

Interactive comment on “Predicting the mineral composition of dust aerosols – Part 2: Model evaluation and identification of key processes with observations” by J. P. Perlwitz et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 7 April 2015

This article provides an extensive evaluation of the model for size and mineralogy-resolved dust emission presented in part 1. The authors construct an impressive compilation of measurements, from about 60 studies, making for a detailed evaluation. I have only a few comments, and recommend that the article be published after the authors address them.

- It would be helpful to include a comparison against the results of Scanza et al. (2015), who use some of the same measurements to evaluate their model for mineralogy-resolved dust emission. Can the authors discuss the effects of the purported improvements over this recent study? Do the additional processes they include actually im-

C1417

prove the simulation?

- I found the discussion section quite tedious to read, in part due its length. I would suggest improving the writing in this section, for instance by adding more sub-headings.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 15, 3577, 2015.

C1418