

Interactive comment on “Dust ice nuclei effects on cirrus clouds” by M. Kuebbeler et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 14 September 2013

Kuebbeler et al. present a study of dust IN on cirrus clouds by using the ECHAM5-HAM GCM. They consider multiple heterogeneous freezing modes and compare these to homogeneous nucleation (no dust IN effect). This takes into account coating state of the aerosol since uncoated particles would be possible depositional nuclei; in this way laboratory data help motivate this study. There is furthermore a comparison made to aircraft data where the GCM results compare well with in situ measurements. This is a timely topic and certainly one of interest to the ACP readership. The authors have performed an important study and one that certainly moves the field forward. The utilization of laboratory and field data makes for a more important results.

I have minor comments; this paper otherwise should be published in ACP.

1. The statement “In recent years field observations have reported about persistent high supersaturations above the homogeneous freezing threshold outside of cirrus. . .”

C6915

with references to Jensen et al 2005 and Peter et al 2006 really is outdated; since that time substantial work has been done on in cloud humidity measurements and much of this data was incorrectly high. Furthermore, these observations really only exist in the lowest T range of the UT region. Although the point is likely valid there should be a bit more modern references here and acknowledgement that the 05 and 06 papers are likely based on highly uncertain data. 2. Regarding “. . .direct measurements in cirrus clouds remain challenging. . .” I think the authors may want to reference the recent study by Cziczo et al. Clarifying the Dominant Sources and Mechanisms of Cirrus Cloud Formation 2013 here. 3. Regarding the reference to Lohmann and Diehl (2006) for ice nucleation modes can the authors provide more data – perhaps a line per nucleation mode – as opposed to purely referencing? Given the complexity of parameterizing ice nucleation more detail should be contained here. Please also add some detail about how this is integrated with the new cirrus scheme presented in 2.2. Currently it seems there could be overlap in what was presented in Lohmann and Diehl (2006) and what is new. Please clarify. 4. Table 1 : for clarity should present abbreviations here or place later in text after definitions are made (e.g. COMP1, PREEX, etc.). Also, could you please present all values in the same system? – some N given in per l, other in per cc. 5. The choice of 1 uncoated and coated dust IN per l seems rather low abundance in the UT given what is stated later; the referenced work by DeMott et al. would suggest this could be higher by an order of magnitude or more; this paper later quotes 5-20 per l. Similarly, DeMott et al. 2003 presents measurements in dust layers of 1000’s per liter; please explain the choices of 1 and 100 for the exemplary simulations. 6. Figure 1 : Unless I’m missing something you haven’t specified which row is which. I assume the call out is from top down but this should be specified, preferable within the figure and caption (not just the text). 7. It is unclear why two separate ‘Results’ sections are included; a single section with sub-parts would seem the standard format. Further, both Results sections tend to be on the long side. In large part these sections are simply text describing the figures. A careful choice of bullet points could reduce the length greatly without sacrifice of content.

C6916

Editorial:

Please take care with punctuation. I noted several cases where there are issues. As an example "... implying that both, heterogeneous..." (no need for ,). Please do a careful read-through.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 13, 9751, 2013.

C6917