

Referee 1: we thank Referee 1 for his comments and suggestions.

Comment 1: Sections 2.2.3 and 2.3.1: The APi-TOF (Atmospheric Pressure interface-Time Of Flight) mass spectrometer is introduced in this section; however, none of its data is shown, although it is mentioned (end of section 2.2.3) that APi-TOF data was used to derive a proxy for determining the H₂SO₄ concentrations from other parameters like the global radiation, the condensation sink, the RH and the SO₂ concentration. As the values of the sulfuric acid concentrations are crucial for the conclusion that other compounds besides sulfuric acid are required to explain the observed nucleation rates, the evaluation of the [H₂SO₄] deserves much more attention. Several points need to be addressed when reporting H₂SO₄ levels: (i) the empirical factor k was determined from data between January 30 and February 6, which is a rather short time to gain confidence in the derived factor, (ii) it is mentioned that the period between February 10 and February 29 was characterized by unusual cold temperatures, it is therefore questionable if the derived scaling factor is valid under such conditions, and, most importantly (iii) the APi-TOF cannot directly measure the sulfuric acid concentration as it measures only atmospheric ions and not the neutral H₂SO₄ molecules. Previous studies, like the ones cited (Petäjä et al., 2009; Mikkonen et al., 2011) were however deriving scaling factors based on measurements with a chemical ionization mass spectrometer (CIMS), which can measure the neutral [H₂SO₄] and should therefore yield much more reliable approximations. To my knowledge the method of deriving H₂SO₄ values from APi-TOF ion measurements has not been described anywhere in the literature before; therefore a detailed description is required in this manuscript. Furthermore, an evaluation of the deployed methods should be presented, which relies on a side-by-side measurement of an APi-TOF and a CIMS over a certain period. In summary, in order to report any [H₂SO₄] values and use them for the interpretation of the data the methods used to evaluate the sulfuric acid concentrations need to be presented in much greater detail and the authors need to convince the reader that their derived concentrations are accurate enough to be used at all. Detailed error estimates are required as well.

Reply 1: (i) and (ii): It is true that the empirical factor was obtained from a rather short period, but during which atmospheric conditions were very similar to the ones observed during the studied period. Especially, between 30 January and 6 February, temperatures were very low, on average -11.8°C. We clearly believe that the use of this factor gave us the opportunity to work with a proxy adapted to the site and especially to the unusual conditions observed in February 2012. The similarity of the two periods regarding atmospheric conditions is now mentioned in the text. We also strongly believe that the use of this proxy is much more reliable than the use of any other proxy that would be derived from other location/time periods. At last, using one proxy or another is only a matter of scaling factor, and the relative abundance of sulfuric acid from one to the other period would be preserved. Here we only discuss this relative change in the sulfuric acid concentration, and not the absolute values of sulfuric acid.

(iii) Referee is correct that the deriving neutral H₂SO₄ concentration from natural ion concentration is not trivial and not widely reported in literature. In the present study, we follow the method described by (Eisele 1989) to calculate neutral H₂SO₄ concentration based on naturally charged negative ion measurements, more precisely on the relative ion concentrations of NO₃⁻ and HSO₄⁻ ions. Detailed explanation can be found from (Eisele 1989), now referenced in the manuscript. In short, the theory behind is based on observations where NO₃⁻ ion is dominant during most of the time, except when sulphuric acid is present, during these periods, HSO₄⁻ is the dominant naturally charged ion. HSO₄⁻ ion is formed from a reaction between NO₃⁻ and H₂SO₄. It can be assumed that the NO₃⁻ ion acts as a reagent ion in CI-source and the ratio of HSO₄⁻ and NO₃⁻ ion species could be used to estimate the neutral concentration of H₂SO₄. Eisele 1989 used a coefficient (derived from collision frequency, assumed ion life time and reaction rate coefficients) $cc=4.1 \times 10^6$ in Eq 1.

$$[H_2SO_4] = cc \frac{[HSO_4^-] + [HNO_3HSO_4^-]}{[NO_3^-] + [(HNO_3)_1NO_3^-]} \quad \text{Eq1}$$

Due to differences between instruments that Eisele was using and the one used in this study the “calibration” coefficient cannot be used directly. Instead we compared sulphuric acid concentration calculated from naturally charged ion signals to measured sulphuric acid concentration by calibrated CI-API-TOF (Jokinen, et al. 2012). The comparison was done for measurements in Hyytiälä field station (Hari and Kulmala 2005). Comparison of the two concentrations is depicted in Figure 1. From this we obtained a new calibration coefficient for our instrumentation that was 9.7×10^4 .

The methodology is now described in the manuscript.

After adjusting the proxy, the average positive and negative bias between proxy estimations and the Api-Tof derived concentrations were 0.57×10^7 and $-0.97 \times 10^7 \text{ cm}^{-3}$, respectively, which is now also mentioned in the text. This deviation is significantly lower than the differences which are observed between H₂SO₄ averaged concentrations from the three sub-periods, suggesting that the proxy is accurate enough to draw global conclusions concerning the role of H₂SO₄ in the nucleation process during the studied period at the Puy de Dôme.




Figure 1. Sulphuric acid concentration calculated from naturally charged ions (APiTOF) and measured by CI-APiTOF.

Comment 2: Nucleation rates are known to depend strongly on temperature and also on relative humidity in some systems. However, these effects are neglected from the discussion of the observed nucleation rates. Instead, the nucleation rates are discussed mainly in terms of the sulfuric acid concentration and the degree of pollution (condensation sink and black carbon concentration) during NPF. If one compares the temperatures (T) and the relative humidities (RH) of the different sub-periods, at least qualitatively the variation of T and RH can also explain the occurrence of NPF. In my opinion the amount of data is too small to disentangle the effect of all involved parameters unambiguously. This should be explicitly stated.

Reply 2: It is true that a potential effect of temperature and RH on NPF is interesting to discuss. For that purpose, an additional section was added to the manuscript. But, as also suggested by Referee 1, we do believe that the small size of the dataset does not allow a complete multi-component analysis of the effects of the different atmospheric parameters.

The newly added section is reported below:

“3.2.4 A potential additional effect of temperature and relative humidity?”

In the present study, the occurrence of nucleation and the concentration of nucleated clusters have been discussed so far in terms of sulfuric acid concentration and condensation

sink only. However, temperature and relative humidity display significant variations in the course of the measurement period and were previously reported in the literature to have effect on the occurrence of nucleation and on the characteristics of the events (formation rates, cluster concentrations). In fact, low temperatures could favor nucleation, and could in particular explain, together with low CS, the occurrence of NPF in the FT and in the low stratosphere (Young et al., 2007). In contrast, the role of the RH appears to be more equivocal. Numerous observations suggest that nucleation could be favored at low RH (e.g.: Birmili et al., 2003) and both the cluster formation rates (Sihto et al., 2006) and the concentration of freshly formed particles (Jeong et al., 2004) were already reported to be anticorrelated with RH. Nonetheless, NPF events were observed in the vicinity of clouds, where RH often exceeds 90% (Clarke et al., 1998). In a more recent study based on model simulations, Hamed et al. (2011) suggest that high RH impact the amount of solar radiation, and thus the source of condensable species, rather than the sink term.

Thus, it is likely that at the Puy de Dôme, the very low temperatures measured during Period 1 (average -14.24 °C) could explain, at least partly, the occurrence of nucleation, and maybe the intensive formation of neutral clusters compared to Period 3. However, regarding previous observations from the literature, one could have expected less intense NPF events since high RH were simultaneously recorded during Period 1 (90.8%). The opposite trend is observed for the second NPF period, Period 3, which displays increased temperatures (4.96 °C) and decreased RH (51.8 %) compared to Period 1. During Period 2, RH is further decreased (29.3 %) and temperatures remain low (-1.40 °C) but, as previously mentioned, nucleation is not triggered. The previous observations suggest that atmospheric parameters, including temperature, RH, but also sources and sinks, cannot be considered separately. This might be explained by the fact that their effects combine with each other, but the amount of data used in the present study seems to be too small to analyze such combinations or to disentangle the effects of all parameters unambiguously.”

Comment 3: I am not completely convinced, that neutral nucleation dominates to the extent the authors suggest. Taking the data from Table 1, one can calculate the fraction of the ion-induced nucleation (IIN) from the ratio of the ion-induced formation rates ($J_{IIN,1.5} = J_{1.5++} + J_{1.5-}$) and the total formation rates ($J_{1.5tot}$). These fractions are rather low for the first three events (<5%) (all belonging to sub-period 1) but are 49% and 19% for the last two events (both belonging to sub-period 3). If one takes into account the low temperatures during sub-period 1 (-14 °C) and compares this to the temperature during sub-period 3 (+5 °C) another possibility, consistent with the observations, would be that the neutral nucleation pathway dominated due to the lower temperatures (and maybe higher RH). In their revision, the authors should therefore discuss such a possibility. The fact that IIN is compatible with neutral nucleation during sub-period 3 can also be concluded from the data in Table 3 where the concentration of charged nuclei is much higher than the neutral one. Since during sub-period 3 the site was influenced by free tropospheric air (in contrast to sub-period 1) it would be possible that IIN is rather important under these conditions.

Reply 3: In the new version of the manuscript Period 1 and 3 are considered separately:

“Moreover, the average formation rates of total 1.5 nm particles exceeds those of charged particles, especially during Period 1 which displays ion induced nucleation fractions (IIN) lower than 4.3% ($J_{1.5}^{tot} \approx 37 \times J_{1.5}^+$ and $J_{1.5}^{tot} \approx 77 \times J_{1.5}^-$), which is relatively low compared to the average values reported for altitude sites (Boulon et al., 2010; Manninen et al., 2010), and especially for the Puy de Dôme ($12.5 \pm 2.0\%$, Boulon et al., 2011). In contrast, the IIN are higher during Period 3, with a value close to 50% on the 28th of February, suggesting that charged pathways could be promoted in the FT compared to the interface between the BL and the FT. However, besides the height of the BL itself, atmospheric parameters such as temperature and relative humidity display significant variations between the different periods, and could also explain the previous observations (Table 3 and Fig. 4). This potential effect is further discussed in Section 3.2.4.”

Comment 4: page 18356, line 15: following the arguments given in comment (3) 40 times higher neutral nucleation rates are an extreme case because the fraction of IIN can also reach ~50% during observations made in this study; this statement should therefore be revised

Reply 4: As previously mentioned in Reply 3, corrections were made.

Comment 5: page 18358, line 21: remove extra dot before the word “and”

Reply 5: Removed

Comment 6: page 18359, line 5: “Milikan diameters”

Reply 6 : Correction was made.

Comment 7 : page 18359, line 12: “ensures”

Reply 7 : Correction was made.

Comment 8 : page 18359, line 17: the word “further” should be removed

Reply 8: Removed

Comment 9: page 18360, line 4: replace the word “sampling” by “activation of particles”

Reply 9: The word was replaced accordingly.

Comment 10: page 18361, line 7: maybe better to use “deriving” instead of “defining”

Reply 10: It might in fact be better.

Comment 11: page 18361, line 25: Which other trace gases besides SO₂ were measured? Could these measurements give further insight into the origin of air masses?

Reply 11: Trace gases that were measured are CO, O₃ and NO_x. These species provide information on the level of pollution of the air masses rather than on their origin. Time series of NO₂ concentration were added to the manuscript to distinguish between the BL and the FT. CO was added to supply the lack of BC data during period 3.

Comment 12: page 18363, line 4: there is something wrong with the unit of k, it should be m²W⁻¹s⁻¹

Reply 12: Of course, correction was made.

Comment 13: page 18364, line 18: The particle concentration in the size range between 1 and 2.5 nm could also include sub-critical particles (the authors mention that the critical size is somewhere close to 1.5 nm in the introduction). If the PSM was operating in scanning mode it should also be possible to provide a number concentration for particles between 1.5 and 2.5 nm. Do the authors have evidence that a size of 1 nm is above the critical diameter?

Reply 13: It is true that the PSM was operating in a scanning mode. However concentrations in each sub-classes were very noisy, maybe due to the unusual atmospheric conditions, and did not allow further analysis of the cluster size distribution.

Comment 14: page 18364, equation (5) and page 18365, equation (6): Shouldn't the denominator in the third term on the RHS of the equations contain the width of the size bin N1-2.5, which is 1.5 nm instead of 1 nm?

Reply 14: Referee is of course right but this is only a typing error, correct equations were used for the calculations.

Comment 15: page 18366, lines 27 and 28: "ion concentrations"

Reply 15: The sentence was slightly changed but correction was made.

Comment 16: page 18367, line 16: remove the word "at"

Reply 16: Done!

Comment 17: page 18367, line 22: "maxima" instead of "maximum"

Reply 17: Changed!

Comment 18: page 18372, lines 21 to 23: I do not agree with that statement. Figure 6b clearly shows that the nanoparticle concentrations decrease when the condensation sink (CS) exceeds $\sim 7 \times 10^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1}$. It rather seems that there is a range where the CS has no clear effect; however, for large values it has an effect as the concentrations decrease by about one order of magnitude as CS increases from 7×10^{-3} to $3 \times 10^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$.

Reply 18: It is true that one can see that cluster concentrations, and especially neutral ones, decrease with an increasing CS for values above $\sim 7 \times 10^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1}$. Thus the occurrence of nucleation and the number of nucleated clusters are now discussed separately in the

manuscript: “The second important result highlighted by Tables 1-3 is that the occurrence of NPF does not seem to be limited by the condensation sink. In fact, NPF is triggered during Periods 1 and 3, which display CS values significantly higher compared to Period 2. This observation contradicts the previous result by Boulon et al. (2011) at the Puy de Dôme for ionic clusters but supports the results reported at the Jungfraujoch station (Boulon et al., 2010). However, based on Fig. 6b, we observed that while cluster concentrations are not deeply impacted by the CS up to $\sim 7 \times 10^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1}$, seem to decrease with an increasing CS above this threshold value, suggesting that high CS values do not inhibit the nucleation process but could limit the number of nucleated clusters. ...”

Comment 19: page 18380, line 5: “third row” instead of “second raw”

Reply 19: Changed!

Comment 20: page 18381, line 8: “in the table”?

Reply 20: Correction was done

Comment 21: page 18382, line 2: “indicated in the table”

Reply 21: Changed!

Comment 22: page 18383, line 3: “calculated” instead of “calculating”

Reply 22: Changed!

Comment 23: page 18384, line 3: “shaded” instead of “shading”

Reply 23: Changed!

Comment 24: page 18385, figure 3: It is surprising that all J_s are positive throughout the whole day (from 8 to 18 UTC). In fact, $J_{3\text{tot}}$ is always larger than $0.4 \text{ cm}^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ even in the early morning and in the late evening when there is no sunlight anymore. What is the explanation for this observation?

Reply 24: This figure was removed since it included statistics calculated from the FT and the interface between the BL and the FT all together. However, to answer the question, negative J values were found earlier in the morning and later in the evening, this is the reason why the figure only showed results between 8:00 and 18:00 (UTC). It is true that one could have expected to have negative values earlier than 18:00 (UTC) because of the lack of sunlight, but it is obviously not the case and we have no robust explanation for that.

Comment 25: page 18387, line 2: “close” instead of “closed”

Reply 25: Correction done.

Comment 26: page 18388, figure 6a: red/magenta circles seem to be missing for the high H₂SO₄ values; the word "no" seems to be missing in the last row of the legend

Reply 26: Magenta circles correspond to neutral cluster concentrations recorded during NPF event days, i.e. during Periods 1 and 3. During these periods, maximum H₂SO₄ values are around 2×10^8 , and are represented on Fig. 6, sometimes hidden by the green and blue crosses. Correction was done in the legend.

References:

- Eisele, F. L. (1988) "1st Tandem Mass-Spectrometric Measurement of Tropospheric Ions." *Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres* 93 (D1) 716-724
- Eisele, F. L. (1989) "Natural and Transmission-Line Produced Positive-Ions." *Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres* 94 (D5) 6309-6318
- Eisele, F. L. (1989) "Natural and Anthropogenic Negative-Ions in the Troposphere." *Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres* 94 (D2) 2183-2196
- Hari, P. and M. Kulmala (2005) "Station for measuring ecosystem-atmosphere relations (SMEAR II)." *Boreal Environment Research* 10 (5) 315-322
- Jokinen, T., M. Sipilä, H. Junninen, M. Ehn, G. Lönn, J. Hakala, T. Petäjä, R. L. Mauldin, M. Kulmala and D. R. Worsnop (2012) "Atmospheric sulphuric acid and neutral cluster measurements using CI-API-TOF." *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* 12 (9) 4117-4125
- Junninen, H., M. Ehn, T. Petäjä, L. Luosujärvi, T. Kotiaho, R. Kostianen, U. Rohner, M. Gonin, K. Fuhrer, M. Kulmala and D. R. Worsnop (2010) "A high-resolution mass spectrometer to measure atmospheric ion composition." *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques* 3 (4) 1039-1053

Referee 2: we thank Referee 2 for his comments.


Comment 1: Major comment: Discussion Paper Already in Quick Access Review I have asked authors to elaborate more on attributing C6813 the NPF to free troposphere. This comment was not addressed at all. One additional ACPD sentence referring to [Boulon et al., 2011]. Boulon et al investigated use of lidar in estimation of planetary boundary layer. On page 5627 they compare WTC method 14, C6813–C6816, 2014 used in this manuscript with their own method derived for conditions in a vicinity of Puy de Dome: The method proposed here was compared to the WTC algorithm proposed by Brooks (2003), initially developed for marine boundary layer height retrievals. The Interactive calculated PBL height was found to be 32.2 % higher on average when it was compared using our method. This difference comes from the fact that the WTC method tries to find the upper limit of the most concentrated aerosol layer (i.e. the start of the decrease of the Mie regime) whereas our method was build to find the transition from Mie diffusion regime to Rayleigh diffusion regime i.e. the transition from planetary boundary layer influenced layers to free tropospheric influenced layers. Compared to WTC and according to LIDAR contour plot, this procedure seems to be better adapted to the calculation of the PBL height in mountainous area such as Puy de Dome. I wonder why authors did not use the more appropriate method from this article instead of WTC method. Adding approximately 30% to WTC method to data presented in Figure 1, the PBL is at or above altitude of Puy de Dome and we cannot any more talk about nucleation in free troposphere, but in upper part of PBL. This is also supported by Figure 4. Claiming that black carbon concentrations $> 1 \mu\text{g}\cdot\text{m}^{-3}$ are relevant for free troposphere does not find any support in literature. Moreover, during the NPF periods 1 and 3, the synoptic situation was controlled by strong high pressure system. During Full Screen / Esc these conditions free troposphere is dominated by large scale subsidence and therefore very low relative humidity in lower FT. Measurements show opposite, high humidity Printer-friendly Version between 90 – 100% for period 1 indicates that station itself was most likely directly influenced by orographic upslope flow of boundary layer air from valley below. Sharp rise of RH during period 3 on 28 Feb indicates the same process. This is also in agreement with absolute values of condensational sink and BC for period 1. For Period 3 Discussion Paper some additional tracer is needed due to absence of BC measurements. This behavior is typical for all mountain stations with late morning-noon rise of nearby BL upslope to C6814 the mountain top depending on local orography and altitude difference between mountain top and surrounding areas. The rise of the air mass associated with decrease in pressure and temperature by itself create conditions more suitable for NPF. Authors in 14, C6813–C6816, 2014 interpret data as free tropospheric feeding process with impression that it is a large scale feature, but without discussing also altitude evolution of the air mass trajectories during transport it is only unsupported speculation. Again, they have to show much more Interactive rigorous and complete analysis to distinguish between free troposphere and boundary Comment layer. There are many more parameters available at Puy de Dome. I would like to see corresponding diurnal cycle

of total aerosol number density, size distribution, trace gases and meteorology, especially local wind and its variability.

Reply 1: Concerning the WCT method, it is true that it was initially developed in the marine atmosphere but it has already been used in different environments since (eg: Baars et al., 2008, Leipzig, Germany). In their study, Boulon et al. (2011) developed an alternative method which was reported to give BL heights 32% higher on average compared to the WCT method. When using this procedure with our dataset, we find BL heights that are on average only 8% higher compared to those derived from the WCT (see Reply 3). Thus it seems that the determination of BL/FT from LIDAR measurements is not impacted by the method that we use.

However, as suggested by Referee 2, we have added to the manuscript time series of atmospheric parameters that can help to distinguish between the BL and the FT (SMPS size distribution, NO₂ concentration and wind speed) and which lead us to slightly nuance our analysis. In fact, during Period 1, the presence of an accumulation mode on the SMPS size distribution, high NO₂ concentrations and high variability in the wind speed measurements lead us to conclude that the station was at the BL/FT interface rather than in the FT in the morning, especially on the 10th and 11th. During Periods 2 and 3, these additional parameters confirm LIDAR measurements which suggest that the station is sometimes in the BL, but always out of the nucleation hours, during which the station is in the FT. Thus, during nucleation hours, Period 1 is now discussed as representative of interface conditions between the BL and the FT and Periods 2 and 3 are still considered representative of FT conditions. Changes were provided throughout section 3 according to this re-analysis.


In the description of the sub-periods, CO concentrations were added to supply the lack of BC data during Period 3 and show variations which are in agreement with BC and CS. Concerning BC concentrations, we do not claim that they are relevant for free troposphere conditions, we only notice that they are relevant for the station. This is clearly visible on the figure below, which shows the monthly mean BC concentrations for 2012.



At last, hypothesis on a “free troposphere feeding process” was removed, and the influence of long range transport from Eastern Europe was only mentioned as a potential additional source of pollution.

Comment 2: Abstract L3-4: With respect to slow growth into CCN size in FT compared to BL I do not understand what authors mean by special importance of direct influence on cloud formation.

Reply 2: The authors mean that the number of CN and hence CCN are particularly relevant at high altitude where clouds form. Referee 2 asserts that particle growth is slower in FT compared to BL. It might be true, even if it is not obvious that particle growth decreases with altitude, as shown on the figure below:




This figure shows the ranges of GRs (blue) as well as the average values, mean or median (red), from different sites as a function of the altitude of the station (Manninen et al., 2010; Vakkari et al., 2011; Rose et al., in prep) for the size range 1.5 – 3 nm (upper panel) and 7 – 20 nm (lower panel). We can see that for the highest stations, which can periodically lay in the FT (i.e. Puy de Dôme, Jungfraujoch and Chacaltaya (5240 m, Bolivia)), the GRs are not significantly lower than the GRs observed for BL stations.

In any case, regardless of the variations of the GR with altitude and the comparisons between the BL and the FT, model studies such as Merikanto et al. (2009) clearly report that NPF occurring in the FT is a significant CCN source for the whole atmospheric column. Especially, it is reported that “The model suggests that 35% of CCN (0.2%) in global low-level clouds were created in the free and upper troposphere”.

Comment 3: P18264 L8-10: In opposite, Boulon et al states that WCT is not suitable method for Puy de Dome and their new method delivers better results in estimation of PBL using lidar signal (see part with major comment). Authors here create false impression that they have chosen correct algorithm to estimate PBL from lidar signal.

Reply 3: In their study, Boulon et al. (2011) say that their method “seems to be better adapted”, but they do not give clear reasons to reject the WCT procedure. We have compared the BL heights derived from the two methods for the period of interest. The result is shown on the figure below.



The two procedures give very similar results: the method from Boulon et al. (2011) gives results that are only 8% higher on average compared to the WCT, which is significantly lower than the 32% reported by Boulon et al. (2011) and does not drastically change our conclusions. Thus we do assume that the WCT, widely accepted as one of the most reliable method in the literature, can be considered as a correct algorithm for the present study.

Comment 4: P 18367: Did authors try to use ratio between PSM and ions instead of introducing arbitrary constant of 500 cm⁻³?

Reply 4: As mentioned in the manuscript, recent studies such as the one by Wimmer et al. (2013) suggest that the PSM could be unable to detect all cluster ions because of their chemical composition. However, we do not know if the PSM does not detect a constant fraction of the charged clusters, or if this fraction is proportional to the charged cluster concentration. Thus, in order to be as cautious as possible and obtain a lower estimation of

the actual total cluster concentration, we chose to use a lower detection limit, which might be considered as arbitrary but was in fact derived from the measurements.

Comment 5: P18368: here should be also included study of the charged particles distribution in European troposphere from EUCAARI experiment [Mirme et al., 2010]. It provides good information about the background FT concentrations and vertical distribution.

Reply 5: the reference was added. However, altitude scales and especially diameter ranges (2.5 – 3 nm for charged and total clusters, and 0.75 - 2 nm for charged clusters) used in Mirme et al. (2010) do not allow a direct quantitative comparison. This is the reason why only major qualitative results were included in the manuscript as follow: “...with lower values at night. NAIS airborne measurements from the whole tropospheric column (up to 12 km) conducted in the frame of the EUCAARI – LONGREX campaign (May 2008) were reported by Mirme et al. (2010) and showed similar results. In fact, charged clusters were continuously detected at all altitudes with a mode centred around 1 nm. Between 2.5 and 3 nm, total cluster concentrations significantly exceeded charged concentrations, suggesting a continuous pool of sub -3nm neutral clusters throughout the whole tropospheric column.

The first observations...”

Comment 6: Figure 4: One needs microscope to see properly what is included. The figure needs improvement in size and scales.

Reply 6: We have tried to improve the quality of Fig. 4. CO concentrations were added to supply the lack of BC measurement and the location of the station in the BL/FT was also indicated.

References

Baars, H., Ansmann, A., Engelmann, R. and Althausen, D.: Continuous monitoring of the boundary-layer top with lidar, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 8, 7281–7296, 2008.

Birmili, W., Berresheim, H., Plass-Dülmer, C., Elste, T., Gilge, S., Wiedensohler, A. and Uhrner, U.: The Hohenpeissenberg aerosol formation experiment (HAFEX): a long-term study including size-resolved aerosol, H₂SO₄, OH, and monoterpenes measurements, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 3(2), 361–376, doi:10.5194/acp-3-361-2003, 2003.

Boulon, J., Sellegri, K., Hervo, M., Picard, D., Pichon, J.-M., Fréville, P. and Laj, P.: Investigation of nucleation events vertical extent: a long term study at two different altitude sites, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 11(12), 5625–5639, doi:10.5194/acp-11-5625-2011, 2011.

Boulon, J., Sellegri, K., Venzac, H., Picard, D., Weingartner, E., Wehrle, G., Collaud Coen, M., Bütikofer, R., Flückiger, E., Baltensperger, U. and Laj, P.: New particle formation and ultrafine charged aerosol climatology at a high altitude site in the Alps (Jungfraujoch, 3580 m a.s.l., Switzerland), *Atmos Chem Phys*, 10(19), 9333–9349, doi:10.5194/acp-10-9333-2010, 2010.

Clarke, A. D., Varner, J. L., Eisele, F., Mauldin, R. L., Tanner, D. and Litchy, M.: Particle production in the remote marine atmosphere: Cloud outflow and subsidence during ACE 1, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmospheres*, 103(D13), 16397–16409, doi:10.1029/97JD02987, 1998.

Hamed, A., Korhonen, H., Sihto, S.-L., Joutsensaari, J., Järvinen, H., Petäjä, T., Arnold, F., Nieminen, T., Kulmala, M., Smith, J. N., Lehtinen, K. E. J. and Laaksonen, A.: The role of relative humidity in continental new particle formation, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmospheres*, 116(D3), D03202, doi:10.1029/2010JD014186, 2011.

Jeong, C.-H., Hopke, P. K., Chalupa, D. and Utell, M.: Characteristics of Nucleation and Growth Events of Ultrafine Particles Measured in Rochester, NY, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 38(7), 1933–1940, doi:10.1021/es034811p, 2004.

Manninen, H. E., Nieminen, T., Asmi, E., Gagné, S., Häkkinen, S., Lehtipalo, K., Aalto, P., Vana, M., Mirme, A., Mirme, S., Hörrak, U., Plass-Dülmer, C., Stange, G., Kiss, G., Hoffer, A., Törő, N., Moerman, M., Henzing, B., de Leeuw, G., Brinkenberg, M., Kouvarakis, G. N., Bougiatioti, A., Mihalopoulos, N., O'Dowd, C., Ceburnis, D., Arneth, A., Svenningsson, B., Swietlicki, E., Tarozzi, L., Decesari, S., Facchini, M. C., Birmili, W., Sonntag, A., Wiedensohler, A., Boulon, J., Sellegri, K., Laj, P., Gysel, M., Bukowiecki, N., Weingartner, E., Wehrle, G., Laaksonen, A., Hamed, A., Joutsensaari, J., Petäjä, T., Kerminen, V.-M. and Kulmala, M.: EUCAARI ion spectrometer measurements at 12 European sites – analysis of new particle formation events, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 10(16), 7907–7927, doi:10.5194/acp-10-7907-2010, 2010.

Merikanto, J., Spracklen, D. V., Mann, G. W., Pickering, S. J. and Carslaw, K. S.: Impact of nucleation on global CCN, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 9(21), 8601–8616, doi:10.5194/acp-9-8601-2009, 2009.

Mirme, S., Mirme, A., Minikin, A., Petzold, A., Hörrak, U., Kerminen, V.-M. and Kulmala, M.: Atmospheric sub-3 nm particles at high altitudes, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 10(2), 437–451, doi:10.5194/acp-10-437-2010, 2010.

Sihto, S.-L., Kulmala, M., Kerminen, V.-M., Dal Maso, M., Petäjä, T., Riipinen, I., Korhonen, H., Arnold, F., Janson, R., Boy, M., Laaksonen, A. and Lehtinen, K. E. J.: Atmospheric sulphuric acid and aerosol formation: implications from atmospheric measurements for nucleation and early growth mechanisms, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 6(12), 4079–4091, doi:10.5194/acp-6-4079-2006, 2006.

Vakkari, V., Laakso, H., Kulmala, M., Laaksonen, A., Mabaso, D., Molefe, M., Kgabi, N. and Laakso, L.: New particle formation events in semi-clean South African savannah, *Atmos Chem Phys*, 11(7), 3333–3346, doi:10.5194/acp-11-3333-2011, 2011.

Wimmer, D., Lehtipalo, K., Franchin, A., Kangasluoma, J., Kreissl, F., Kürten, A., Kupc, A., Metzger, A., Mikkilä, J., Petäjä, T., Riccobono, F., Vanhanen, J., Kulmala, M. and Curtius, J.: Performance of diethylene glycol-based particle counters in the sub-3 nm size range, *Atmospheric Meas. Tech.*, 6(7), 1793–1804, doi:10.5194/amt-6-1793-2013, 2013.

Young, L.-H., Benson, D. R., Montanaro, W. M., Lee, S.-H., Pan, L. L., Rogers, D. C., Jensen, J., Stith, J. L., Davis, C. A., Campos, T. L., Bowman, K. P., Cooper, W. A. and Lait, L. R.: Enhanced

new particle formation observed in the northern midlatitude tropopause region, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmospheres*, 112(D10), D10218, doi:10.1029/2006JD008109, 2007.