Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 12, C9636–C9637, 2012
www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/12/C9636/2012/

Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions

Interactive comment on "No statistically significant effect of a short-term decrease in the nucleation rate on atmospheric aerosols" *by* E. M. Dunne et al.

N. M. Donahue (Editor)

nmd@andrew.cmu.edu

Received and published: 20 November 2012

I strongly urge the authors to abandon the use of "CN" in favor of "N". When I was first exposed to the particle field it took some time to figure out the difference between "CCN" and "CN" and even longer to figure out why "CN" were "C"N. Of course, the "CN" refers to condensation of a working fluid with sufficient supersaturation to grow particles to a size where optical detection is facile, but that is a working definition for an instrument. Non aerosol readers may not know this. I see no reason to retain the term, especially in a modeling study where the reported values are surely the total number greater than some cut size obtained with a perfect cutoff curve. Please, use

N_{10} instead of CN_{10}...

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 12, 15373, 2012.

ACPD

12, C9636–C9637, 2012

Interactive Comment