

## ***Interactive comment on “A study of aerosol liquid water content based on hygroscopicity measurements at high relative humidity in the North China Plain” by Y. X. Bian et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 24 March 2014

1. Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of ACP? Yes 2. Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? Yes 3. Are substantial conclusions reached? Yes 4. Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? Yes 5. Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions? Yes 6. Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? Yes 7. Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? Yes 8. Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? Yes 9. Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary?

C677

Yes 10. Is the overall presentation well structured and clear? From line 22 Page 4091 to line 5 page 40929(13 lines), more models were introduced, in which there were six lines to introduce the ADDEM model, but it was not used in this work. In fact, model ISORRPIA II was used. It is better to give some words to describe why this model was chosen. 11. Is the language fluent and precise? Yes 12. Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used? There were too many abbreviations need not be defined, since they were not used frequently 13. Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated? No. 14. Are the number and quality of references appropriate? Yes 15. Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate? Yes

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 14, 4089, 2014.

C678