mode WSON ($r^2 = 0.9$, $p < 0.0001$, $N = 10$) during summer period.” Based on the detection limits (DL) listed in the methods, it seems that the DL for WSON should be greater than ~ 0.64 nmol N/m³ (as ~ 0.64 nmol N/m³ appears to be the

DL for TDN). That excludes all but 2 of the coarse sample values during the summer period as best I can tell based on Fig. 8. Therefore I think any correlations with MS for these samples are probably not valid. Plus, in Figure 8, I only see 6 samples of coarse WSON during the austral summer. Perhaps the symbols are hidden and there are more samples than I can discern (in which case the authors should change Fig. 8 so that they are more visible), but either way please check consistency here as N=10 was listed in the text.

We agree with the reviewer's comments and the discrimination between summer and winter was better clarified in the figure 8 to better indicate the number of samples.

That is good, but since the authors did not show the new figure, or the revised text, I have no way of evaluating their response here. How many samples are we now comparing, n=10 or n=6? Either way, see my point below.

On the other hand, there is no real detection limit for WSON as TDN and the inorganic species were always present in our samples in significant amounts. It is clear that the correlation is based on a number of points with low WSON but we don't see how this can invalidate the relation between MS and WSON.

Regarding their point that "there is no real detection limit for WSON" – that is simply not true. Since $WSON = TDN - inorganic\ N$, their detection limit is at least the maximum of the detection limit of TDN (~0.64 nmol N/m³) or inorganic N, but most people would determine the detection limit of a derived property as the square root of the detection limits of it's components: $(DL_{TDN})^2 + (DL_{inorganic\ N})^2$, which would make the DL of WSON larger than that of just that of TDN alone. In Fig. 8, WSON concentrations are very low (nearly always <1 nmol/m³, near the likely detection limits). Clearly, trying to get a correlation from values below their detection limits is invalid. And their point that most of the TDN is from inorganics makes it even more clear that one would expect there to be a large error in determining WSON correctly, as the majority of the TDN signal would be not from WSON but from inorganic N.

Amsterdam Island: p. 11372, l. 15: "The fine mode WSON was found to correlate significantly with fine mode MS- ($r^2 = 0.7, p < 0.01, N = 9$) during austral summer, implying that probably part of WSON was produced secondary from biogenic marine precursors, following similar production mechanism with MSA." Please plot the data.

They did not plot the data, so I cannot evaluate the statement

Again, beware correlation and causation issues. Because of the small sample size, I would change "implying that probably part of WSON was produced secondary from biogenic marine precursors" to "implying that part of WSON might have been produced secondarily from biogenic marine precursors"

Following reviewer's suggestion the phrase was changed accordingly.

Ok

Amsterdam Island: Figure 10: what is the thin yellow line?

It is clear to me now that the yellow line was a hangover from the paper that this plot originally came from directly (Sciare et al., 2009, see my “One more note” original review). The authors said they would correct Figure 5, but they did not say how (i.e., whether they would now correctly gain permissions to use this figure, or whether they would make a new plot). Please specify that.

Did all upwind air pass through the dotted box, or is that only typical? Why didn't the authors do back trajectories like with the other two sites in the Atlantic? Are the data shown in Fig. 10 averaged for all of January (if so, please state that)?

Details on Amsterdam Island climatology can be found in Miller et al., 1993, now referenced in the manuscript) and from this work it is clear that the southwest sector (100°-250°) dominates much of the year.

Yes, but what about during your study in particular? Climatology is not always representative of sampling conditions.

There still seems to be relatively high chlorophyll a upwind, so the low WSON seems to conflict with the suggestion that local marine sources are a large or dominant source of WSON in the S. Atlantic.

Relation between chlorophyll amounts and WSON levels at both Amsterdam Island and the S. Atlantic is not easy to make on the basis only of chlorophyll levels. For instance, information on the dominant phytoplankton species at both areas as well as on the relation between Chlorophyll and WSON are clearly needed. All this information is out of the scope of this manuscript.

But if that is the case, what makes DMS so different? DMS is not a direct source of WSON, but you use that as an indicator in other sites?

Other suggestions/comments (in no particular order) are listed as follows:

p. 11370, l. 11: “Two main episodes of phytoplankton blooms were encountered during the sampling period. These are clearly seen in Fig. 5, which depicts the chlorophyll a map derived from SeaWiFS satellite retrievals (<http://disc.sci.gsfc.nasa.gov/giovanni>) and referred to monthly average values (January 2007). The episode-A encountered by the ship over two days (30–31 January) and the episode-B began on 1 February and was followed until the end of the cruise.” First, I am unclear about why the authors differentiated between episodes in the first place. The first episode was said to occur from Jan. 30-31, and the next bloom started on Feb. 1 (the very next day), and went to the end of the cruise. So what is the scientific reason to differentiate between episodes a and b?

The second bloom was under the influence of continental air mass at the day of sampling.

Please state this in the text.

On the map the bloom looks essentially contiguous, with the low point in chlorophyll a values present only because the ship went temporarily outside of the bloom. Also, wouldn't February be a better month to average Chl a over for Fig. 5 since that is when the blooms were, primarily? As an aside, when I tried to recreate Figure 5 from Giovanni (which is where the authors listed that they got the data), I got a slightly different looking picture with better data coverage (see Figure 4 in supplement attached). I wonder why this difference occurred? It could be possible that Giovanni altered something between when the authors downloaded the data and when I did? Either way, since now a version is available with better data coverage, perhaps the authors should use the more comprehensive data to overlay the cruise track instead?

Or even better yet, they could obtain the values of satellite-derived chlorophyll a that coincide with the cruise track and plot those below Fig. 5. That would be a lot easier on the reader to interpret the location and strength of the blooms. Just a suggestion.

Following reviewer's suggestion the picture was changed accordingly.

Accordingly how? Can I please see the figure?

p. 11369, l. 14: "Almost 86% of WSON was found in the coarse mode atmospheric particles, denoting the important role of dust as a primary source of organic nitrogenous[compounds]." What evidence is there for dust being a primary rather than secondary source of WSON? Mace et al., 2003 presented the hypothesis that dust WSON might actually come mostly from adsorbed pollution, and this hypothesis has since been supported by subsequent studies (e.g., Zamora et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2013). Because the authors also mention that nss-SO₄ was present, it seems possible that the WSON might have been from pollution mixed in with the dust rather than having dust itself be the primary source. There were multiple other places in addition to the ones listed above where correlations were used to infer causation. I'd like to see more care being taken throughout the paper to reword these instances and to frame the interpretation with greater ambiguity. I also suggest adding figures plotting the data for any important correlations discussed in the paper.

The sentences provided by the reviewer "Mace et al., 2003 presented the hypothesis that dust WSON might actually come mostly from adsorbed pollution, and this hypothesis has since been supported by subsequent studies (e.g., Violaki et al., 2010b, Zamora et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2013)" as well as the relevant references were added in the manuscript.

Ok

While it appears that the methods for each study are sound, they are different for each of the sites. There were different collection filters (Teflon vs. quartz), collection methods (denuder vs. cascade impactor), desorption techniques (ultrasound vs. soft shaking), and pore size of extract filter (0.2 μm vs. 0.45 μm vs. unlisted for S. Atlantic (please do list this in the next version)). In the next version, please briefly discuss these differences and their potential impact on site intercomparison discussed

We totally agree with the reviewer and a sentence on that direction was added in the manuscript where the results of table 1 are presented. “Note the different sample substrate and the different cut-offs used in the data presented at Table 1 which have an impact on the comparison between the various sites”. Note however that:

- 1) Although the results reported in the literature for WSON are not collected or analyzed using uniform techniques (actually there are no recommendations for WSON sampling and analysis) a comparison is always performed in every publication.
- 2) The main difference between our results could only come from filter media (Teflon vs Quartz) as the differences in cut-offs or filter porosity is very small. In addition based on tests performed in our laboratory no difference has been observed between extraction using ultrasound vs. soft shaking. Quartz Filters were only used during the Meteor cruise.

Ok

in section 4.p. 11369 line 15: “No correlation was found with inorganic nitrogen, indicating different sources.” No correlation with what? A dust tracer? Inorganic N? Any of the other tracer compounds? Please be more specific.

No correlation was found with either NO₃⁻ or NH₄⁺

Please clarify that in the text. Also, just because there is not correlation of WSON with NO₃ or NH₄ does not mean that they have different sources if their losses were at different rates (e.g., adsorption to or chemical reaction with larger particles).

p. 11369: the information from the first paragraph would be clearer and easier for the reader to digest if organized in a Table.

All the relevant information regarding WSON (the main focus of the work) exists in Table 1

p. 11371, second paragraph: This could also be better summarized in a table I think.

All the relevant information regarding WSON (the main focus of the work) exists in Table 1

Technical corrections:

Section 2.1.2, l. 13.a low volume aerosol sampler placed on [the] prow of the research vessel

It was corrected.

Ok

p. 11365, l. 23:” Samples were stored at the ship in the freezer (4°C) till the laboratory analysis.” Did the authors mean in the freezer -4 degrees, or in the refrigerator at 4 degrees?

The samples were stored in the refrigerator; It was corrected accordingly.

Ok

Figure 1. The figure seems to indicate that Finokalia is a sampling site, which is a bit misleading. Perhaps better would be to distinguish between sites sampled in this study, and those discussed in context later by using different symbols and adding explanation of the symbols in the caption.

The legend of Fig.1 was changed as: Sampling sites around the world during this study. Finokalia station is used for comparison reasons.

Ok

p. 11367 l. 13, please define LSCE

LSCE: Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement

Ok

p. 11369 L. 4 and Table 1 caption, please define in the paper “D” and “Da” (aerosol diameter I presume), and make them consistent with each other throughout the paper.

D was replaced with Da

Ok

Table 1 and Figures 2 and 4 captions, and throughout the text: I suggest changing North Atlantic to tropical North Atlantic. Or, samples were really only taken in the eastern part of the tropical N. Atlantic, being even more specific about the location.

"North Atlantic" was changed to "tropical North Atlantic"

Ok

Table 1: I find the titles of the columns to be confusing. Why are there 2 columns with the title “D (µm)”? I guess to show the cutoffs between “coarse” and “fine” mode fractions? But if that is the case, why is the “% to TDN” (which is also confusing wording to me but which I think means % contribution to TDN) less than 100% when coarse and fine are added together? Rewriting/reorganizing these columns so that they are clearer would be helpful to the reader.

Reorganization of table 1 was done following reviewer’s suggestions.

Ok

Fig. 6: is the Jan 21 sample taken over more than 24 hours (since the cruise started on the 19th?)

Although cruise started on the 19th, first sample was collected 2 days later. The average sampling resolution was 12 hours.

Ok

p. 11369 lines 12 and 14: did the authors mean to say, “organic nitrogenous compounds” in this sentence?

We mean both organic and inorganic N species.

Ok, can that please be specified in the text?

p. 11372. Methanesulfonate is defined (twice) as MS, but then the authors use MS-later. Please be consistent.

MS was replaced with MS-

Ok

p. 11372, l. 10: “During austral summer increased concentrations of MS were observed that can be linked to a similar increase of marine productivity.” Reference?

The reference Sciare et al., (2009) was inserted.

Ok

p. 11372, last paragraph: I think the authors can get rid of this paragraph as it does not add much to the main point.

We kept this paragraph as reviewer 1 asked for clarifications of the origin of BC in this location and we believe it will also help the reader to better understand the Figs. 8 & 9.

Ok

References

Gaiero, D. m., Simonella, L., Gassó, S., Gili, S., Stein, A. f., Sosa, P., Becchio, R., Arce, J. and Marelli, H.: Ground/satellite observations and atmospheric modeling of duststorms originating in the high Puna-Altiplano deserts (South America): Implications for the interpretation of paleo-climatic archives, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmospheres*, 118(9), 3817–3831, doi:10.1002/jgrd.50036, 2013.

Gassó, S., Stein, A., Marino, F., Castellano, E., Udisti, R. and Ceratto, J.: A combined observational and modeling approach to study modern dust transport from the Patagonia desert to East Antarctica, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 10(17), 8287–8303,

doi:10.5194/acp-10- 8287-2010, 2010.

Johnson, M. S., Meskhidze, N., Kiliyanpilakkil, V. P. and Gassó, S.: Understanding the transport of Patagonian dust and its influence on marine biological activity in the South Atlantic Ocean, *AtmosChemPhys*, 11(6), 2487–2502, doi:10.5194/acp-11-2487-2011, 2011. Lesworth, T., Baker, A. R. and Jickells, T.: Aerosol organic nitrogen over the remote Atlantic Ocean, *Atmos. Environ.*, 44(15), 1887–1893, 2010.

Mace, K. A., Kubilay, N. and Duce, R. A.: Organic nitrogen in rain and aerosol in the eastern Mediterranean atmosphere: An association with atmospheric dust, *J. Geophys. Res.- Atmospheres*, 108(D10) 2003. Wang, G. H., Zhou, B. H., Cheng, C. L., Cao, J. J., Li, J. J., Meng, J. J., Tao, J., Zhang, R. J. and Fu, P. Q.: Impact of Gobi desert dust on aerosol chemistry of Xi'an, inland China during spring 2009: differences in composition and size distribution between the urban ground surface and the mountain atmosphere, *AtmosChemPhys*, 13(2), 819–835, doi:10.5194/acp-13-819-2013, 2013.C5062

Zamora, L. M., Prospero, J. M. and Hansell, D. A.: Organic nitrogen in aerosols and precipitation at Barbados and Miami: Implications regarding sources, transport and deposition to the western subtropical North Atlantic, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 116(D20), D20309, doi:10.1029/2011JD015660, 2011.