Editorial comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. This language is still unclear in places; please proofread, ideally by a fluent English speaker. | Please find edited full article. |
| 2. Your explanation of the flow rate (“optimized to each instrument by aerodynamic calculation and design”) is vague and not very helpful to researchers who would like to adapt this to their own equipment. Please explain in the text how to optimize flow rate, if only by reference to previous work or to product literature; this could be added as a ‘note’ after, e.g., 1.1.2. | As for sampling of ambient air we usually follow the method issued by EPA.  For detail please refer document entitled “Compendium Method IO-2.2  SAMPLING OF AMBIENT AIR FOR PM10 USING AN ANDERSEN  DICHOTOMOUS SAMPLER” |
| 3. 1.1.1: You have still not clearly explained how you know that there was no contamination of PM proteins and peptide; please explain within the text or using a reference. Also, what does “3-NT content in the quartz filter was under detection limit by the following method” mean? Is the ‘method’ the HPLC-ECD method? | Basically, ECD system detecting redox potential by using the nitro group is reduced to an amino group and further oxidized to an imino group. So, it is necessary to have the same nitro group in order to be detected in this system. For these reasons, it is considered that the possibility of detecting substances other than 3-NT at the same retention time in PM is low. Actually, in our previous analysis, nitrophenylalanine could be divided from nitrotyrosine by HPLC-ECD method, even these two substrates have similar structure. Moreover, at HPLC-ECD analysis of human serum sample that contain lot of unexpected factors, we could not detect 3-NT. [Hitomi et al., J Biochem, 2007]. |
| 4. Figure 5: I saw the explanation of which regions showed a linear relationship, but how good is this relationship (e.g., R-squared)? | R-squared value showed 0.995. We added it into figure 5. |