

Interactive comment on “Improved identification of primary biological aerosol particles using single particle mass spectrometry” by Maria A. Zawadowicz et al.

Anonymous Referee #4

Received and published: 27 January 2017

This paper has some very good ideas and execution behind it. And it should be published. My main concern, like the referees, is that the journal chosen is not the best fit for what is essentially an instrumentation paper to my mind. AMT would be a better fit. I also agree with the others in that the essence is not PBAP...rather a neat method of potentially distinguishing between them in the atmosphere. Given that, I thought the somewhat extensive discussion on WBS as a bioaerosol detection technique was not necessary (although due mention should be made). The same criticism applies to the ice nucleation material. The one major scientific matter of concern to me is the laboratory work on pollen (too large for detection) unless sub-pollen. I was not at all sure what could be characterized here as the atmospheric process associated with this is

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



complicated involving both humidity and, when appropriate, lightning.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., doi:10.5194/acp-2016-1119, 2016.

ACPD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

