

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Flight-based chemical characterization of biomass burning aerosols within two prescribed burn smoke plumes” by K. A. Pratt et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 17 September 2011

This paper presents a thorough physico-chemical analysis of a smoke plume from prescribed burns over Wyoming, USA. Measurements were taken from the interception of the NSF/NCAR C-130 aircraft with two different fire plumes during the ICE-L study. A suite of instrumentation was onboard the aircraft for aerosol single particle and bulk analysis, EC/OC analysis, as well as CCN and IN measurements.

This is a well written and clearly structured paper which presents new and interesting results. The topic of the paper is well in the scope of ACP, and I recommend the paper for publication in ACP with only a few minor corrections suggested below.

Comments:

C9040

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Tab. 2: I guess the standard deviations are the numbers in parenthesis. If so please more clearly mention that somewhere. Also indicate from which instrument the size thresholds were taken for the analysis. If it was the UHSAS, an instrument later in the text body, please also give an idea to the reader which equivalent particle diameters are given here and how this compares to the vacuum aerodynamic diameters used by the aerosol mass spectrometers. Also please explain where the background concentrations given in Table 2 have been measured, upstream or downstream of the plume area.

p.7, l.165: I wonder how the volume distribution was calculated from the UHSAS data which is an optical single particle counter. If this was done for the smoke plume particles, it should be explained, how the actual geometric diameter was calculated from the optical diameter for the probably rather irregular smoke particles, and how accurate or uncertain this conversion is. Or do you refer here to lab studies with standard aerosols of known shape and refractive index?

p.9, l.196: Should be subsection 2.5, because preceding section already is numbered as 2.4

p.9, l.205: (... in aerodynamic diameter)

p.24, l.550: For the discussion of the ice nuclei (IN) results in comparison to the parameterisation by DeMott et al. 2010, it seems obvious that the plume situation may not perfectly match the average situation in the troposphere, in particular if one considers the general variability of IN number concentrations. A direct comparison of the IN concentration measured in the plume to the background concentration in the air upstream of the fire may help to quantify the efficiency of fire plume particles as ice nuclei. Was the IN concentration also measured in the background air around the fire plume? Was the IN concentration really enhanced in the plume or was it even diminished. The latter could happen if the plume somehow chemically processes and deactivates ambient IN and the fire does not emit IN.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

For further studies close to sources like fires it may be worth putting some more emphasis in the analysis of the background conditions, in particular upstream of the fire place. The aircraft studies may also be complemented by ground-based measurements upstream of the fire place.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 11, 17507, 2011.

ACPD

11, C9040–C9042, 2011

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C9042

