

1           This file describes one of two mistakes we discovered in the ACPD manuscript. Both mistakes  
2 are minor and neither affect the overall findings. The other mistake is discussed in the file titled  
3 “pressure\_correction.pdf.”

4           Subsequent to publication of the ACPD manuscript we discovered a mistake in the method #2 fit  
5 coefficients reported in Table 2. A revised Table 2 is attached to the end of this document. We are  
6 confident that the revised method #2 fit coefficients are correct. There are three (3) implications for the  
7 revised manuscript:

8  
9 1) P26604 / L7 to L10

10 Author’s Comment: We note that the revised method #2 coefficients are now in better agreement with  
11 the method #1 values. In the ACPD manuscript our argument was that more fitted points (method #1),  
12 versus fewer (method #2), was the reason for the factor-of-two larger statistical errors for  $\ln(a)$  and  $b$   
13 seen in Table 2 of the ACPD manuscript. In fact, the values reported for method #2 statistical errors, in  
14 the ACPD manuscript, were variances.

15 The Authors omitted the following: Another difference is that the number of points used to evaluate  
16 statistical error, associated with the fit coefficients, is relatively small in the case method #2. In method  
17 #1 the number of points is 80, while in our application of method #2 only four points were fitted in the  
18 second and third steps of D10’s procedure.

19

20 2) P26604 / L13 to L19

21 Focusing on results obtained using method #1, our coefficients  $\ln a$  and  $b$ , and our coefficients  $c$  and  $d$ ,  
22 are seen to agree within one and two standard deviations of  $D10$ 's, respectively. Also, there is  
23 agreement, within one standard deviation, between our application of method #2 and  $D10$ 's. It is also  
24 apparent that larger statistical error is evident for  $\ln a$  and  $b$  derived in method #2, compared to method  
25 #1. This is because of the smaller number of points fitted in method #2, as discussed in the previous  
26 paragraph.

27 Author's Change of Manuscript: Focusing on results obtained using method #1, our four coefficients are  
28 seen to agree within two standard deviations of  $D10$ 's. Also, agreement within two standard deviations  
29 was obtained between our application of method #2 and  $D10$ 's.

30

31

32 3) P26605 / L5 to L9

33 Based on our method #1 coefficients, this percentage is 69% and thus larger than the percentage (66 %)  
34 based on fit coefficients from D10 (the percentage is 60% when using the method #2 coefficients; not  
35 shown here). Thus, we obtained better fitted-vs.-measured agreement with our method #1 fit  
36 coefficients, and poorer agreement with either our method #2 coefficients or with the D10 coefficients.

37 Author's Change of Manuscript: Based on our method #1 coefficients, this percentage is 69% and thus  
38 larger than the percentage (66 %) based on fit coefficients from D10 (the percentage is 71% when using  
39 the method #2 coefficients; not shown here). Thus, we obtained better fitted-vs.-measured agreement  
40 with our method #1 and method #2 fit coefficients and somewhat poorer agreement with the D10  
41 coefficients.

42

43 Tab. 2 - Eqn. 1 fit coefficients

Coefficients	<sup>a</sup> Fit D10	Fit Method #1	<sup>b</sup> Statistical Error Method #1	Fit Method #2	<sup>c</sup> Statistical Error Method #2
<i>ln a</i>	-9.73	-15.26	2.87	-15.03	4.11
b	3.33	4.94	0.88	4.86	1.30
c	0.0264	0.0028	0.0308	0.0038	0.034
d	0.0033	0.86	0.88	0.82	0.83

44

45 <sup>a</sup> Fit coefficients from D10

46 <sup>b</sup> The standard deviations for coefficients fitted via method #1

47 <sup>c</sup> The standard deviations for coefficients fitted via method #2