

Interactive comment on “Estimating neutral nanoparticle steady state size distribution and growth according to measurements of intermediate air ions” by H. Tammet et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 11 June 2013

The arguments in this article are well constructed. I honestly do not have any suggestion for further correction. Authors have the best technology in the world to measure the small and intermediate ions, and there are a very few group in the world who can carry out the measurements of these charged species. Authors use the average of the measured ion-mobility distributions during the sampling period; therefore, the results do not give any insights on the variations of the GR and J among different days or seasons. Authors are encouraged to obtain the statistical information on the GR and J during the quiet periods and compare with those during the burst periods. I also hope that authors would not exclude the possibility of the GR has negative values as well. As

C3516

the authors would already realizes, the authors are encouraged to take advantage of the well-established aerosol instruments for directly measuring the particle size distribution of total particles in 3-500 nm range. It was a bit awkward that authors indirectly estimate the value of N_{50-500} and $n_0(d)$ from the ion-mobility distributions.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 13, 13519, 2013.

C3517