



Supplement of

Aerosol and dynamical contributions to cloud droplet formation in Arctic low-level clouds

Ghislain Motos et al.

Correspondence to: Ghislain Motos (ghislain.motos@epfl.ch) and Athanasios Nenes (athanasios.nenes@epfl.ch)

The copyright of individual parts of the supplement might differ from the article licence.

1 Supplement







Figure S2. Comparison between wind LiDAR and uSonic 1-hour grouped data over all simultaneous measurement periods.



11 12 13 14 15 Figure S3. a): Time series of daily-averaged hygroscopicity parameter κ as derived from filterpack, high-volume sampler and aethalometer data (in dark red) and from ACSM (PM1) and aethalometer data (in blue). b): Scatterplot of dailyaveraged ACSM-derived versus filterpack-derived particle hygroscopicity value κ over the whole campaign, coloured by date.

10







19 20 21 22 23 24 Figure S4. Time series of a) measured updraft velocity σ_w , predicted potential b) maximum cloud supersaturation S_{max} , c) cloud droplet number concentration N_d and d) particle activation diameter D_{act} at the Zeppelin station over the whole NASCENT campaign. N_d , S_{max} and D_{act} are constrained by measurements of σ_w , whose values (after analysis as described in Sect 3.2) are shown at the top of both panels. These results are direct outputs of the cloud droplet formation parameterization presented in Sect. 3.2.







27 28 29 30 Figure S5. Sensitivity analysis showing the mean seasonal percent change of predicted potential maximum cloud supersaturation S_{max} , cloud droplet number concentration N_{d} and particle activation diameter D_{act} assuming that half of the aerosol mass consists of sea salt. Error bars represent the standard deviation around the seasonal mean.

