

# ***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-

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



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.

ACPD

15, C1417–C1418, 2015

---

Interactive  
Comment

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)

