Dear ACP editor office,

I am writing to express my great concern to the decision that the editor made to the recent ACP submission, ACP2020-553 which is now posted online (<https://acp.copernicus.org/preprints/acp-2020-553/>). As a reviewer, I don’t think that this manuscript provides sufficient new findings to be considered by ACP for publication. I am copying part of my comments below for editor office as a reference.

“The method and data used in study are nothing special (see P96-152), and most of the discussions or analyses on interactions between ARF and the ABL presented in this study are not new except for one point that is proposed as an useful indicator in the quantitative assessment of such interactions. However, the threshold value (55 W·m2) identified is highly relied on the modeling and cases studies. An evaluation of model calculations against observational data is not provided. In addition, the authors overstate the novelty and importance of this study, which may cause a misleading to the reviewers and future readers. For instance, the authors claimed that “the relation between particulate matter (PM) pollution and atmospheric boundary layer (ABL) structure is not fully understood because most studies have been superficial” (L13-15). How can the authors say that other studies are “superficial”? Please provide specific examples. They also pointed out “this paper is the first to analyze the interaction between the ABL structure and air pollution using high-resolution and real-observation datasets, such as …” (L87-91). To my knowledge, this is NOT true. The only explanation is that the authors have not completed a careful reference survey on this research topic or other related ones.”

I haven’t received a point-by-point response letter. Instead, I was surprised that the editor made a decision of “minor revision” without considering reviewer’s comments. I feel that the editor can make his decision without considering peer-review comments. If that is the case, why did the editor send the manuscript to us for review? I have completed review tasks to many peer-reviewed journals. This is the first time that I met this issue without receiving enough respects as a reviewer. ACP is one of the top journals in the field of atmospheric chemistry and physics. Many of my colleagues including me want to get their research results published by ACP. I want to get an explanation by the editor why he made a decision of “minor revision”. To be clear, I do not have any research conflict with all the authors since I do not know or meet any of them.

I am attaching my review report for your reference.

Thanks for providing me a chance to review the ACP manuscript.

Jianping