

[Interactive  
Comment](#)

# ***Interactive comment on “Single-particle characterization of ice-nucleating particles and ice particle residuals sampled by three different techniques” by A. Worringen et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #3**

Received and published: 18 October 2014

Review of “Single-particle characterization of ice-nucleating particles and ice particle residuals sampled by three different techniques” by Worringen et al.

This manuscript presents the characterization of individual ice nucleating and ice residual particles using SEM/EDX analysis. The ice nucleating particle and ice particle residuals were collected by three different instruments. This study provides very useful information/insights on the comparison of sampling instruments/techniques for ice nuclei. The subject of the manuscript is suitable for publication in ACP. I recommend the authors to consider addressing the following comments/issues for the revision.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



Major comments:

1. the manuscript didn't provide sufficient description on the FINCH+IN-PCVI experiments. First, was there size selected inlet applied (i.e, were the ice crystals removed before FINCH)? or it take all the particles including ice crystals and evaporate the ice before their inter the FINCH for ice nucleation activation? What were the experimental temperature and RH conditions for FINCH ice nucleation measurements? These are crucial information for the comparison with other two techniques. If the ice crystals were removed before FINCH, then it is comparing the non-activated particles with ice crystal residuals (activated particles) even if they were sampled the same air mass spontaneously.

2. It is not very clear what samples are compared. In Figure 1, were only the samples from the marked periods (A-F) compared? The only overlap of the sampling for all three instruments was the F period around Feb. 20, which also across about 24 hours. How many particles/samples were analyzed during this F period? It would be very useful to provide air mass backward trajectories (HYSPLIT data) in the supplement materials to validate that the same particle source during the sampling times which were compared. The sampling time for the background aerosol particles was only less than 30 min, additional evidences (e.g., HYSPLIT data) are needed to validate this comparison with background aerosol composition. Same for the comparison with LA-MS data set. It is also not clear when LA-MS data were collected, the sampling time of LA-MS data should also be marked in the Figure 1.

3. Section 4.2, a major part of the discussion on the comparison of ice nucleation ability for the different particle classes is not appropriate, since the manuscript didn't provide sufficient supporting information of this type of comparison. First, Strictly speaking, when comparing the nucleation ability, data on freezing temperature/RH, activation fraction, or nucleation rate are needed for each particle types. Second, the enrichment is not quantitatively determined and background aerosol information is not sufficient (this study only has background aerosol data on a very short period of time).It is rec-

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



ommended to rewrite this section or leave it out.

4. Section 4.3, the discussion on the comparison of these three techniques can be extended in more details. It would be also important for the community if the manuscript can discuss briefly the limitations and advantages of each technique and provide some recommendations to improve the sampling or measurements in the future.

Specific comments:

1. P23030, I21-24, these two statements are oversimplified and it is not true. This should be reworded. For example, sea salt and sulfate can be efficient ice nuclei, e.g. Gregory P. Schill and Tolbert [2014] G. P. Schill and Tolbert [2013], Abbatt et al. [2006].

2. P23031, I3-4, there are a few studies that investigated the effect of mixing state of particles on ice nucleation and characterizations of ice nucleating particles from different field campaigns using SEM/EDX and other X-ray analysis technique (Hiranuma et al. [2013], [Knopf et al., 2010; Knopf et al., 2014]; Wang et al. [2012]).

3. P23031, I25, the sampling for three techniques was not in parallel.

4. P23032, I23-25, Please provide a more detailed description on collecting particles onto different substrates. Are both two substrates used in all three different sampling instruments? How chemical composition was quantified for the particles these two substrates (the X-ray background of these two substrate is different)?

5. P23033, I16 and I19-21, Do you mean “INUIT-JFJ 2013” or “INUIT-JFJ 2014”? Please provide more information regarding the ice nucleation experiments. It is not sufficient by just saying “supersaturation and freezing temperature were varied during the campaign.”

6. P23035, Section 2.3, the manuscript didn't provide sufficient descriptions/criteria on the particle classification for both SEM/EDX and LA-MS techniques. What is the “Droplet”, any chemical information on these particles? It could be very useful to show representative SEM images and X-ray spectra for each particle class (can be in the

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



supplemental materials).

7. P23037, L10-16, since there are abrupt increases in particle concentrations which may come from local source, why it is only a “minor local influence”?

8. Combining discussion in P23041, L18-19; p23045, L2-13; and P23050, L23-25, It is stated that lead-bearing particles in the whole INUIT campaign is 1% for FINCH+IN-PCVI and from Figure 6, no lead-bearing particle was detected from ISI sampling. If assuming that FINCH+IN-PCVI captured all the lead-bearing particles that nucleated ice (or nucleated ice on all the lead-bearing particles), does that mean 90% of lead-bearing particle (9% out of 10%) determined by Ice-CVI was artifacts?

#### Reference:

Abbatt, J. P. D., S. Benz, D. J. Cziczo, Z. Kanji, U. Lohmann, and O. Mohler (2006), Solid ammonium sulfate aerosols as ice nuclei: A pathway for cirrus cloud formation, *Science*, 313(5794), 1770-1773. Hiranuma, N., S. D. Brooks, R. C. Moffet, A. Glen, A. Laskin, M. K. Gilles, P. Liu, A. M. Macdonald, J. W. Strapp, and G. M. McFarquhar (2013), Chemical characterization of individual particles and residuals of cloud droplets and ice crystals collected on board research aircraft in the ISDAC 2008 study, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 118(12), 6564-6579. Knopf, D. A., B. Wang, A. Laskin, R. C. Moffet, and M. K. Gilles (2010), Heterogeneous nucleation of ice on anthropogenic organic particles collected in Mexico City, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 37(11), L11803, doi:11810.11029/12010GL043362. Knopf, D. A., P. A. Alpert, B. Wang, R. E. O'Brien, S. T. Kelly, A. Laskin, M. K. Gilles, and R. C. Moffet (2014), Microspectroscopic imaging and characterization of individually identified ice nucleating particles from a case field study, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 119(17), 2014JD021866. Schill, G. P., and M. A. Tolbert (2013), Heterogeneous ice nucleation on phase-separated organic-sulfate particles: effect of liquid vs. glassy coatings, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13(9), 4681-4695. Schill, G. P., and M. A. Tolbert (2014), Heterogeneous Ice Nucleation on Simulated Sea-Spray Aerosol Using Raman Microscopy, *The*

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Journal of Physical Chemistry C. Wang, B. B., A. Laskin, T. Roedel, M. K. Gilles, R. C. Moffet, A. V. Tivanski, and D. A. Knopf (2012), Heterogeneous ice nucleation and water uptake by field-collected atmospheric particles below 273 K, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 117, D00v19.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 14, 23027, 2014.

ACPD

14, C8216–C8220, 2014

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

