Atmospheric
Chemistry
and Physics
Discussions

Open Access

EGU

Interactive
Comment

# *Interactive comment on* "Aerosol measurements at a high elevation site: composition, size, and cloud condensation nuclei activity" *by* B. Friedman et al.

**B. Friedman et al.**

bfriedma@uw.edu

Received and published: 15 October 2013

We thank Referee #2 for reading the manuscript and providing helpful comments; below we provide responses to each comment individually.

The authors measure CCN concentrations, single particle composition and particle size distributions of aerosol sampled at the Storm Peak Laboratory field site. The data set is grouped by different sources; biomass burning, organics, soot, and seasalt. The authors find that sulfate which dominates the composition plays a large role in determining the overall hygroscopicity. New Particle Events, modify the particle number,

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

and thus change CCN concentration. The article is appropriate for ACP. The title aptly describes the article content. The language and writing are straight forward. Concerns about the article are listed below.

Concerns. P18285 L 24. How is POA defined? What instrument is used to define the amount of unsaturated hydrocarbons? Is Unit mass resolution data used to define this property? And at which peak? Or is it multiple likely unsaturated peaks? The analysis and identification of this fraction is not clear.

**Individual particle mass spectra acquired by SPLAT II were classified using SpectraMiner [Zelenyuk et al., 2006], based on all 450 mass spectral peak intensities. The POA class exhibits high intensities at m/z 41, 43, 55, 57, and 69 that are observed by our instrument in reference mass spectra of laboratory-generated aerosol standards.

P18284. L25 The authors write, "CCN concentrations follow the overall aerosol particle concentration, with high variability at higher supersaturation, as smaller particles are able to activate. The two concepts in this sentence are somewhat confusing and opposing. As written, the sentence would suggest that there is higher variability in the correlation of CCN concentrations to total particle number at high supersaturations. But at higher supersaturations the ratio of CCN to CN should become closer to one and CCN will follow CN closely. Hence, why variability at high supersaturation? Perhaps the authors could clarify.

**We show that the variability at higher supersaturations is due to the high number concentration of small particles where CCN does follow CN closely at higher supersaturations but there exists high variability in CN. We do not believe the two concepts are in opposition but we do acknowledge the original statement was confusing. We have changed this sentence to "CCN concentrations follow the overall aerosol particle concentration, with higher variability at higher supersaturations due to the variability in the total aerosol concentration and as smaller particles are able to activate"for clarity.

If I understand correctly, the authors define their CCN activity by the ratio of CCN

C8026

measured with the DMT CCN counter divided by the number of particles greater than 80nm (P18286). This definition is problematic and somewhat misleading. By P18289 the authors acknowledge the issues and state "we hypothesize that particles smaller than 80 nm are able to act as CCN". I would suggest it is not a hypothesis but a reality skewing the interpretation of CCN activity results. One can do a quick back of the envelope calculation, let's assume the particle is entirely sulfate then at 0.12, 0.22, and 0.42% supersaturation the d_crit is somewhere near 90, 75, and 50 nm. If sulfate is a CCN activity driver at this site then particles below 80nm will be counted as CCN. Why not use total counts from the SMPS? Even though the SPLAT cannot see below 80nm, the activity of the entire distribution of particles is just as important (especially since the CCN counter is activating particles in this range).

**We chose to plot the CCN activity of larger particles as the overall CCN activated fraction (CCN/totalCN) is dominated by the number of very small particles, the majority of which are not relevant to cloud activation. Further, the number of very small particles obscures the trends at the lower supersaturations, where chemical composition is more important to cloud activation. We believe the ratio of CCN to CN>80nm emphasizes the most atmospherically relevant and meaningful data. This has been clarified in the text (section 3.2, paragraph 3).

Furthermore, as a reader the importance of this developed fraction is not clear. If the authors wish to continue publishing this fraction, I would suggest including a paragraph emphasizing that it is difficult to use Splat II mixing state above 80nm to infer CCN activation properties below 80nm. I would also suggest explaining the utility of this fraction versus conventional total CCN counts.

**A sentence emphasizing the importance of using this activated fraction to compare to SPLAT measurements has been added into section 3.2, where the activated fraction >80nm was originally defined.

**References:

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

Zelenyuk, A., Imre, D., Cai, Y., Mueller, K., Han, Y., Imrich, P.: SpectraMiner, an Interactive Data Mining and Visualization Software for Single Particle Mass Spectroscopy: A Laboratory Test Case, Int. J. Mass Spectrom., 258 (1-3), 58-73, 2006.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 13, 18277, 2013.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper