

## ***Interactive comment on “The mechanism of spray electrification: the waterfall effect” by James K. Beattie***

### **Anonymous Referee #4**

Received and published: 18 August 2016

While this manuscript deals with a potentially interesting research topic, it lacks several features that are required for a scientific research article. A scientific research articles should contain the following elements: introduction, description of used methods, representation of new results, discussion of these results, and conclusions. This paper has several problems associated with this:

First, this paper lacks entirely the methods section that should provide information on the sources of data used in this paper.

Second, partly because of the first issue, it remains unclear where the main results (figure 1 and associated discussion) come from, and are these results even produced in this particular study.

Third, I have some difficulty in separating when authors represent new results, when

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



they discuss earlier results, and when they discuss the result obtained in this study.

Fourth, sections 1 and 3 and part of section 3 contain introductory material that is commonly under the title "Introduction" in a scientific article.

Fifth, the "conclusions" section is not real conclusions: the first sentence is introductory material, the second one mainly discussion type material.

Finally, the prior research is not acknowledged in a proper way in the paper. Citations are missing from many places where a citations should exist, and many of the existing citations are imperfect (like writing Tammet and co-workers without specifying the actual scientific articles).

As a result of the problems mentioned above, I cannot recommend accepting this paper for publication in ACP.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., doi:10.5194/acp-2015-892, 2016.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)