

Interactive comment on “Observations of fluorescent aerosol–cloud interactions in the free troposphere at the Sphinx high Alpine research station, Jungfrauoch” by I. Crawford et al.

E. Herrmann

erik.herrmann@iki.fi

Received and published: 18 November 2015

Dear authors / Hi guys!

With some interest I have followed the outcome of your latest Jungfrauoch campaign (this and the snow-blow paper). Referee #1 has already made some useful remarks (most of which I would agree with) but there is one more issue I'd like to raise.

In figure 6, you show something that you call particle size distributions. These extend from ~250 nm to ~15 micrometer and have a peak between 400 and 800 nm or so. However, there is a bit of a problem with that: The actual size distributions at Jungfrau-

C9447

joch, measured behind the same inlet, do not look at all like the plots in figure 6 (see <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/2015JD023660/full>). The size distribution at Jungfrauoch has an accumulation mode at roughly 140 nm, beyond that is merely that mode's "tail" and the occasional dust particle from Africa.

The explanation for this odd result can be found earlier in the manuscript (page 26071 bottom) where you write that the WIBS doesn't provide reliable numbers for particles with diameters below 800 nm. With this in mind it would seem that figure 6 merely shows the WIBS signal. I could get behind that. But it is important to note that the WIBS signal is NOT the particle size distribution. Instead I would say that the WIBS signal is the actual size distribution multiplied with the WIBS detection efficiency curve. And that detection efficiency is significantly smaller than 1 below 800 nm (as the text implies) and appears to be 0 (zero) at 250 nm (as figure 6 suggests). It is therefore a bit misleading to write that figure 6 shows particle size distributions at Jungfrauoch. And I also want to stress that the actual size distribution does not have a mode at 580 nm (as stated in the manuscript). That "mode" is a result of WIBS detection efficiency. It would be nice if you would take this into account in the revision. Considering that not only the counting efficiency decreases but also the fluorescence measurement is unreliable below 800 nm, one of course has to wonder how meaningful the information in figure 7 is. You might want to discuss this in the revised manuscript as well.

Beside this main point I wanted to make, some other things caught my eye. For example, what exactly is the motivation for discussing the SDE events separately? The current manuscript doesn't appear to be all that massive to make this necessary. And why do you call clouds glaciated that are still 50% water? While one certainly needs to define a threshold, 50% feels like an unintuitive choice. Finally, the colours got mixed up in the legend of the top panel of figure 3 (the caption is correct).

I'll be looking forward to the revised manuscript.

erik.herrmann@psi.ch

C9448

C9449