

**Review of “comparing calculated cloud microphysical properties of tropical convective clouds at cloud base with measurements during the ACRIDICON-CHUVA campaign” by *Ramon Campos Braga et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #1**

Braga et al., use airborne measurements aboard HALO from a CCP, CAS-DPOL and CCN counter to derive cloud drop size distributions (DSDs) and cloud water content from various instruments via an inter-comparison. In this study parameterizations for liquid cloud formation in tropical convection are validated, but for instance comparing the directly measured cloud drop concentrations ( $N_d$ ) near cloud base to inferred values that are derived by combining the cloud base updraft velocity, CCN vs SS (supersaturation) spectra. In addition,  $N_d$  from cloud base was also compared to drop concentrations ( $N_a$ ) derived by assuming adiabatic expansion for vertical evolution of cloud drop effective radius above cloud base.

Overall, this paper presents a good summary but it lacks a significant scientific finding or discovery. Rather it is verifying previous formulated parameterizations, which is valuable. However, the authors could do a better job of comparing the differences they observe between the parameterizations validated here with previous studies.

Perhaps the paper can be re-worked to demonstrate the novelty of the work, which is lacking in the current version of the manuscript. Specific comments below should help achieve this. After such revisions have been made, the paper maybe considered for publication.

There are small editorial issues and some grammatical errors throughout the manuscript, of which I have pointed out a few, but will leave it to the authors to check that more carefully upon submission of the revised version.

***General comments***

The authors thank the referee for the general comments and advices. Furthermore, the advices of the referee are highly appreciated as well as the very valuable and constructive suggestions to increase the quality of the manuscript. We tried to address the points requested by the reviewer to the

paper be considered for publication. Overall, we have improved the focus of the paper highlighting our objectives and the novelty of our study.

**Specific comments:**

Line 29: Why not introduce CWC here like all the other acronyms in the abstract?

A: OK. Changed.

Line 46: “pursue” replace this word with something more suitable like “cloud microphysical models “aim” to reproduce or “The goal of cloud microphysical models is to reproduce....”

A: OK. Changed.

Line 137 “account” should be “accounted”

A: OK. Changed.

The discussion in line 132 to 137 can be expanded upon to make the paper more scientifically novel. State in more detail what was unique about these measurements, are the convective clouds here unique? Related to this but later in the paper, are the results obtained here the same as other convective regions in the world? Could the authors comment or discuss this? If indeed this is the case, that the results are similar to other locations of convection globally, the authors may consider discussing this point and stressing this aspect.

A: The text was changed to address these comments. Thanks.

**New text:**

“The availability of these measurements collected by the same aircraft provides a unique opportunity to compare the data with model predictions and to test the sensitivity of the results to the differences between the measurements by the cloud probes.

This study is novel in several aspects:

- a. It is the first study that validates the methodology of retrieving the adiabatic cloud drop concentrations  $N_a$  (Freud et al., 2011) from the vertical evolution of  $r_e$  while assuming that  $r_e$  is nearly adiabatic. This is important because it supports the validity of retrieving  $N_a$  from satellite-retrieved vertical profile of  $r_e$  (Rosenfeld et al., 2014a and 2016).
- b. It is the first study that tests with aircraft the measured  $N_d$  with its parameterization that is based on  $N_{CCN}(S)$  along with cloud base spectrum of updrafts weighted by the updraft speed itself,  $W_b^*$ . It is done this way to be compatible with the recently developed methodology of retrieving CCN from satellites by means of retrieving  $N_d$  and  $W_b^*$  (Rosenfeld et al., 2016).
- c. It is the first study that compares observationally the old Twomey (1959) parameterization of the dependence of  $N_d$  on  $W_b$  (Eq. 2) versus the recent Pinsky et al. (2012) analytical expression for the same (Eq. 3)."

#### References:

Freud, E., Rosenfeld, D. and Kulkarni, J. R.: Resolving both entrainment-mixing and number of activated CCN in deep convective clouds, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11(24), 12887–12900, doi:10.5194/acp-11-12887-2011, 2011.

Pinsky, M., Khain, A., Mazin, I. and Korolev, A.: Analytical estimation of droplet concentration at cloud base, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 117(17), 1–14, doi:10.1029/2012JD017753, 2012.

Rosenfeld, D., Fischman, B., Zheng, Y., Goren, T. and Giguzin, D.: Combined satellite and radar retrievals of drop concentration and CCN at convective cloud base, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 41(9), 3259–3265, doi:10.1002/2014GL059453, 2014a.

Rosenfeld D., Y. Zheng, E. Hashimshoni, M. L. Pöhlker, A. Jefferson, C. Pöhlker, X. Yu, Y. Zhu, G. Liu, Z. Yue, B. Fischman, Z. Li, D. Giguzin, T. Goren, P. Artaxoi, H. M. J. Barbosa, U. Pöschl, and Meinrat O. Andreae, 2016: Satellite retrieval of cloud condensation nuclei concentrations by using clouds as CCN chambers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, doi:10.1073/pnas.1514044113.

Twomey, S.: The nuclei of natural cloud formation part II: the supersaturation in natural clouds and the variation of cloud droplet concentration, *Geophys. Pura e Appl.*, 43(1), 243–249, doi:10.1007/BF01993560, 1959.

Line 149: should read “Manaus City” not “Manaus city”

A: OK. Changed.

Line 193-194: Delete “was used additionally considering” and Line 194: add “was considered” after 10%. In total the sentence should read “For the CDP sample area of 0.22 mm<sup>2</sup>, an uncertainty of about 10% was considered (Molleker et al., 2014).”

A: OK. Changed.

Line 205: Delete extra periods

A: OK. Changed.

Line 267: “maximal” should be “maximum”

A: OK. Changed.

Line 269: should “probes” have an apostrophe after it i.e. probes’? it sounds like it is being used in the possessive.

A: OK. Changed.

Line 297: Why these specific flights being used (AC08 and AC20) for the CWC, why not data from the entire campaign? Also, why not use the same flights as were used in the effective radius comparison (line 278)?

A: The sentence is wrong. We used all flights, except AC07 which we have not hotwire data. We have corrected the sentence.

Line 309-314: Why compare only with one hot wire probe when three of them were on board the aircraft?

A: There was only one hotwire operational aboard HALO. This one was mounted on the CAS-DPOL.

Some DMT instruments are delivered with hot-wires. The CCP was indeed equipped with the hot-wire as well, but we do not operate it during flight as then

the CCP's overall power consumption would exceed the limits. It was physically disconnected and no part of CCP anymore.

Line 319: insert "the" before "hot-wire"

A: OK. Changed.

Line 320: Can you make it clearer that this is a decreasing number concentration with *increasing* effective radius

A: OK. Changed.

Line 322: insert "the" ahead of "CAS-DPOL" in general the grammar is really poor from lines 320-325, please rectify

A: The text was rewritten.

Line 326-333: Why not consider using only particles less than 40 microns in your CWC comparison?

A: The amount of CWC above 40  $\mu\text{m}$  is negligible. However, it illustrates the difference in the shapes of the DSDs.

Line 406: replace "greater than or equal" with the symbol " $\geq$ "

A: OK. Changed.

Line 471-479: Are these values presented here similar to literature values from other locations in the world? Can there be a comparison and discussion of this?

A: Ok. We added a new text:

"For some flights the values estimated for  $N_0$  and  $k$  parameters of Eq. 1 are similar to what was found by Pöhlker et al., (2016) for ground measurements ( $N_0 = 1469 \pm 78$  and  $k = 0.36 \pm 0.06$ ) during the dry season in the Amazon. However, in the majority of the cases  $N_0$  and  $k$  are twice or three times greater than the values from Pöhlker et al., (2016). These differences are probably related to flying selectively to areas that had high aerosol concentrations to contrast the cloud behavior with the flights with low aerosol concentrations, as shown in Fig. 2. The high CCN measured in this study is more similar to

previous aircraft measurements in smoky conditions over the Amazon (Andreae et al., 2004; Freud et al., 2008).”

Table from Pöhlker et al., 2016

**Table 5.** Twomey fit parameters describing CCN spectra  $N_{CCN}(S)$  vs.  $S$  as parametrization input data (compare to Figs. 10 and 11a, c). Fit parameters are provided for annually averaged CCN spectra and resolved by seasons.

Time period	$N_{CCN}(1\%)$ ( $\text{cm}^{-3}$ )	$k$	$R^2$
Annual	$998 \pm 60$	$0.36 \pm 0.04$	0.88
Wet season	$289 \pm 7$	$0.57 \pm 0.03$	0.98
LRT period	$378 \pm 9$	$0.38 \pm 0.03$	0.94
Transition	$970 \pm 40$	$0.49 \pm 0.05$	0.94
Dry season	$1469 \pm 78$	$0.36 \pm 0.06$	0.86

Andreae, M. O., Rosenfeld, D., Artaxo, P., Costa, A. A., Frank, G. P., Longo, K. M. and Silva-Dias, M. A. F.: Smoking rain clouds over the Amazon, *Science*, 303(5662), 1337–42, doi:10.1126/science.1092779, 2004.

Freud, E., Rosenfeld, D., Andreae, M. O., Costa, A. A. and Artaxo, P.: Robust relations between CCN and the vertical evolution of cloud drop size distribution in deep convective clouds, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 8(6), 1661–1675, doi:10.5194/acp-8-1661-2008, 2008.

Pöhlker, M.L., Pöhlker, C., Ditas, F., Klimach, T., Hrabce de Angelis, I., Araújo, A., Brito, J., Carbone, S., Cheng, Y., Chi, X. and Ditz, R., 2016. Long-term observations of cloud condensation nuclei in the Amazon rain forest–Part 1: Aerosol size distribution, hygroscopicity, and new model parametrizations for CCN prediction. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 16(24), pp.15709-15740.

Line 520: Figure 14a shows the LWC? The Na that is stated in Figure 14a is also mentioned here in Line 523, not sure why the reference to Figure 14a is needed here.

A: Yes, LWC for adiabatic fraction > 0.25.

A: Ok.

Line 530-534: The scaling of 1.3 works quite well, perhaps mention it here since this is a new data set.

A: Ok. Thanks.

Line 558: Here the authors should make a case for why their work was novel, interesting or what is new about their work.

A: The conclusions now clearly show the novel aspects of this study.

Line 570-574: Was there any doubt about the validity of the parameterization prior to this study? What is new about the work here other than the fact that the measurements were all taken during this campaign on one/the same aircraft?

A: Most of the tested parameterizations are new, and it is the first time that they are tested comprehensively alongside old parameterizations.

Figures

Fig 4: Consider editing the plot so that the legend matches the sub=plot where the quantities are shown

Fig 4 (lower left panel for CWC): Why is it necessary to have a log scale? The data just cover one order of magnitude and are all squeezed to the bottom half of the panel. There is no need for the scale to extend to 10. And no need for a log scale either. This artificially downplays some of the differences between the probes.

A: We changed the Figure 4 as you suggest. See below.









Figure 4. Mean cloud water content from the hot-wire measurements and estimated from the cloud probes (CCP-CDP and CAS-DPOL from top to bottom, respectively) as a function of effective radius ( $r_e$ ) size (left panel). The ratios between the hot-wire liquid water content and the cloud water content derived from each probe are shown in red ( $CWC_r$ ). The total uncertainty for each probe and the hot-wire measurements are shown by the dotted lines. The number of cases (black continuous line), hot-wire measurement standard deviations (dashed black line), and probe CWC standard deviations (dashed colored line) for each  $r_e$  size are shown in the right panels.



Fig 6a and 6b: is it necessary to have zeros in front of the micron sizes, i.e. 05 instead of 5. Also, can both scales be made linear for consistency and clarity? It is hard to compare presented in the manner here.

A: The others referees also have requested some changes in figures 6. We have changed the figures 6 and captions to address the suggestions. Following these suggestions we have changed the DSDs figures using histograms of binned detection channels. The data points are shown with size bin limits in x-direction (to cover the Mie-ambiguity ranges, providing an approach to have the channel-wise sizing error superimposed by the size-bin limits) and uncertainty in y-direction. We also eliminate the zeros in front of micron sizes. See new figures below.








Figure 6. (left) Mean cloud droplet concentration (solid lines) and (right) cloud water content as a function of droplet diameter in the left and right panels, respectively, for a)  $5 \mu\text{m} < r_e < 6 \mu\text{m}$ ; b)  $8 \mu\text{m} < r_e < 9 \mu\text{m}$ ; c)  $11 \mu\text{m} < r_e < 12 \mu\text{m}$ ; d)  $12 \mu\text{m} < r_e < 13 \mu\text{m}$ . The probes are identified by colors as shown at the top of the panels. The error bars indicate the uncertainty range of mean cloud droplet concentration and cloud water content values as a function of droplet diameter.

Line 1134: Italicize "m"

A: Ok. Thanks.

Fig 12 (all panels): Shouldn't  $N_d$  be in red?

A: Yes. Thanks.

Fig 13 (line 1190): reference to Fig 7-8 is not consistent with text, should be Figure 11 and 12

A: Yes. Thanks.

**Interactive comment on “Comparing calculated microphysical properties of tropical convective clouds at cloud base with measurements during the ACRIDICON-CHUVA campaign” by Ramon Campos Braga et al.**

**Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 10 February 2017

The Manuscript is a little vague in its objectives, but it appears that it is attempting to validate aircraft observations by performing closure with either different instruments or between CCN measurements made at different supersaturations and cloud droplet numbers measured at different updraft speeds. It does this using below cloud and in cloud measurements made during the ACRIDICON-CHUVA campaign and combining these with activation models.

The other reviewers have already made comments regarding the models used so I will focus here mostly on the measurements and the analysis that goes along with those.

Unfortunately this paper needs significant extra work in order to make it of publishable quality. However I think the type of analysis that has been performed here is valuable and is not undertaken enough. This is the type of paper that can be used to assure the quality of the measurements being made and that other papers in the project can reference to avoid repeating this analysis by multiple groups and authors. It is also the type of paper that can highlight the limits of the instruments. This is good as it can provide insight to a modeller who is using the data perhaps without an in-depth knowledge of its limits and it also means that it becomes clear what science cannot be performed with the data and therefore where we need to improve our instruments, calibration methods and analysis techniques. However the work is only valuable in this sense if the analysis is performed in an incredibly rigorous manner. I applaud the author's attempt to write this paper, but I would suggest that he needs to pull in more input from coauthors - there are many well respected coauthors on the paper and I am surprised that their instrument knowledge does not show through in this paper. There are certainly other

people who work full time within the aircraft instrument community who could have input.

I would suggest that the manuscript needs a full rewrite and I would suggest that the author goes back to basics in terms of deciding exactly what the objectives are (are they validating instruments or validating the cloud models), then doing a thorough uncertainty analysis of the instruments. This must include details of calibration methods used and the uncertainty derived from those, plus things that cannot or have not been calibrated and the reason why and what the expected uncertainty for these things might be. Based on the uncertainty analysis the author can then decide if the objectives are achievable and can present appropriate uncertainties in the conclusions. Based on the general comments above I recommend the paper be rejected in its current form. Some more detailed comments follow

#### *General Comments:*

The authors thank the referee for the general comments and advices. Furthermore, the advices of the referee are highly appreciated as well as the very valuable and constructive suggestions to increase the quality of the manuscript. We tried to address the points requested by the reviewer to the paper be considered for publication. Overall, we have improved the focus of the paper highlighting our objectives and the novelty of our study.

The availability of the measurements collected by the aircraft HALO provides a unique opportunity to compare the data with model predictions and to test the sensitivity of the results to the differences between the measurements by the cloud probes.

This study is novel in several aspects:

- a. It is the first study that validates the methodology of retrieving the adiabatic cloud drop concentrations  $N_a$  (Freud et al., 2011) from the vertical evolution of  $r_e$  while assuming that  $r_e$  is nearly adiabatic. This is important because it supports the validity of retrieving  $N_a$  from satellite-retrieved vertical profile of  $r_e$  (Rosenfeld et al., 2014a and 2016).

- b. It is the first study that tests with aircraft the measured  $N_d$  with its parameterization that is based on  $N_{CCN}(S)$  along with cloud base spectrum of updrafts weighted by the updraft speed itself,  $W_b^*$ . It is done this way to be compatible with the recently developed methodology of retrieving CCN from satellites by means of retrieving  $N_d$  and  $W_b^*$  (Rosenfeld et al., 2016).
- c. It is the first study that compares observationally the old Twomey (1959) parameterization of the dependence of  $N_d$  on  $W_b$  (Eq. 2) versus the recent Pinsky et al. (2012) analytical expression for the same (Eq. 3)."

#### References:

Freud, E., Rosenfeld, D. and Kulkarni, J. R.: Resolving both entrainment-mixing and number of activated CCN in deep convective clouds, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11(24), 12887–12900, doi:10.5194/acp-11-12887-2011, 2011.

Pinsky, M., Khain, A., Mazin, I. and Korolev, A.: Analytical estimation of droplet concentration at cloud base, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 117(17), 1–14, doi:10.1029/2012JD017753, 2012.

Rosenfeld, D., Fischman, B., Zheng, Y., Goren, T. and Giguzin, D.: Combined satellite and radar retrievals of drop concentration and CCN at convective cloud base, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 41(9), 3259–3265, doi:10.1002/2014GL059453, 2014a.

Rosenfeld D., Y. Zheng, E. Hashimshoni, M. L. Pöhlker, A. Jefferson, C. Pöhlker, X. Yu, Y. Zhu, G. Liu, Z. Yue, B. Fischman, Z. Li, D. Giguzin, T. Goren, P. Artaxoi, H. M. J. Barbosa, U. Pöschl, and Meinrat O. Andreae, 2016: Satellite retrieval of cloud condensation nuclei concentrations by using clouds as CCN chambers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, doi:10.1073/pnas.1514044113.

Twomey, S.: The nuclei of natural cloud formation part II: the supersaturation in natural clouds and the variation of cloud droplet concentration, *Geofis. Pura e Appl.*, 43(1), 243–249, doi:10.1007/BF01993560, 1959.

*Specific comments:*

Introduction - In general the author should be familiar with the calibration methods used with the instruments used and this should be reflected in the references.

line 75 - Previous analysis (Strapp et al 1992, Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology Vol 9 p 548) has indicated that the PCASP dries its sample through ram heating during measurements. The author should familiarise himself with this work, and understand why this drying may not be happening.

**A: There is no mention of PCASP near line 75 of the ACPD paper.**

**We are well aware of the claim that PCASP is drying the aerosols in the inlet. The observations show that this assumption is clearly not valid. This disqualified the use of PCASP for this study. This is explained in lines 111-117 of the ACPD paper.**

Line 85 - If CCN measured at constant  $S$  is not constant then either  $N_0$  or  $k$  in (1) are changing. I.e., either the total number is changing but everything else remains the same or the hygroscopicity or size distribution of the aerosol is changing. Or of course there could be a combination of these factors. The author must show which are occurring.

**A: We highlight that CCN concentration changes as a function of  $S$  or CCN load. Therefore, we correct CCN concentrations measured with different  $S$  with the CCN loaded observed for measurements with fixed  $S$ . The CCN load is calculated by calculating the difference between the measured CCN concentrations with the mean CCN concentration measured for a fixed  $S$ .**

Line 95-100 - Total number totally cancels from effective radius calculations and adiabatic calculations reveal expectations for mass of condensed water not number. Dividing adiabatic water content by measured mass per particle would give a number concentration but even in an adiabatic regime the uncertainty on

this would be larger than the measured droplet number concentration. Calibrations on the CDP operated by FAAM using the method described by Rosenberg et al 2012 (Atmospheric Measurement Techniques vol 5 p1147) provides an uncertainty around 0.5  $\mu\text{m}$  in sizing, but typically shows a discrepancy of around 2  $\mu\text{m}$  from the manufacturer's specification. If the manufacturer spec is used in this work then we can expect that at 20  $\mu\text{m}$  we have approximately 30% uncertainty in mass per particle measurements.

Line 190 - Has the collecting angle of the instruments been measured? This defines the location of the Mie wiggles and where the bins should be merged.

A: Given the uncertainty of the sample area, the Probe Air Speed (PAS), article losses, deviations and maybe coincidence (not negligible but likely not a significant issue) the uncertainty in concentration ranges below 20% and likely approaches or exceeds 20% only in cases of tight curve maneuvers à this might be the most prominent case when the "collecting angle" comes into play. For level flight (straight heading) I would quantify this issue to be comparatively small given the flight speeds of generally larger 170m/s and up to 240m/s – i.e. the direction of particle penetration may be predominantly perfectly in-line with the flight direction (unless there was a systematic deviation of cloud elements due to flow disturbances induced by the aircraft structure or the neighbored instrument, etc. for which at current state no clear evidence is given, yet).

Line 246-260 - As described previously this assumes  $k$  is constant, the author needs to provide evidence this is a good assumption. The correction method means that we are correcting to a point where  $N_0$  is equal to the average  $N_0$  for the scan. This should be made clear and an estimate of how much  $N_0$  is varying must be made as this impacts how much confidence we have in a model's estimate of  $N_d$  in cloud.



A: The correction method assumes that the variability of  $CCN_1$  at each flight step can be corrected by the average measurements of  $CCN_1$  ( $TmCCN_1$ ). Indeed, there is a variation on  $TmCCN_1$  for each flight segment. The calculated standard deviation for  $TmCCN_1$  in all flight segments was up to 24 %, indicating a small impact on the parameterization proposed to fit the Twomey equation (Eq. 1). We calculated the uncertainty impacts from the adjusted  $N_0$  and  $k$  and it contributes to about 35 % of  $N_{dCCN}$  and  $N_{DT}$  uncertainties on average.

This was added to the text.

Line 261-269 - When I first read this seemed entirely circular. Later it becomes clear that this is the point. We are putting observations into a model and checking for consistency. The author should highlight in the aims of the paper that they intend to do this so that the reader knows to expect this. A better way to represent this may be a plot of  $N_d$  vs  $S$  with data points taken from measurements and derived through equation 3 (perhaps coloured by  $w$ ) along with points from the scanning and static CCN instrument. If the model is correct and the obs are consistent then all points should fall on one line.

A: Unfortunately  $S$  measurements within clouds are not accurate, and then we could not compare with  $S_{max}$  estimates.

Lines 284-288 This probability matching method assumes droplet number is a monotonic function of  $w$  only. I have no issue with the monotonic assumption, but the author should show that there is no other influences upon drop concentration such as entrained dry/clean air and constant aerosol/ccn concentration below cloud or at least state why this is a good assumption.

A: We assume that for a given  $CCN(S)$  spectrum below cloud base the droplet number measured at cloud base is a function of  $W$ , as stated by Twomey equation (Eq. 2). The analysis shows that for most of cases that the theoretical estimates do not reproduce the measured  $N_d$  the degree of entrainment should be high (because we have a large dispersion of  $N_d$  values). This is an issue that we should highlight in the new version of the manuscript.

New text at manuscript:

“A suitable method to analyze the relationship between  $W_b$  and  $N_d$  measurements is the ‘probability matching method’ (PMM) (Haddad and Rosenfeld, 1997), which requires that the two related variables will be increasing monotonically with each other. For a set of measurements of  $W_b$  and  $N_d$  at cloud base, it is expected that larger  $W_b$  would produce larger  $N_d$  for a given  $N_{CCN}(S)$ . Therefore, it is assumed also that  $N_d$  is produced uniquely by  $W_b$  for a given  $N_{CCN}(S)$  spectrum as calculated from the measurements below cloud base. It is further assumed that entrainment does not change systematically with  $W_b$  in a way that would reverse the monotonic increase of  $W_b$  with  $N_{CCN}(S)$ .”

Lines 307-325 This needs a thorough uncertainty analysis to show its usefulness as described earlier.

A: The line numbers do not match anything that can be relevant to the comment in the manuscript.

Line 350 - You are claiming an uncertainty of 5% in  $N_0$ , but as described earlier this is in the average  $N_0$  over the scan. We have seen CCN number on the constant supersaturation instrument vary from 650 to 950  $\text{cm}^{-3}$  so it seems unreasonable to claim 5% uncertainty in this parameter. . This ambiguity comes from not being clear in the first instance about what you are trying to measure. In reality I think an estimate of  $k$  is what you should be aiming for as  $N_0$  is clearly changing and is not a constant.

A: We have calculated an uncertainty of about 20% for large  $N_{CCN}(S)$  and about 10 % for smaller  $N_{CCN}(S)$ . On average,  $N_{CCN}(S)$  have an uncertainty of 15 %,  $N_0$  and  $k$  20 and 23 %, respectively. This is better described at the new version.

Line 380-390 I certainly would not be alone in suggesting that the phrase “agree closely” and similar variations has very little place in scientific work. In this case there is a difference of up to 70% in fig 9a. Phrases such as “agree within the

measurement uncertainties,” “differ by up to x amount,” or “agree to the extent that conclusion y is unaffected” are all appropriate, but “agree closely” is entirely subjective.

A: Ok. changed.

Line 401 - Another “good agreement” statement. Points here deviate from the 1:1 line by up to a factor of 2.

A: We rewrote the sentence.

New text:

“...Figure 13a shows the values of  $N_d^*$  and  $N_{dT}^*$  for the different cloud base measurements shown in Figs. 11 and 12. The  $N_{dT}^*$  agrees with  $N_d^*$  within the measurements uncertainties, as shown by the error bars. The bias of  $N_{dT}^*$  with respect to  $N_d^*$  for the CAS -DPOL is 1.00 with a standard deviation  $\pm 0.17$  around it. The respective result for the CDP is  $0.84 \pm 0.12$ . A weaker agreement is observed for comparisons between  $N_{dCCN}^*$  and  $N_d^*$  (see Fig. 13b), A factor of  $\sim 2$  can be observed for some cases (AC14 and AC17). The bias of  $N_{dCCN}^*$  with respect to  $N_d^*$  for the CAS-DPOL is  $0.80 \pm 0.07$ . The respective result for the CDP is  $0.76 \pm 0.1$ . “

Line 440-444 - This difference is almost certainly within the expected uncertainty which as described above is probably 30% from the mass per particle measurement, plus perhaps 10-20% from sample area and air speed through the sample volume estimates.





447-450 and figs 13/14 - I see size distributions like this all the time and often by people who work with these instruments a lot. They are unfortunately not really appropriate styles for plotting size distributions. The following changes should be made. The plot should show points and not lines. It is not appropriate to “join the dots” on a plot that has significant uncertainties. Each point should have an x and y uncertainty. Standard error is not an appropriate uncertainty to use. It assumes that we measure the same thing repeatedly and that the uncertainty is dominated by noise. Here we have concentrations that vary with

time during and between the periods that contribute to these average size distributions. So the standard error becomes some combination of noise and variability and omits all systematic uncertainties. Instead the author should do a proper error analysis including contributions from sample area, air speed at the probe, bin width and counting (Poisson) uncertainty for the y error and sizing uncertainty for the x error.

A: The CDP'S sizing uncertainty is calibrated regularly before, during and after flights with mono-sized glass beads or Poly Styrol Latex (PSL) of various sizes. The uncertainty of these calibrations mainly results from the uncertainty in size of the test aerosol and refractive index resulting in an uncertainty for specific particle diameter of at most 10%. The CIPgs sizing may imply an general uncertainty of +/- 15  $\mu\text{m}$  which is the instruments resolution. In the way we treated the data for spherical bodies, the uncertainty should not be larger for the CIPgs sizing as the particles are mainly in PAS speed or faster (latter causes an image squeezing in flight direction which is compensated by choosing the diameter in diode array direction for the image sizing). Furthermore, in the droplet regime, the reproduction of the Fresnel-diffraction may cause a non-systematic uncertainty in the sizing. However, all droplet sizes may more or less be influenced in the airborne state by deformation or shrinking (very smallest drops - due to congestion heating) in the compressed flow regime upstream of the probes at highest flight speeds which at current state is not quantifiable but may be small.

We agree with the referee that the DSDs on Figures 6 should not be presented as line plots. The line between data points suggests a course of the DSDs that is not real. Instead, we have changed the DSDs figures using histograms of binned detection channels. The data points are shown with size bin limits in x-direction (to cover the Mie-ambiguity ranges, providing an approach to have the channel-wise sizing error superimposed by the size-bin limits) and uncertainty in y-direction.

The new figures 6a-d are available below.






Figure 6. (left) Mean cloud droplet concentration (solid lines) and (right) cloud water content as a function of droplet diameter in the left and right panels, respectively, for a)  $5 \mu\text{m} < r_e < 6 \mu\text{m}$ ; b)  $8 \mu\text{m} < r_e < 9 \mu\text{m}$ ; c)  $11 \mu\text{m} < r_e < 12 \mu\text{m}$ ; d)  $12 \mu\text{m} < r_e < 13 \mu\text{m}$ . The probes are identified by colors as shown at the top of the panels. The error bars indicate the uncertainty range of mean cloud droplet concentration and cloud water content values as a function of droplet diameter.

Line 454-560 The sensitivity is probably not the issue, it is more likely to be the bin widths for which we see no calibration.

A: OK.

**Interactive comment on “Comparing calculated microphysical properties of tropical convective clouds at cloud base with measurements during the ACRIDICON-CHUVA campaign” by Ramon Campos Braga et al.**

**Anonymous Referee #3**

Received and published: 20 January 2017

Title: Comparing calculated microphysical properties of tropical convective clouds at cloud base with measurements during the ACRIDICON-CHUVA campaign.

Author(s): Ramon Braga et al.

The paper compares calculated with measured microphysical properties of convective liquid clouds in the tropics.

Unfortunately, calculations are not performed within a microphysical model taking into account important spatiotemporal fluctuations of dynamical and thermodynamical properties, turbulence, entrainment, etc... In this study solely a comparison of calculating cloud properties from analytical equations and respective measurements has been performed, which represents a considerable work, however with rather limited outcome.

Conclusions of this comparison study are disappointing and do not gain new insights in liquid convective cloud microphysical processes. The paper barely presents new and noteworthy concepts. As it stands, the work is solely a rather qualitative affirmation of existing parameterizations. Taking these issues into account, the study may better carve out the uncertainties of used cloud parameterizations (equations 1, 2, 3? ...) based on the uncertainties of measured cloud parameters from the ACRIDICONCHUVA dataset. Also taking into account missed features and uncertainties stemming from turbulence (and more complex droplet activation) and entrainment not captured in this study. Would this be possible at all? The uncertainties of your instruments and derived measurements have been discussed rather honestly in this manuscript. This is



why I encourage authors to develop this manuscript into that direction. Otherwise, I would recommend rejection of this manuscript due to its poor contribution to scientific progress.

The manuscript shows some striking and unexplained differences between calculated and measured microphysical parameters ( $N_d$  versus  $N_dT$ ,  $N_dT^*$  versus  $N_dCCN^*$  for a series of flights). Is this a principal problem of performed measurements within an environment of complex processes and limited degree of complexity of calculations that are hardly comparable: calculations do not capture measurement data features like turbulence, entrainment, etc...? At least above mentioned differences are more important for higher  $W_b$  values!

### *General comments*

The authors thank the referee for the general comments and advices. Furthermore, the advices of the referee are highly appreciated as well as the very valuable and constructive suggestions to increase the quality of the manuscript. However, we disagree with the referee affirmation which highlight that the study have a poor contribution to scientific progress. As mentioned before, the objective of the paper is to validate the physical parameterizations connecting between  $CCN(S)$ ,  $W_b$ ,  $N_d$  and  $N_a$ , when tested over the important convective regime of the Amazon. This is the first paper that tests all parameterizations proposed for convective clouds regime against each other with the same dataset.

Furthermore, the parameterizations are far from being old. Rather, as now stated in the first paragraph of the abstract: "The objective of this study is to validate novel parameterizations that were recently developed for satellite retrievals of  $CCN(S)$  at cloud base alongside with more traditional parameterizations connecting  $CCN(S)$  with cloud base updrafts and drop concentrations."

The calculations of the effective updraft speed at cloud base ( $W_b^*$ ) provide a new capability for test the parameterizations proposed in the study and to

ascribe the capability of  $N_a$  estimates for convective clouds developed at different aerosol conditions over Amazon. The role idea of using  $W_b^*$  is already accounting for the air turbulence (see Rosenfeld et al., 2014a) and the  $N_a$  estimates for convective clouds also account for entrainment as is described at section 4.4 (also discussed at Freud et al., 2011). The study supports the use of  $N_a$  estimates using satellite data of effective radius vertical profiles at convective clouds over the Amazon basin.

Regarding the possibility of use other parameterizations in our analysis, we have already highlight at introduction section some issues due to the unreasonable measurements of low hygroscopic factor ( $\kappa$ ) values below cloud base, which prevent us to test other types of parameterizations (e.g. *k-Köhler* model estimates) to validate  $N_d$  at cloud base.

In summary, the following text was added to the introduction:

“This study is novel in several aspects:

- a. It is the first study that validates the methodology of retrieving the adiabatic cloud drop concentrations  $N_a$  (Freud et al., 2011) from the vertical evolution of  $r_e$  while assuming that  $r_e$  is nearly adiabatic. This is important because it supports the validity of retrieving  $N_a$  from satellite-retrieved vertical profile of  $r_e$  (Rosenfeld et al., 2014a and 2016).
- b. It is the first study that tests with aircraft the measured  $N_d$  with its parameterization that is based on supersaturation spectrum of CCN along with cloud base spectrum of updrafts,  $W_b^*$ . It is done this way to be compatible with the recently developed methodology of retrieving CCN from satellites by means of retrieving  $N_d$  and  $W_b^*$  (Rosenfeld et al., 2016).
- c. It is the first study that compares observationally the old Twomey (1959) parameterization of the dependence of  $N_d$  on  $W_b$  (Eq. 2) versus the recent Pinsky et al. (2012) analytical expression for the same (Eq. 3).”

We agree to better carve out the uncertainties of used cloud parameterizations, which will be available at the new version of the manuscript.

The uncertainties of  $W_b$  of HALO were recalculated for all campaign data. In the new version of the manuscript we ascribe the uncertainties of theoretical estimates assuming  $0.3 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  as the  $W_b$  uncertainty. This new number changes the values of variables uncertainties used for  $N_{dT}$ ,  $S_{max}$  and  $N_{dCCN}$  estimates.

#### References:

Freud, E., Rosenfeld, D. and Kulkarni, J. R.: Resolving both entrainment-mixing and number of activated CCN in deep convective clouds, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11(24), 12887–12900, doi:10.5194/acp-11-12887-2011, 2011.

Pinsky, M., Khain, A., Mazin, I. and Korolev, A.: Analytical estimation of droplet concentration at cloud base, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 117(17), 1–14, doi:10.1029/2012JD017753, 2012.

Rosenfeld, D., Fischman, B., Zheng, Y., Goren, T. and Giguzin, D.: Combined satellite and radar retrievals of drop concentration and CCN at convective cloud base, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 41(9), 3259–3265, doi:10.1002/2014GL059453, 2014a.

Rosenfeld D., Y. Zheng, E. Hashimshoni, M. L. Pöhlker, A. Jefferson, C. Pöhlker, X. Yu, Y. Zhu, G. Liu, Z. Yue, B. Fischman, Z. Li, D. Giguzin, T. Goren, P. Artaxoi, H. M. J. Barbosa, U. Pöschl, and Meinrat O. Andreae, 2016: Satellite retrieval of cloud condensation nuclei concentrations by using clouds as CCN chambers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, doi:10.1073/pnas.1514044113.

Twomey, S.: The nuclei of natural cloud formation part II: the supersaturation in natural clouds and the variation of cloud droplet concentration, *Geophys. Pura e Appl.*, 43(1), 243–249, doi:10.1007/BF01993560, 1959.

#### ***Specific answers***

Specific comments related to above general statement:

Line 36: What is the impact of  $W_b$  uncertainty of  $0.2 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  on  $N_d$  calculation?

A: The  $W_b$  uncertainty impacts on average for about 65% on  $N_{dT}$  uncertainty.

Line 98: What is the cumulative impact of  $W_b$  and  $N_d$  uncertainties on  $S_{max}$  calculation and then  $N_0$  and  $k$ ?

A: The cumulative impact on  $S_{max}$  is 22 % on average.  $N_0$  and  $k$  is not used on  $S_{max}$  calculation, just  $W_b$ ,  $N_d$  and temperature and pressure of cloud base (used on coefficient  $C$  estimate at equation 2).

A: We have changed the manuscript to address these questions as follow:

“The uncertainties regarding the  $S_{max}$ ,  $N_{dCCN}$  and  $N_{dT}$  estimates for measurements at cloud base with both probes (CCP-CDP and CAS-DPOL) are on average about 22, 20 and 38 % for all flights, respectively (the uncertainty method adopted for these theoretical estimates are available at Appendix A). The  $W_b$  uncertainty of  $0.3 \text{ m s}^{-1}$  impacts on average for about 65% (60 %) on  $N_{dT}$  ( $S_{max}$ ) uncertainty, and the uncertainty from the estimated  $S_{max}$  contributes for most of  $N_{dCCN}$  uncertainty (~70% on average).”

Line 194: CDP sample area has not been calibrated before, during, after flight campaign? In this case you may not claim only 10% of uncertainty in SA?

A: The CDP sample area has been frequently measured revealing by the way  $0.27\text{mm}^2$  (not  $0.22\text{mm}^2$ , which should be a typo or an outdated value and must be corrected in the text) with an uncertainty of 10%. The uncertainty  $\pm 0.03\text{mm}^2$  results from repeated measurements. Unless there is no massive manipulation/disarrangement of the CDP's optics or a detectable aging of the laser diode, the sample area remains stable even if the instrument experiences regular handling during, e.g., field campaign operations.

Do you correct King probe LWC (seems not to be the case), knowing that sensitivity below  $10 \mu\text{m}$  and above may be  $30\text{-}40 \mu\text{m}$  is reduced. You are using this probe for LWC reference, however Strapp (2003) demonstrated large deviations of King probe LWC also for larger drop diameters of  $40 \mu\text{m}$  (may be

already 30  $\mu\text{m}$ ?). Your effective drop diameters reach 26  $\mu\text{m}$  .... Uncertainty of solely 5% in LWC is difficult to believe.

A: The uncertainty of 5 % was referenced with the original paper by King et al.. In order to account for the particles <10 $\mu\text{m}$  that are not fully detected by the hotwire, we only consider size distributions with an effective radius above 5  $\mu\text{m}$  to reduce the contributions from smaller particles. Since the agreement between the Hotwire and CAS-DPOL and the Hotwire and CDP doesn't change with effective diameter, this is a good indicator that the uncertainty of the measurement doesn't change with the growth of the detected particles. Figure 6d shows the size resolved contribution of LWC for effective radii of 26  $\mu\text{m}$ . The fraction of CWC from particles above 30  $\mu\text{m}$  is one to two orders of magnitude less than the maximum CWC. Therefore we believe that the uncertainty of 5% is justified for the size range considered in this analysis.

Line 309: And what if King probe and CAS DPOL are both wrong and CDP is right?

A: We believe that as they measure the same cloud volume and have good agreement the measurements are correct. This does not exclude the possibility of CDP works fine as we were measuring at very inhomogeneous convective clouds. Also, perfect agreement between both probes is not expected due differences at cloud volume and singular characteristics of each instrument (e.g. sample area, inlet configuration etc.)

Line 339: Why don't you correct CAS DPOL data for your calibrations? Consequently, in your data the CAS DPOL instrument undersizes large droplets! (40  $\mu\text{m}$  in diameter appear as 35  $\mu\text{m}$  drops?). In case your effective diameter droplets of 26  $\mu\text{m}$  would have been 30  $\mu\text{m}$  droplets in reality, you are underestimating LWC by 50% for these droplet sizes: : : Likewise, the King probe is underestimating LWC for other reasons as mentioned above.

A: In Figure 6d (available below), we show size distributions and CWC distributions of both cloud probes for large effective diameters. Even for the large effective diameter, only few drops  $> 40 \mu\text{m}$  were measured by both instruments CDP and CAS-DPOL. The difference between CAS-DPOL and the CDP above  $35\mu\text{m}$  is less than a factor of two, though at very low concentrations. Thus, the difference/error in diameter of these large particles does not contribute significantly to the calculated effective radius. The large droplets contribute an order of magnitude less to the total water content than droplets in the size range around  $25 \mu\text{m}$ . Changing the calibration would change the result of the intercomparison of CWC insignificantly. According to Strapp et al. 2003, hotwire probes in general compared well to other LWC instruments up to MVDs of about  $32 \mu\text{m}$ , which comprises the largest fraction of the CWC measured during ACRIDICON-CHUVA. To sum up, the disagreement between the CWC of hot wire and the cloud probes represent an upper limit of the cloud probe inaccuracy.




Figure 6. (left) Mean cloud droplet concentration (solid lines) and (right) cloud water content as a function of droplet diameter in the left and right panels, respectively, for a)  $5 \mu\text{m} < r_e < 6 \mu\text{m}$ ; b)  $8 \mu\text{m} < r_e < 9 \mu\text{m}$ ; c)  $11 \mu\text{m} < r_e < 12 \mu\text{m}$ ; d)  $12 \mu\text{m} < r_e < 13 \mu\text{m}$ . The probes are identified by colors as shown at the top of the panels. The error bars indicate the uncertainty range of mean cloud droplet concentration and cloud water content values as a function of droplet diameter.

Line 386-394: What is the uncertainty in  $N_0$  and  $k$  calculation and finally the uncertainty in equation (2) calculated droplet number (calculated each second) when averaging  $CCN_2$  per time step normalized by FA (with two other averages of  $mCCN_1$  per time step and  $TmCCN_1$  average of all  $mCCN_1$  time steps or may be even all  $CCN_1$  data)?

A: We have changed the manuscript to address these questions as follow:

“ The calculated  $N_{CCN}(S)$  errors for these flight segments are a function of the measured particle number (i.e. 10% of  $N_{CCN}(S)$  for large concentrations and the mean of the error is around 20% of  $N_{CCN}(S)$ ). The estimated standard error (STDE) for the  $N_0$  and  $k$  parameters and  $CCN$  estimates were calculated (as described in Appendix B) for each flight segment and are shown in Table 2. The table shows that the STDE associated to the Twomey’s equation fit is about 5% for the  $N_0$  and  $k$  parameters. The changes in the air mass assumed to correct the  $CCN_2$  for FA during the flight segments were up to 24 % for all flights. As long as the cloud segment compared with this data are not at exactly the same location as the measurements was performed, the mean (i.e.  $TmCCN_1$ ) is a good measure for this comparison. The standard error was used for the error propagation calculations and the resulting error in  $N_{CCN}(S)$  is 15 % of  $N_{CCN}(S)$  estimates on average. The resulting error of  $N_0$  ( $k$  slope) was also calculated and is 23 % (20 %) of  $N_0$  ( $k$ ) values on average, associated to the Twomey’s equation fit and the  $N_{CCN}(S)$  error.”

“The uncertainties regarding the  $S_{max}$ ,  $N_{dCCN}$  and  $N_{dT}$  estimates for measurements at cloud base with both probes (CCP-CDP and CAS-DPOL) are on average about 22, 20 and 38 % for all flights, respectively (the uncertainty method adopted for these theoretical estimates are available at Appendix A). The  $W_b$  uncertainty of  $0.3 \text{ m s}^{-1}$  impacts on average for about 65% (60 %) on  $N_{dT}$  ( $S_{max}$ ) uncertainty, and the uncertainty from the estimated  $S_{max}$  contributes for most of  $N_{dCCN}$  uncertainty (~70% on average).”

Line 400: equation (3) does not pretend  $S_{max}$  depending on  $N_{CCN}(S)$ . Please detail how  $N_d$  can be used to achieve a closure for  $N_{dCCN}$  estimate.

A: Ok. The following text was added:

" The value of  $S_{max}$  at cloud base can be estimated from Eq. 3 based on the vertical velocity at cloud base and  $N_d$  values measured with the cloud probes CCP-CDP and CAS-DPOL ( $N_{cdp}$  and  $N_{cas}$ , respectively). Therefore, the estimated  $S_{max}$  near cloud base can be used in Eq. 1, producing the  $N_{dCCN}$  estimates to achieve a closure for  $N_d$  measurements at cloud base."

Section 5.2.1.: Gray solid/dashed lines difficult to see in Figs 11 and 12!

A: Ok. We made it thicker.

Fig 11a & 11c show very weak overlap of  $N_{dCCN}$  and  $N_{dT}$  including both uncertainties. In addition, real  $N_d$  measurements can be considerably outside  $N_{dT}$  uncertainties and particularly outside the overlap region. Why? What is the value of this study when measurements are not better matching the calculations with their uncertainties? Are the already large uncertainties still underestimated? Are measurements and calculations comparable in their complexity of the respective environments? I don't think so....

A:  $N_{dT}$  show a great overlap at Figures 11a and 11c, whilst  $N_{dCCN}$  indeed have a weaker overlap (see Figures 11a and 11c below).

The following text was added to the manuscript:

"Both values of  $N_{cas}$  and  $N_{cdp}$  are within the range of the theoretical expectation of  $N_{dT}$  and  $N_{dCCN}$ , except for occasional deviations at the extreme percentiles. For example, the maximum  $N_{dT}$  versus maximum  $N_d$  are outside the error interval for  $N_d$ . This is so because extreme percentiles are much more prone to random variations than the middle range, such as the median.

The lines of  $N_{dT}$  mostly agreed quite well with the lines of  $N_d$  with only small deviations. The  $N_{dCCN}$  mostly underestimates  $N_d$  by down to a factor of 0.5 for reasons that we could not identify. Entrainment is not a likely cause, because it would dilute  $N_d$  and thus incur  $N_{dCCN}$  to be biased positively with respect to  $N_d$ .



It appears that measuring  $S$  in clouds is still a great challenge, even indirectly by using Eq. 3. Remarkably, Eq. 2 (Twomey, 1959), which avoids an explicit usage of  $S$ , still performs better when limited within the observed bounds of  $W_b$  and  $k$  within the cloud."





Fig 12: Color difference of  $N_d$  curves (red) and  $N_d$  in legend (blue). Can you also show results for AC13 and AC16? Fig 12b and 12c as well as 11c show  $N_d$  that significantly exceed  $N_{dT}$  for higher  $W_b$ . Explanation? The problem stems basically from  $N_{CCN2}$  calculation?

A: The response to the previous comment addresses this comment too.

Line 513: Change 10% to at least 15% if not 20% (AC14!).

A: Ok. Changed.

Line 513-517: and a factor of 1.5 for other cases AC11 and again AC17. Solely AC 13 and AC16 data points ok. Therefore I don't agree with that improper statement.

Line 566-567: I would call a factor of 2 in  $N_{dCCN^*}$  to  $N_d^*$  comparison a pretty bad result rather than a good agreement.

A: The following text was added to the manuscript regarding these comments: "...Figure 13a shows the values of  $N_d^*$  and  $N_{dT}^*$  for the different cloud base measurements shown in Figs. 11 and 12. The  $N_{dT}^*$  agrees with  $N_d^*$  within the measurements uncertainties, as shown by the error bars. The bias of  $N_{dT}^*$  with respect to  $N_d^*$  for the CAS -DPOL is 1.00 with a standard deviation  $\pm 0.17$  around it. The respective result for the CDP is  $0.84 \pm 0.12$ . A weaker agreement is observed for comparisons between  $N_{dCCN^*}$  and  $N_d^*$  (see Fig. 13b), A factor of  $\sim 2$  can be observed for some cases (AC14 and AC17). The bias of  $N_{dCCN^*}$  with respect to  $N_d^*$  for the CAS-DPOL is  $0.80 \pm 0.07$ . The respective result for the CDP is  $0.76 \pm 0.1$ ."

# Comparing parameterized versus measured microphysical properties of tropical convective cloud bases during the ACRIDICON-CHUVA campaign

[rb1] Comentário: New title

5 *Ramon Campos Braga<sup>1</sup>, Daniel Rosenfeld<sup>2</sup>, Ralf Weigel<sup>3</sup>, Tina Jurkat<sup>4</sup>, Meinrat O. Andreae<sup>5,9</sup>, Manfred Wendisch<sup>6</sup>, Mira L. Pöhlker<sup>5</sup>, Thomas Klimach<sup>5</sup>, Ulrich Pöschl<sup>5</sup>, Christopher Pöhlker<sup>5</sup>, Christiane Voigt<sup>3,4</sup>, Christoph Mahnke<sup>3</sup>, Stephan Borrmann<sup>3</sup>, Rachel I. Albrecht<sup>7</sup>, Sergej Molleker<sup>8</sup>, Daniel A. Vila<sup>1</sup>, Luiz A. T. Machado<sup>1</sup>, and Paulo Artaxo<sup>10</sup>*

10 <sup>1</sup>Centro de Previsão de Tempo e Estudos Climáticos, Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais, Cachoeira Paulista, Brasil

<sup>2</sup>Institute of Earth Sciences, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel

<sup>3</sup>Institut für Physik der Atmosphäre, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität, Mainz, Germany

<sup>4</sup>Institut für Physik der Atmosphäre, Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt (DLR),  
15 Oberpfaffenhofen, Germany

<sup>5</sup>Multiphase Chemistry and Biogeochemistry Departments, Max Planck Institute for Chemistry, 55020 Mainz, Germany.

<sup>6</sup>Leipziger Institut für Meteorologie (LIM), Universität Leipzig, Stephanstr. 3, 04103 Leipzig, Deutschland

<sup>7</sup>Instituto de Astronomia, Geofísica e Ciências Atmosféricas, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil

20 <sup>8</sup>Max Planck Institute for Chemistry (MPI), Particle Chemistry Department, Mainz, Germany

<sup>9</sup>Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, California 92037, USA

<sup>10</sup>Instituto de Física (IF), Universidade de São Paulo (USP), São Paulo, Brazil

*Correspondence to:* Ramon C. Braga ([ramonbraga87@gmail.com](mailto:ramonbraga87@gmail.com))

## Abstract:

25 The objective of this study is to validate novel parameterizations that were recently developed for satellite retrievals of cloud condensation nuclei supersaturation spectra -  $N_{CCN}(S)$  - at cloud base alongside with more traditional parameterizations connecting  $N_{CCN}(S)$  with cloud base updrafts and drop concentrations. This was based on the HALO aircraft measurements during the ACRIDICON-CHUVA campaign over the Amazon region, which took place in September 2014. The properties of convective clouds were measured with a Cloud Combination Probe (CCP), a  
30 Cloud and Aerosol Spectrometer (CAS-DPOL), and a CCN counter on board the HALO aircraft. An intercomparison of the cloud drop size distributions (DSDs) and the cloud water content (CWC) derived from the different instruments generally shows good agreement within the instrumental uncertainties. To this end, the directly measured

[rb2] Comentário: New abstract highlighting the focus of the paper.

cloud drop concentrations ( $N_d$ ) near cloud base were compared with inferred values based on the measured cloud base updraft velocity ( $W_b$ ) and  $N_{CCN}(S)$  spectra. The measurements of  $N_d$  at cloud base were also compared with  
35 drop concentrations ( $N_a$ ) derived on the basis of an adiabatic assumption and obtained from the vertical evolution of cloud drop effective radius ( $r_e$ ) above cloud base. The measurements of  $N_{CCN}(S)$  and  $W_b$  did reproduce the observed  $N_d$  within the measurements uncertainties when using the old (1959) Twomey's parameterization. The agreement between measured and calculated  $N_d$  was only within a factor of 2 when attempting to use cloud base  $S$ , as obtained from the measured  $W_b$ ,  $N_d$  and  $N_{CCN}(S)$ , underscoring the yet unresolved challenge of aircraft measurements of  $S$  in  
40 clouds. Importantly, the vertical evolution of  $r_e$  with height reproduced the observation-based nearly adiabatic cloud base drop concentrations,  $N_a$ . The combination of these results provides aircraft observational support for the various components of the satellite retrieved methodology that was recently developed to retrieve  $N_{CCN}(S)$  under the base of convective clouds. This parameterization can now be applied more confidently and with the proper qualifications to cloud simulations and satellite retrievals.

45

## 1. Introduction

The understanding of cloud formation and its influence on the global hydrological cycle and radiation budget is fundamental for improving weather and climate forecasting models (Ten Hoeve et al., 2011; Jiang and Feingold,  
50 2006; Kohler, 1999; Rosenfeld et al., 2008; Stephens, 1984). The goal of cloud microphysical models is to reproduce atmospheric processes based on physical relationships developed from field experiments and remote sensing observations in different parts of the globe (Silva Dias et al. 2002; Machado et al. 2014; Fan et al. 2014; Rosenfeld et al. 2014b). Data from aircraft probes provide opportunities to validate and improve cloud models and satellite retrievals of cloud microphysical properties.

55 An assessment of the validity of the cloud probe data themselves is essential before the results can be implemented into cloud models. According to previous studies, the number concentration of cloud droplets ( $N_d$ ) expected at cloud base mainly depends on the atmospheric conditions just below cloud base, i.e., updraft wind speed and the supersaturation ( $S$ ) activation spectra of cloud condensation nuclei [ $N_{CCN}(S)$ ] (Pinsky et al., 2012; Reutter et al., 2009; Twomey, 1959). From cloud condensation nuclei counter (CCNC) measurements across a range of  
60 supersaturations ( $S$ ), the parameters  $N_0$  and  $k$  are estimated from Twomey's formula (Twomey, 1959):

$$N_{CCN} = N_0 \cdot S^k \quad (1)$$

where  $N_0$  is the cloud condensation nuclei (CCN) concentration at  $S=1\%$  in  $\text{cm}^{-3}$ , and  $k$  is the slope parameter (Twomey, 1959). Equation 1 is an analytical representation of the observational data within the measured range of  $S$ , which in our case represents the observed CCN spectrum from 0.2 to 0.55 %. Note, however, that Eq. 1 does not  
65 allow a reliable extrapolation of  $N_{CCN}(S)$  beyond this range (Pöhlker et al., 2016).

The parameters  $N_0$  and  $k$  are estimated from data measured below cloud base along with updraft wind speed measurements at cloud base ( $W_b$ ). The values of  $W_b$ ,  $N_0$ , and  $k$  are used for calculating the theoretical cloud droplet concentration from Eq. 2 (Twomey, 1959) below:

$$N_{dT} = 0.88 \cdot N_0^{\frac{2}{k+2}} \cdot (0.07 \cdot W_b^{1.5})^{\frac{k}{k+2}} \quad (2)$$

where  $N_{dT}$  are the estimated cloud base drop concentrations in  $\text{cm}^{-3}$ . Here we compare the measured  $N_d$  to  $N_{dT}$  by substituting in Eq. 2 the measured  $N_{CCN}(S)$  in the form of  $N_0$  and  $k$ , along with the measured  $W_b$ .

Equations 1 and 2 are a rather simplistic parameterization. More advanced methods, using the hygroscopicity parameter  $\kappa$  (kappa) are more accurate to represent the CCN spectrum (Pöhlker et al., 2016). However, in this study, using Twomey's parameterization is advantageous, because the CCN measurements were performed within the range of 0.2-0.55 %, where the estimation of the  $N_0$  and  $k$  parameters using Eq. 1 does not incur significant errors in comparison with more advanced methods (Pöhlker et al., 2016). Furthermore, Twomey's parameterization also allows calculating the effects of updraft wind speed on  $N_{dT}$  as a function of  $N_0$  and  $k$ .

Another approach to estimate the number concentration of CCN that are expected to nucleate as droplets at cloud base is through the use of the  $\kappa$ -Köhler model (Petters and Kreidenweis, 2007). Based on a given dry aerosol particle size distribution (ASD), the  $\kappa$ -Köhler model with prescribed  $W_b$  simulates the expansion and cooling of air as well as the resulting changes in relative humidity and the related hygroscopic growth of aerosol particles and further condensational growth of cloud droplets. The input to this approach depends strongly on the measured ASD and  $\kappa$  (Reutter et al., 2009).

Measurements of ASD by Passive Cavity Aerosol Spectrometer Probe (PCASP) and Ultra-High-Sensitivity Aerosol Spectrometer (UHSAS) probes were available during the ACRIDICON (Aerosol, Cloud, Precipitation, and Radiation Interactions and Dynamics of Convective Cloud Systems) - CHUVA (Cloud processes of the main precipitation systems in Brazil: A contribUTION to cloud resolVing modeling and to the GPM [Global Precipitation Measurements]) campaign (Wendisch et al., 2016). However, calculating  $\kappa$  from the combined CCN, PCASP, and UHSAS measurements below cloud resulted in unreasonably low  $\kappa$  values (not shown), which could only be explained by hygroscopic swelling of the aerosols at ambient humidity by a large factor of up to more than two. This implies that the particles were not completely dried in the intake of the probe, and thus prevents a quantitative assessment of  $\kappa$  based on the PCASP and  $N_{CCN}(S)$ . A possible reason for this behavior in measurements over the Amazon is that the effective hygroscopicity parameters describing water uptake at sub-saturated conditions can be substantially lower than at supersaturated conditions (Mikhailov et al., 2013). The analysis of this effect on the ASD measurements from PCASP and UHSAS below cloud base requires considerable efforts, which are beyond the scope of this paper. Also, in the case of our flight missions, a major obstacle to the use of the  $\kappa$ -Köhler approach is the fact that measuring the  $N_{CCN}(S)$  spectrum requires a much longer time than the aerosol spectrum with PCASP and/or UHSAS, thus the two measurements are not representing the same aerosol sample. This was evident from the variability of the CCN concentrations measured at fixed  $S$  with one CCNC column, while measuring the  $N_{CCN}(S)$  spectrum with the other column during the flights. The lack of these important analyses prevents the use of  $\kappa$ -Köhler model estimates for comparison with  $N_d$  measurements from cloud probes in the present study.

An estimation of the cloud base droplet concentrations is also possible via the calculation of the maximum supersaturation ( $S_{max}$ ) at cloud base, relying on the measured  $N_d$  and  $W_b$  according to Eq. 3 (Pinsky et al. 2012) below:

$$S_{max} = C \cdot W_b^{\frac{3}{4}} \cdot N_d^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (3)$$

105 where  $C$  is a coefficient that is determined by cloud base temperature and pressure. Since the combination of  $N_{CCN}(S)$  and  $W_b$  determines  $N_d$  and  $S_{max}$ , it is possible to compare the measured and theoretical relationships. Additionally, the estimation of adiabatic cloud droplet concentrations ( $N_d$ ) from measurements of the vertical profile of cloud drop effective radius ( $r_e$ ) is another alternative to evaluate the number of droplets nucleated at cloud base (Freud et al., 2011). The definition of  $r_e$  is:

$$110 \quad r_e = \frac{\int N(r) \cdot r^3 dr}{\int N(r) \cdot r^2 dr} \quad (4)$$

where  $N$  and  $r$  are the droplet concentrations and radii, respectively.

Rosenfeld et al. (2014a) have shown that the effective number concentration of droplets at cloud base ( $N_d^*$ ) can be expressed by a single number, which depends on the effective updraft speed at cloud base ( $W_b^*$ ). To evaluate whether the measured  $N_d^*$  represents the theoretically expected  $N_d^*$  based on the independent measurements of  $N_{CCN}(S)$  and  $W_b$ , it is necessary to find the range of measured  $W_b^*$  and  $N_d^*$  that fulfills best the closure between the measured and indirectly calculated values. Cloud models represent the number of droplets at cloud base by a single number (Pinsky et al., 2012). Therefore, from a set of  $N_d$  measurements at cloud base, an ‘effective’ number of droplets,  $N_d^*$ , can be derived, which represents the measurements for a set of clouds formed in the same thermodynamic condition.

120 The droplet size distribution (DSD) spectrum from clouds, i.e., the DSD variability, depends on the stage of cloud development. After nucleation, the cloud droplets in rising cloud parcels grow with height mainly by condensation. Raindrops start forming when  $r_e$  reaches 13-14  $\mu\text{m}$  and coalescence becomes efficient (Freud and Rosenfeld, 2012; Rosenfeld and Gutman, 1994). Accurate documentation of the vertical evolution of cloud and rain DSDs is essential for analyzing these types of microphysical processes within clouds. Assessing the quality of DSD measurements by the aircraft probes is thus a necessary task. This assessment can be achieved via comparisons between the cloud water content (CWC) calculated from cloud probe DSDs and the direct measurements of CWC with a hot-wire device (CWC $h$ ) for cloud penetrations at different heights (Freud et al., 2008; Rosenfeld et al., 2006). This is done in section 3 while accounting for the dependence of the measurement efficiency of the hot-wire on drop size.

125 Three cloud probes measured the DSDs on board the HALO aircraft during the ACRIDICON-CHUVA campaign (Wendisch et al., 2016). In addition, CWC was measured by a King hot-wire probe (King et al. 1978) installed in the Cloud and Aerosol Spectrometer (CAS-DPOL) probe.

Figure 1 illustrates the HALO flight patterns in convective cloud clusters performed in three steps:

- a. Flying below cloud base for measuring  $N_{CCN}(S)$ ;
- b. Flying through cloud base for measuring  $W_b$  and DSD;
- 135 c. Conducting vertical profiles in growing convective towers close to their tops, to avoid precipitation that may fall from above. The cloud penetrations during this phase are made in vertical steps of several hundred meters when possible, from cloud base to the anvils.

The availability of these measurements collected by the same aircraft provides a unique opportunity to compare the data with theoretical predictions and to test the sensitivity of the results to the differences between the measurements by the cloud probes.

[rb3] Comentário: Here we add a new paragraph highlighting the novelty of this study.

This study is novel in several aspects:

- a. It is the first study that validates the methodology of retrieving the adiabatic cloud drop concentrations  $N_d$  (Freud et al., 2011) from the vertical evolution of  $r_e$  while assuming that  $r_e$  is nearly adiabatic. This is important because it supports the validity of retrieving  $N_d$  from satellite-retrieved vertical profile of  $r_e$  (Rosenfeld et al., 2014a and 2016).
- b. It is the first study that compares the aircraft-measured  $N_d$  with its parameterization that is based on  $N_{CCN}(S)$  along with the spectrum of updrafts at cloud base weighted by the updraft speed itself,  $W_b^*$ . It is done this way to be compatible with the recently developed methodology of retrieving CCN from satellites by means of retrieving  $N_d$  and  $W_b^*$  (Rosenfeld et al., 2016).
- c. It is the first study that examines observationally the old Twomey (1959) parameterization of the dependence of  $N_d$  on  $W_b$  (Eq. 2) versus the recent Pinsky et al. (2012) analytical expression for the same relationship (Eq. 3).

These different methodologies are presented in the next sections. Section 2 discusses the instrumentation and database used for this study. Section 3 gives an overview of the cloud probe measurements and discusses consistencies and disagreements between the measurements. Section 4 describes the methodologies applied to compare measurements and model results at cloud base.

## 2. Instrumentation

The HALO flights during the ACRIDICON-CHUVA campaign were performed over the Amazon region, centered on Manaus, during September 2014 under different conditions of aerosol concentration and land cover, as shown in Fig. 2 (from Wendisch et al., 2016). This region was chosen for documenting cloud microstructure and precipitation-forming processes during the dry season with high concentrations of CCN, and to contrast these measurements against cleaner conditions that could be found within flight range, as documented previously (Andreae et al., 2004; Artaxo et al., 2002). Additionally, we made use of the fact that Manaus is located in the central Amazon (3.11 °S; 60.02 °W), and that therefore the aerosol perturbation from the Manaus urban plume may increase CCN concentrations by one to two orders of magnitude above the pristine conditions in the background air (Kuhn et al., 2010). This study is done in collaboration with the Green Ocean Amazon experiment – GoAmazon (Martin et al., 2016), which also addressed the aerosol influences on cloud microphysical properties with special focus on the Manaus urban plume. A comprehensive introduction to airborne instrumentation is given by Wendisch and Brenguier (2013), and in particular of the microphysical instruments involved in this study by Brenguier et al. (2013).

### 2.1 CCN measurements

175 CCN number concentrations were measured on board HALO during ACRIDICON-CHUVA using a two-column  
CCNC (CCN-200, Column A and B), a continuous-flow longitudinal-thermal-gradient instrument manufactured by  
Droplet Measurement Technologies (DMT) (Roberts and Nenes, 2005). It measures the CCN number concentration  
as a function of water vapor supersaturation ( $S$ ) at a time resolution of 1 Hz. In the instrument, the sampled aerosol  
particles are exposed to a set supersaturation, and adsorb water depending on their size and chemical composition.  
Those particles that grow to droplets larger than  $1\ \mu\text{m}$  in diameter are counted as CCN at that  $S$ . The instrument was  
180 calibrated between flights following Rose et al. (2008). The estimated uncertainties for CCN number concentration  
is about 20 % (10 %) on average for large (small) concentrations. In addition, the uncertainty on supersaturation  
values is 10 % on average.

Sample air for the aerosol measurements was obtained from two different inlets: (i) the HALO aerosol submicron  
inlet (HASI), and (ii) the HALO counterflow virtual impactor (HALO-CVI) (Wendisch et al., 2016). The CCN-200  
185 provides the possibility to measure in parallel from both inlets or at two different values of  $S$ . In this study, only the  
aerosol measurements from the HASI inlet have been used. The measurements were done with one column at a  
constant  $S=0.55\%$ , while the other was cycling  $S$  between 0.2 and 0.55 % with steps every 100 seconds.

## 2.2. Cloud probe measurements

190 Three cloud probes were operated on board HALO during the measurements in the ACRIDICON-CHUVA  
campaign. This study focuses on the CAS-DPOL and CCP-CDP probes. The third probe, NIXE-CAS-DPOL was of  
identical type as CAS-DPOL and is thus not used in this study. The probes' range of measurements is shown in  
Table 1. In this study, cloud particle concentrations are counted at diameters larger than  $3\ \mu\text{m}$  to avoid  
measurements of haze droplets. This is also in accordance with the similar lower limits of the bins sizes of the CCP-  
195 CDP. Details of the cloud probe measurement characteristics are described in the following sections (see also  
Brennguier et al., 2013).

### 2.2.1 CCP-CDP and CCP-CIP measurements

200 The Cloud Combination Probe (CCP) combines two detectors, the Cloud Droplet Probe (CDP) and the greyscale  
Cloud Imaging Probe (CIPgs). The CDP detects forward scattered laser light from cloud particles as they pass  
through the CDP detection area (Lance et al., 2010) and represents an advanced version of the Forward Scattering  
Spectrometer Probe (FSSP) (Baumgardner et al., 1985; Dye and Baumgardner, 1984; Korolev et al., 1985; Wendisch  
et al., 1996). The CIPgs records 2-D shadow-cast images of cloud elements that cross the CIPgs detection region.  
The overall particle detection size range is 2 to  $960\ \mu\text{m}$  when measuring with the CCP. The highest temporal  
205 resolution of the CCP measurements is limited to 1Hz. Recent findings concerning the measurement uncertainties of  
the underwing cloud probes at the comparatively high HALO flight velocities (well above  $170\ \text{m s}^{-1}$ ) provide  
correction procedures to be applied to the measured raw data to further improve the data quality of the ambient  
cloud particle number concentrations (Weigel et al., 2016). The robust performance of the specific CCP instrument  
used in this study, even under extreme conditions, was demonstrated by earlier investigations in tropical convective  
210 outflow (Frey et al., 2011), Polar Stratospheric Clouds (PSC) (Molleker et al., 2014), and low-level mixed-phase



clouds in the Arctic (Klingebiel et al., 2015).

215 For the CDP sample area of 0.27 mm<sup>2</sup>, an uncertainty of about 10% was considered (Molleker et al., 2014). The  
uncertainty  $\pm 0.03$  mm<sup>2</sup> results from repeated measurements. Unless there is no massive  
manipulation/disarrangement of the CDP's optics or a detectable aging of the laser diode, the sample area remains  
stable even if the instrument experiences regular handling during, e.g., field campaign operations. Given the  
uncertainty of the sample area, the Probe Air Speed (PAS), article losses, deviations and maybe coincidence (not  
negligible, but likely not a significant issue) the uncertainty in cloud droplets concentration ranges below 20% and  
likely approaches or exceeds 20% only in cases of tight curve maneuvers as this might be the most prominent case  
when the "collecting angle" comes into play. For the flight pattern adopted during vertical profiling of clouds (where  
220 cloud penetrations were performed in straight and level flight) the uncertainty of the number concentration for CCP-  
CDP is 10%.

[rb4] Comentário: New paragraph which gives more details about the instrumentation.

#### 2.2.2 CAS-DPOL measurements

225 The CAS-DPOL measures particle size distributions between 0.5 and 50  $\mu\text{m}$  at 1-Hz time resolution (Baumgardner  
et al., 2001). Its measurement principle is developed based on the FSSP-300 (Baumgardner et al., 1985, Korolev et  
al., 1985), which has been used previously to study the particle size range in ice clouds (Voigt et al., 2010, 2011;  
Schumann et al., 2011; Jeßberger et al., 2013). The intensity of forward scattered light in the angular range of 4 –  
12° is detected and sorted into 30 size bins. Assuming Mie scattering theory, additional binning into 15 size bins is  
employed to rule out ambiguities. Polarized backward scattered light is detected to investigate the sphericity and  
230 phase of the particles (Baumgardner et al., 2005; Gayet et al., 2012; Järvinen et al., 2016). Number concentrations  
are derived using the probe air speed measured by the probe. The distribution of time intervals between single  
particles, recorded for the first 290 particles in each second, did not provide indications of droplet coincidence up to  
a time resolution of 0.8  $\mu\text{s}$  or a number concentration of 2200 cm<sup>-3</sup>. After the campaign, the sampling area (SA)  
which is used to derive the number concentration of particles was characterized by a high-resolution scan with a  
235 droplet generator. For this, 250 water droplets of a known, quasi-constant size of about 40  $\mu\text{m}$  were dropped at and  
around the sensitive region perpendicular to the laser beam. The resolution of the droplet generator scan was 25  $\mu\text{m}$   
perpendicular to the laser beam and 50  $\mu\text{m}$  along the laser beam. According to the scan, the area of the measured SA  
for particle diameters above 3  $\mu\text{m}$  was 0.27 mm<sup>2</sup>, which is 8% higher than the initially reported SA by the  
manufacturer. The fringe of the area, a region where particles are counted but with low efficiency was about 0.032  
240 mm<sup>2</sup> which represents an uncertainty of 15% of the total SA. Additionally, we estimate an uncertainty of the particle  
velocity in the CAS sampling tube of 15%, taking into account that particle velocities in the sampling tube may be  
slowed down or accelerated compared to open path instruments or the Pitot tube velocities at the CAS. This results  
in a combined uncertainty of the number concentration of 21%.

245 Calibrations with glass beads of four different sizes (2, 5, 20 and 42  $\mu\text{m}$ ) were performed between the flights to  
monitor the stability of the size bin classification. Differences in the refractive index can be accounted for using the  
method of Rosenberg et al. (2012). The size calibration was stable over the whole campaign. For the purpose of this  
study, mainly the effective diameter range between 10 and 26  $\mu\text{m}$  was evaluated, which employed mainly the lowest

amplifier gain stage. For particles up to 20  $\mu\text{m}$  the size, the calibration did not show any size deviations from the expected values. Larger particles with diameters  $> 40 \mu\text{m}$  were shifted towards lower sizes by about 5  $\mu\text{m}$ . We therefore estimate an uncertainty in particle size for particle diameters above 40  $\mu\text{m}$  on the order of 13 to 15%, and less for smaller particles. The instrument had been installed previously on HALO and the DLR Falcon aircraft during the ML-CIRRUS (Voigt et al., 2016), ACCESS-II, ECLIF, and DACCIWA campaigns.

### 2.3 Hot-wire CWC measurements

The hot-wire instrument is a King Probe type device that measures the bulk liquid water content (LWC) from 0.01 to 3  $\text{g m}^{-3}$  in the droplet diameter range of 5 to 50  $\mu\text{m}$  by detecting the power (current) required to maintain a heated wire at a constant temperature of 125  $^{\circ}\text{C}$ . The sensitivity of the instrument is reduced for droplets below 10  $\mu\text{m}$ , since smaller particles follow more closely the streamlines around the hot-wire. The instrument was mounted on the CAS-DPOL probe. The accuracy of the King Probe LWC measurement is estimated to be 5 % at 1  $\text{g m}^{-3}$  and decreases down to 16 % at 0.2  $\text{g m}^{-3}$ , with a sensitivity of 0.02  $\text{g m}^{-3}$  (King et al., 1978). For this study, mainly CWC values in the range up to 1  $\text{g m}^{-3}$  were used.

### 2.4 Vertical wind speed measurements

The HALO aircraft was equipped with a new meteorological sensor system (BASIC HALO Measurement And Sensor System - BAHAMAS) located at the nose of the aircraft (Wendisch et al., 2016). Measurements of updraft speeds during cloud base penetrations during the ACRIDICON-CHUVA campaign showed maximum vertical wind speeds in the range of 5  $\text{m s}^{-1}$ . In these conditions, the uncertainties of  $W$  measurements are 0.3  $\text{m s}^{-1}$  (Mallaun et al., 2015). For a long sequence of measurements at cloud base ( $> 20 \text{ s}$ ) these uncertainties become negligible.

## 270 3. Cloud probe intercomparison

### 3.1 Method

The validation of convective cloud parameterizations requires reliable cloud probe measurements. In this section, we discuss quantitatively the differences in estimated and directly measured CWC and DSDs of the two cloud probes CAS-DPOL and CCP-CDP as well as the hot-wire instrument.

For comparisons between the CWC estimated from the cloud probe DSDs and hot-wire measurements ( $CWC_h$ ), we distinguish between spectra that are dominated by condensational growth, and spectra where coalescence becomes important as well. These spectra are separated by the threshold of  $r_e$  for significant coalescence, which varies as a function of the drizzle water content (DWC) for 1 second cloud passes (Freud and Rosenfeld, 2012). In addition, droplets with diameters  $< 10 \mu\text{m}$  are captured less efficiently by the hot-wire probe, resulting in an underestimation of  $CWC_h$ . The hot-wire device was installed on the CAS-DPOL probe; therefore a better statistical agreement is expected for this probe in comparison with the CCP-CDP. The CCP-CDP was mounted on the other wing, about 15 m away from the hot-wire device (Voigt et al., 2016; Wendisch et al., 2016). Only cloud passes at temperatures greater than 0  $^{\circ}\text{C}$  are considered in this intercomparison, to avoid uncertainties of the measurement due to freezing of droplets.

### 3.2 CWC comparison between cloud probe and hot wire measurements

290 Comparison of different techniques of cloud water content measurements are challenging because of the individual instrumental differences, like time resolution, dependence of sensitivity on size, and due to the characteristics of their target of interest, i.e., inhomogeneous, turbulent convective cloud.

For this study we use the hot-wire instrument as a reference to the scattering spectrometer probes, since its total water content is derived from a smaller set of physical parameters with an overall uncertainty of maximum 16% as compared to ~ 30% uncertainty when derived from DSDs.

295 The calculation of CWC is performed separately from CAS-DPOL and CCP-CDP probe droplet concentrations as follows:

$$CWC = \frac{4\pi}{3} \rho \int N_d(r) r^3 dr \quad (5)$$

300 where  $N_d$  is the droplet concentration in  $m^{-3}$ ,  $r$  the droplet radius in m and  $\rho$  is the water density ( $1 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ ). The calculation of DWC is done similar to CWC but with different cloud probe and particle size ranges. The DSDs from CCP-CDP and CAS-DPOL are used to calculate the CWC, defined here as the mass of the drops integrated over the diameter range of 3–50  $\mu\text{m}$ . Similarly, DSDs from CCP-CIP are used to calculate the DWC, defined here as the mass of the drops integrated over the diameter range of 75–250  $\mu\text{m}$  (Freud and Rosenfeld, 2012).

305 Figure 3 shows the dependency of calculated  $r_e$  as a function of altitude for cloud passes during flights over different conditions of aerosol concentrations (AC13 - very polluted, AC18- polluted, and AC19 – clean). The probability of rain due to collision and coalescence processes are indicated with dashed lines. It is assumed that rain formation starts when calculated DWC exceeds  $0.01 \text{ g m}^{-3}$  (Freud and Rosenfeld, 2012). Overall, the figure shows that  $r_e$  values increase with altitude. In addition, it shows the effects of aerosol loading, which in higher concentration nucleate a larger number of droplets at cloud base, which grow slower as a function of height via condensation. Also, for  $r_e$  values  $< 9 \mu\text{m}$  the probability of coalescence of droplets is very small and it starts to be significant only for  $r_e > 11 \mu\text{m}$ . There is little concern that raindrops precipitate from above when flying near the tops of growing convective clouds (as illustrated at Fig. 1).

310 The comparison of CWC estimated from the cloud probe data and  $CWCh$  measured with the hot-wire was performed as a function of  $r_e$ , because the measurement efficiency of the hot-wire probe depends on drop size. This type of analysis also provides information about the differences between the two cloud probes regarding the estimated CWCs. Strapp et al. (2003) show that large differences between actual CWC and hot-wire measurements occur when larger drops ( $\sim r > 20 \mu\text{m}$ ) contribute to the cloud water content above  $1 \text{ g m}^{-3}$ . We therefore limit our analysis to the effective diameter range of  $5 \mu\text{m} < r_e < 13 \mu\text{m}$  and compare  $CWCh$  with CWC estimated from the cloud probe DSD only for CWC up to  $1 \text{ g m}^{-3}$ . The comparison between the mean CWC estimated from the cloud probe DSDs and mean  $CWCh$  is shown as a function of  $r_e$  in Fig. 4. The ratio between the  $CWCh$  from the hot-wire measurements and the probe estimates ( $CWCr$ ) is also shown (in red color).

320 The mean values of CWC estimated from the probes from flights AC08 to AC20 (AC07 had no hot-wire CWC data) and altitudes between 600 m and 5,000 m generally show an increase with increasing  $r_e$ . The CWC uncertainty calculated with CAS-DPOL (CCP-CDP) DSDs is about 22% (10 %) for all measurements. In addition, the

uncertainty associated with  $r_e$  calculations with CAS-DPOL (CCP-CDP) DSDs is about 14 % (9 %). Within their statistical variability, the CAS-DPOL CWC agrees well with the hot-wire CWCh over the whole effective radius range (upper panel). The CWC<sub>r</sub> for CAS-DPOL (CCP-CDP) is around  $1 \pm 0.1$  ( $0.8 \pm 0.05$ ) for almost all  $r_e$  sizes. The comparisons of the CWCh with the CWC estimated from the CCP-CDP probe (lower panel) shows that the CCP-CDP is systematically higher by about 21%. The difference is larger than the standard deviation of the individual measurements. The overall systematic differences (mean of the ratio) in the cloud probe CWC in comparison to CWCh are  $0.04 \text{ g m}^{-3}$  (6% in percentage) for CAS-DPOL and  $0.11 \text{ g m}^{-3}$  (21% in percentage) for CCP-CDP higher than the hot-wire measurements. However, considering the uncertainty of the measurements, all three CWC measurements agree within the uncertainty range (16% and 30%).

In summary, the CWCh from the hot-wire agrees better with the CWC derived from CAS-DPOL DSDs. The fact that the CCP-CDP was mounted on the opposite wing while the measurements were performed in very inhomogeneous conditions may account for some of the larger spread between CCP-CDP and hot-wire than between CAS-DPOL and hot-wire (e.g., in  $r_e$ ), but it cannot explain the systematic offset of the CCP-CDP. In the next subsection we discuss input parameters for the CWC estimated from the cloud probes, like number concentration and size to find an explanation for the observed differences.

### 3.3 Comparing cloud probe $N_d$ and DSDs

Figure 5 shows the mean  $N_d$  values measured by CAS-DPOL and CCP-CDP (solid line) and the systematic uncertainties of the measurements (dashed lines) as a function of  $r_e$  for values greater than  $5 \mu\text{m}$  (left panel) and the standard deviation of the two cloud probe  $N_d$  measurements (right panel). The data is the same used as used for the hot-wire intercomparison. Both probes measure a decreasing number concentration with increasing effective radius and CWC at greater heights above cloud base. This is related to the increasing extent of mixing and coalescence processes with height in the cloud. Therefore, a reduced number of larger droplets contribute to the enhanced CWC at larger  $r_e$ . In general, the CAS-DPOL mean  $N_d$  agrees well (difference lower than 1 %) with the mean  $N_d$  of CCP-CDP for effective radii between 7 and 11  $\mu\text{m}$ . Statistically significant differences are observed for  $r_e$  smaller than 7  $\mu\text{m}$  and above 11  $\mu\text{m}$ . Both probes have similar standard deviation (STDE) for different  $r_e$  sizes. The STDE decreases with increasing  $r_e$ , varying from  $\sim 20 \text{ cm}^{-3}$  to  $\sim 10 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ .

The two  $N_d$  measurements agree within the combined statistical variability and the systematic uncertainties of the two probe measurements (21% for CAS-DPOL and 10% for CCP-CDP). However, in order to explain the difference in CWC, we point towards the difference in the mean droplet number at  $r_e > 11 \mu\text{m}$ . Lower number concentrations of the CAS-DPOL at larger  $r_e$  may be related to the shift in droplet radii for particles above  $40 \mu\text{m}$  to smaller sizes, which shifts the effective radius and the CWC to smaller  $r_e$  and smaller CWC. On the other hand, the difference in the size binning of the two probes may artificially shift particles from higher sizes to lower sizes just by the choice of the bin boundaries. For the CAS-DPOL, larger bin sizes were chosen in order to avoid ambiguities based on Mie-Lorenz theory.

The differences in  $N_d$  at larger  $r_e$  correspond to the enhanced CWC in Fig. 4 and may explain most of the differences in CWC between the probes. The higher number concentration at  $r_e < 7 \mu\text{m}$  may be explained by the higher

360 sensitivity and lower cutoff of the CAS-DPOL at smaller sizes. The instrument was built to particularly measure the  
full spectrum of aerosol and cloud particles in the size range where aerosols are activated into cloud droplets.  
Figure 6a-d shows the mean droplet concentration and CWC as a function of droplet diameter from the cloud  
probes. The distributions are shown for four different effective radii to give an impression of the evolution of  
particle size and CWC with altitude for the two cloud probes. For  $r_e$  between 5 and 6  $\mu\text{m}$  and 8 and 9  $\mu\text{m}$  (Figures  
365 6a-b), where collision and coalescence processes are negligible (see Fig. 3), the CCP-CDP DSDs are somewhat  
below the CAS-DPOL DSDs, revealing an enhanced sensitivity of the CAS-DPOL for smaller particles. For larger  $r_e$   
(Figures 6c-d), where coalescence starts and raindrops may be present, the CCP-CDP shows slightly larger droplet  
concentrations and CWC for diameters  $> 15 \mu\text{m}$  in comparison to CAS-DPOL. This may be related to larger  
droplets that enter the open path instrument sampling area of the CCP-CDP more easily than the closed path  
370 sampling area of the CAS-DPOL by falling vertically into the measurement area.  
These results suggest that CAS-DPOL and CCP-CDP generally measure similar droplet concentrations in the size  
range between 3-50  $\mu\text{m}$ . The observed deviations between the probes could be caused by different inlet  
configurations or measurement principles of the two probes, each with individual advantages depending on the  
measurement target and related size range. However, the differences in DSDs are within the uncertainties of the  
375 measurement and show a much better agreement than earlier measurements under similar conditions (Lance et al.,  
2012; Rosenberg et al.,2012).

#### 4. Methodology

The reliability of the cloud probe measurements shown in the previous section provides the capability to perform the  
380 validation of convective cloud parameterizations for the Amazon region, and these analyses are performed through  
the following four steps. Section 4.1 presents the analyses of CCN measurements below cloud base. Assuming the  
relation between  $N_{\text{CCN}}$  and  $S$  is given by Eq. 1, the parameters  $N_0$  and the slope  $k$  are calculated from the  
measurements below cloud base. Section 4.2 describes the estimation of maximum  $S$  at cloud base ( $S_{\text{max}}$ ) based on  
the measured  $N_d$  and  $W_b$  there. The co-variability of  $N_d$  and  $W_b$  is used to estimate the CCN concentration ( $N_{d\text{CCN}}$ ) by  
385 calculating  $S_{\text{max}}$  according to Eq. 1. This is repeated for the two  $N_d$  spectra that were obtained from the two cloud  
droplet probes. In addition,  $N_d$  is estimated by application of the measured  $W_b$  spectrum to Eq. 2 and comparing  
against the directly measured  $N_d$  from the two cloud probes. Section 4.3 outlines the methodology of calculating the  
effective number of droplets at cloud base from cloud probe measurements ( $N_d^*$ ). This is done using theoretical  
considerations based on the estimated values of  $N_{dT}$  and  $N_{d\text{CCN}}$  at cloud base ( $N_{dT}^*$  and  $N_{d\text{CCN}}^*$ , respectively). The  
390 exact definitions of all parameters are provided in Section 4.2. Section 4.4 explains the calculation of the estimated  
adiabatic cloud droplet concentration ( $N_a$ ), as obtained from the measured vertical profile of cloud drop size  
distributions.

##### 4.1 CCN measurements below cloud base as a function of $S$

395 The measurements of  $N_{\text{CCN}}$  and  $S$  can be parameterized by Eq. 1 and provide  $N_0$  and  $k$  (Pruppacher et al., 1998). The  
typical values of  $N_0$  are about  $100 \text{ cm}^{-3}$  for pristine conditions, and range from  $500 \text{ cm}^{-3}$  to several thousand  $\text{cm}^{-3}$  for

polluted continental regions at different levels of aerosol loading. The values of the slope parameter  $k$  vary from about 0.3 to 1 in clean and polluted air, respectively (Andreae, 2009).

Two types of CCN measurements were performed: (i) measuring CCN concentration at fixed  $S$  (~0.55%) [hereafter referred to as  $S_1$  with the corresponding CCN concentration referred as  $CCN_1$ ] and (ii) measuring CCN concentration at variable  $S$  (ranging from 0.2 % to 0.55 %) [hereafter referred to  $S_2$  with the corresponding CCN concentration referred as  $CCN_2$ ]. Since the  $CCN_2$  measurements were performed at varying  $S_2$  (generally modified every 100 seconds during the flights; hereafter referred as time step), the mean values of these measurements for each time step are used to calculate the  $N_0$  and  $k$  parameters in Eq. 1. The flight period of measurements below cloud base in a specific region consisted of several CCN time steps and covered at least one full  $N_{CCN}(S)$  spectrum, and is defined as a group of measurements (hereafter referred as a group).

To achieve accurate measurements of  $CCN_2$  as a function of  $S_2$ , a weighting factor calculated from the  $CCN_1$  measurements is applied, as specified in the steps below. Because  $CCN_1$  measures at a fixed supersaturation ( $S_1$ ), its variability is caused only by changes of total CCN concentration (from aerosol loading) along the flight track (assuming constant size distribution and composition during the measurement group). This is used to correct the  $N_{CCN}(S)$  as measured by  $CCN_2$  for these changes of total concentration. The procedure for this analysis is:

1. The mean values of  $S_1$ ,  $S_2$ ,  $CCN_1$  and  $CCN_2$  measurements ( $mS_1$ ,  $mS_2$ ,  $mCCN_1$  and  $mCCN_2$ , respectively) are calculated for each time step below cloud base;
2. A factor of aerosol loading ( $FA$ ) for measurements during a full cycle of  $S$  is calculated as follows:

$$FA = \frac{mCCN_1}{TmCCN_1}$$

where  $TmCCN_1$  is the mean of all  $CCN_1$  measurements for the group of  $S$  cycling.  $FA$  provides the deviation of aerosol concentration from the mean for a specific time step in the group;

3. The  $mCCN_2$  values for each group are weighted by  $FA$  generating normalized  $mCCN_2$  values ( $NCCN_2 = mCCN_2 / FA$ ). Then, the  $NCCN_2$  are used in combination with  $mS_2$  to fit a power-law-function equation for each group of measurements. From this fit, the values of the parameters  $N_0$  and  $k$  in the Twomey equation ( $N_{CCN} = N_0 S^k$ ) are obtained.

#### 4.2. Estimating $S_{max}$ , $N_{dCCN}$ , and $N_{dT}$

The number of CCN that nucleate into cloud droplets ( $N_d$ ) reaches its maximum value near the  $S_{max}$  height in the cloud (Pinsky et al., 2012). This level is observed between cloud base and a height up to a few tens of meters above it. The value of  $S_{max}$  can be estimated from Eq. 3 based on the vertical velocity at cloud base and on  $N_d$  as measured with the cloud probes CCP-CDP and CAS-DPOL ( $N_{cdp}$  and  $N_{cas}$ , respectively). Therefore, the estimated  $S_{max}$  near cloud base can be used in Eq. 1, producing the  $N_{dCCN}$  estimates to hopefully achieve a closure for  $N_d$  measurements at cloud base.

The  $N_0$  and  $k$  values that were calculated from measurements below cloud base (as described in Section 4.1) are substituted in Eq. 1 and Eq. 2 for calculating  $N_{dCCN}$  and  $N_{dT}$ , respectively. The comparisons between  $N_{dCCN}$ ,  $N_{dT}$  and  $N_d$  from the cloud probes are discussed in Section 5.2. Measurements of  $N_d$  for each probe are considered only for

concentrations  $\geq 20$  droplets per cubic centimeter, to focus on the convective elements and avoid highly mixed and dissipating portions of the clouds. The time and distance differences that were allowed between the measurements below cloud base and at cloud base have maximum values of 1 hour and 30 km, respectively. With this consideration, we assume that the  $N_d$  measurements at cloud base pertain to the same region as the CCN measurements below cloud base.

According to Twomey (1959), the  $N_d$  that should be observed at cloud base increases with  $W_b$  (assuming a constant CCN concentration; see Eq. 2). However, at cloud base the variability of  $W_b$  and  $N_d$  measurements is high due to air turbulence. Since a cloud parcel moves as an eddy with a local  $W_b$  that produces a given  $N_d$  at cloud base, its continued movement as a turbulent eddy within the cloud adds a large random component to the individual realizations of  $W_b$  for a given  $N_d$ . These turbulent characteristics greatly reduce the confidence that a given measured  $W_b$  within cloud has produced the corresponding measured  $N_d$ , and therefore, these measurements are often not well correlated. A suitable method to analyze the relationship between  $W_b$  and  $N_d$  measurements is the ‘probability matching method’ (PMM) (Haddad and Rosenfeld, 1997), which requires that the two related variables will be increasing monotonically with each other. For a set of measurements of  $W_b$  and  $N_d$  at cloud base, it is expected that larger  $W_b$  would produce larger  $N_d$  for a given  $N_{CCN}(S)$ . Therefore, it is assumed also that  $N_d$  is produced uniquely by  $W_b$  for a given  $N_{CCN}(S)$  spectrum as calculated from the measurements below cloud base. It is further assumed that entrainment does not change systematically with  $W_b$  in a way that would reverse the monotonic increase of  $W_b$  with  $N_{CCN}(S)$ . In a PMM analysis, the same percentiles of updrafts are matched to the same percentiles of  $N_d$  (or  $N_{dCCN}$  and  $N_{dT}$ ). As  $N_d$  must be produced by positive updrafts (Eq. 2), negative (positive) values of  $W_b$  are associated with lower (higher)  $N_d$ . This procedure allows identifying the role of  $W_b$  (positive) in producing  $N_d$  in a set of cloud base measurements. The results of PMM analysis from cloud probes  $N_d$  versus  $W_b$ , and for estimated  $N_{dCCN}$  with  $N_{dT}$  are discussed in Section 5.2.1.

#### 4.3. Estimating $W_b^*$ , $N_d^*$ , $N_{dT}^*$ and $N_{dCCN}^*$

The formulation of an effective updraft speed at cloud base ( $W_b^*$ ) is a useful approximation of the updraft spectrum (Rosenfeld et al., 2014a; Zheng et al., 2015).  $W_b^*$  and  $N_d^*$  are given in Eqs. (6) and (7):

$$W_b^* = \frac{\int W_b^2}{\int W_b} \quad ; \text{ where } W_b > 0 \quad (6)$$

$$N_d^* = N_d[\text{percentile}(W_b^*)] \quad (7)$$

where  $N_d^*$  represents the spectrum of  $N_d$  at cloud base that matches the same percentile of  $W_b^*$ . Figure 7 shows an illustration and example of the estimated value of  $W_b^*$  and  $N_d^*$  from the CCP-CDP probe for flight AC17. In this case the calculated  $W_b^*$  has a value of  $1.83 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ , which represents the 86<sup>th</sup> percentile of total measurements at cloud base when sorted by  $W_b$  measurements, including negative values. The corresponding percentile of  $N_d^*$  (when sorted by  $N_d$ ) in this case is  $1207 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ . Another approach for  $N_d$  retrieval is the calculation of  $N_{dT}^*$  considering  $W_b^*$  as the updraft wind speed in Eq. 2. In addition,  $S_{max}$  can be estimated by applying the calculated values of  $W_b^*$  and  $N_d^*$  to

Eq. 3. Then, applying the obtained  $S_{max}$  to Eq. 1 yields  $N_{dCCN}^*$ . The values of the calculated  $N_{dT}^*$  and  $N_{dCCN}^*$  in this case are  $1,175 \text{ cm}^{-3}$  and  $915 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ , respectively.

#### 4.4. Estimating $N_d$

470 Another approach for estimating  $N_d$  is through the calculation of the adiabatic cloud droplet number concentration,  $N_a$  (Freud et al., 2011). The  $N_a$  is calculated from CWC and the mean volume droplet mass ( $M_v$ ) calculations from the cloud probe DSDs obtained during the cloud profiling measurements. This behavior is the outcome of the almost completely inhomogeneous mixing behavior of the clouds with the ambient air (Burnet and Brenguier, 2007; Freud et al., 2011). Recently, Beals et al. (2015) wrote that their "measurements reveal that turbulent clouds are  
475 *inhomogeneous, with sharp transitions between cloud and clear air properties persisting to dissipative scales (<1 centimeter). The local droplet size distribution fluctuates strongly in number density but with a nearly unchanging mean droplet diameter*". The dominance of inhomogeneous mixing diminishes when the drops become very large ( $r_e > 15 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$ ) and their evaporation rate becomes more comparable to the mixing rate. This is most evident in those cloud passes where CWC is greater than 25 % of the adiabatic CWC (Freud et al., 2011). The measurements during  
480 cloud profiling flights were aimed at penetrating the tops of growing convective towers (as shown at Fig. 1). This was done successfully in the data selected for analysis, as verified by examination of videos recorded by the cockpit camera of HALO. The cloud penetrations occurred mainly near the tops of growing convective cumulus, where mixing is expected to be rather inhomogeneous and little precipitation can fall from above. The validity of this expectation will affect the agreement between  $N_d$  and  $N_a$ . The  $N_a$  is calculated from the slope of CWC and  $M_v$   
485 measurements and provides an estimate of  $N_d^*$  near cloud base. However, this methodology does not account for cloud mixing losses from droplet evaporation and the  $N_a$  estimates commonly overestimate the expected  $N_d$  by 30 % (Freud et al., 2011). Therefore, in calculating  $N_d$  we applied this 30 % correction.

## 5. Results

### 490 5.1 CCN measurements below cloud base

The estimation of the  $N_0$  and  $k$  parameters in Eq. 1 is made from CCN and  $S$  measurements below cloud base. Figure 8 illustrates CCN and  $S$  measurements below cloud base for flight AC17 over a deforested region in the central Amazon. The cloud base was located at a height of about 2,300 m. The values of  $S_1$  were constant at ~0.55 % and the values of  $S_2$  ranged from 0.2 % to 0.55 %. During these measurements,  $CCN_1$  showed higher values than  $CCN_2$ ,  
495 which is in agreement with its larger  $S$ , and the difference between  $CCN_1$  and  $CCN_2$  increased with decreasing  $S_2$  (e.g., at time ~ 19:45 UTC, where  $CCN_2$  values are around  $300 \text{ cm}^{-3}$  and  $CCN_1$  values are around  $700 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ ). The  $mCCN_1$ ,  $mCCN_2$ , and  $NCCN_2$  for this group of measurements are shown in Fig. 9. The average measurements of  $CCN_1$  ( $TmCCN_1$ ) assumed to correct the  $CCN_2$  for aerosol load ( $FA$ ) presented a standard deviation of 14 %, indicating a small impact on the parameterization proposed to fit the Twomey equation (Eq. 1). The power fit  
500 equation from  $NCCN_2$  and  $mS_2$  measurements is shown and the values of  $N_0$  and  $k$  are  $1015 \text{ cm}^{-3}$  and 0.54, respectively.

This procedure was applied to all cloud profiling flights with measurements of  $N_{CCN}(S)$  with variable  $S$  below cloud



base. The  $N_0$  and  $k$  slope parameters for all groups of measurements during the campaign are shown in Fig. 10. The measurements show that for the less polluted conditions, the values of  $N_0$  ( $k$  slope) are near 1000 (0.5), while for more polluted conditions, values of  $N_0$  ( $k$  slope) greater than 2000 (0.9) are observed. Additionally, the correlation coefficient values for almost all power fit equations are around 0.9. The calculated  $N_{CCN}(S)$  errors for these flight segments are a function of the measured particle number, such that the error is 10% of  $N_{CCN}(S)$  for large concentrations and the mean of the error is around 20% of  $N_{CCN}(S)$ . The estimated standard error (STDE) for the  $N_0$  and  $k$  parameters and CCN estimates were calculated (as described in Appendix B) for each flight segment and are shown in Table 2. The table shows that the STDE associated with the Twomey equation fit is about 5% for the  $N_0$  and  $k$  parameters. The changes in the air mass assumed to correct the  $CCN_2$  for FA during the flight segments were up to 24 % for all flights. When the cloud segment compared with this data are not at exactly the same location as where the measurements were performed, the mean (i.e.  $TmCCN_I$ ) is a good measure for this comparison. The standard error was used for the error propagation calculations and the resulting error in  $N_{CCN}(S)$  is 15 % of the  $N_{CCN}(S)$  estimates on average. The resulting error of  $N_0$  ( $k$  slope) was also calculated and is 23 % (20 %) of the  $N_0$  ( $k$ ) values on average, associated to the Twomey equation fit and the  $N_{CCN}(S)$  error.

For some flights, the values estimated for the  $N_0$  and  $k$  parameters of Eq. 1 are similar to what was found by Pöhlker et al. (2016) for ground measurements at the Amazon Tall Tower Observatory (ATTO) site ( $N_0 = 1469 \pm 78$  and  $k = 0.36 \pm 0.06$ ) during the dry season in the Amazon. However, in the majority of the cases  $N_0$  and  $k$  are twice or three times greater than the values from Pöhlker et al. (2016). These differences are probably related to flying selectively to areas that had high aerosol concentrations to contrast the cloud behavior with the flights with low aerosol concentrations, as shown in Fig. 2. The high CCN measured in this study are more similar to previous aircraft measurements in smoky conditions over the Amazon (Andreae et al., 2004; Freud et al., 2008) than to the values observed at ATTO.

**5.2 Comparing estimated with measured  $N_d$  near cloud base**

Cloud base drop concentrations obtained in several different ways were compared. Appendix C summarizes the measurements and theoretical calculations at cloud base. Agreement between these different estimates constitutes a closure. Section 5.2.1 discusses comparisons between individual cloud probe  $N_d$  measurements with the corresponding theoretical estimations of  $N_{dT}$  and  $N_{dCCN}$ . Section 5.2.2 describes the comparisons between estimated  $N_d^*$ ,  $N_{dT}^*$  and  $N_{dCCN}^*$ . Section 5.2.3 analyzes the agreement between  $N_d^*$  and  $N_a$ .

**5.2.1 Comparison between  $N_d$  measurements with estimated  $N_{dT}$  and  $N_{dCCN}$**

The PMM procedure was applied to the measured  $W_b$  and  $N_d$  for analyzing the spectrum of  $N_d$ ,  $N_{dT}$ , and  $N_{dCCN}$  values near cloud base (as described in Section 4.2). This analytical method makes it possible to identify the role of  $W_b$  in producing  $N_d$ . A perfect agreement of the values is not expected due to the turbulent nature of the clouds, but the statistical modes of the measurements should have similar values to the theoretical estimation of the same modes of  $N_{dCCN}$  and  $N_{dT}$ , within their uncertainty range. Figures 11 and 12 show  $N_{dCCN}$ ,  $N_{dT}$ , and  $N_d$  values for the two cloud probes as a function of  $W_b$  for the cases presented in Table 3. The uncertainties regarding the  $S_{max}$ ,  $N_{dCCN}$  and  $N_{dT}$

[rb5] Comentário: New paragraph detailing more our analysis

[rb6] Comentário: New paragraph showing a comparison between what we measured with previous studies.

[rb7] Comentário: Here we give more details about measurements uncertainties.

540 estimates for measurements at cloud base with both probes (CCP-CDP and CAS-DPOL) are on average about 22, 20, and 38 % for all flights, respectively (the uncertainty methods adopted for these theoretical estimates are available in Appendix A). The  $W_b$  uncertainty of  $0.3 \text{ m s}^{-1}$  accounts on average for about 65% (60 %) of the  $N_{dT}$  ( $S_{max}$ ) uncertainty, and the uncertainty from the estimated  $S_{max}$  contributes most of the  $N_{dCCN}$  uncertainty (~70% on average).

545 Both values of  $N_{cas}$  and  $N_{cdp}$  are within the range of the theoretical expectation of  $N_{dT}$  and  $N_{dCCN}$ , except for occasional deviations at the extreme percentiles. For example, the maximum  $N_{dT}$  versus maximum  $N_d$  are outside the error interval for  $N_{dT}$ . This is so because extreme percentiles are much more prone to random variations than the middle range, such as the median.

The curves for  $N_{dT}$  mostly agreed quite well with those for  $N_d$  with only small deviations. The  $N_{dCCN}$  mostly underestimates  $N_d$  by as much as a factor of 0.5 for reasons that we could not identify. Entrainment is not a likely cause, because it would dilute  $N_d$  and thus incur  $N_{dCCN}$  to be biased positively with respect to  $N_d$ . It appears that measuring  $S$  in clouds is still a great challenge, even indirectly by using Eq. 3. Remarkably, Eq. 2 (Twomey, 1959), which avoids an explicit usage of  $S$ , still performs better when limited within the observed bounds of  $W_b$  and  $S$  within the cloud. These results support the analyses concerning the  $N_d$  measurement at cloud base that are presented in the next sections.

555

### 5.2.2 Comparing estimated $N_d^*$ with $N_{dT}^*$ and $N_{dCCN}^*$

Assuming that  $W_b^*$  represents the updraft velocity for a set of cloud base measurements, the corresponding measured  $N_d^*$  from CAS-DPOL and CCP-CDP ideally should have similar values to the estimated  $N_{dCCN}^*$  and  $N_{dT}^*$ .

560 The uncertainties of  $N_{dCCN}^*$  and  $N_{dT}^*$  are ~20 % and ~35 % on average, respectively. Figure 13a shows the values of  $N_d^*$  and  $N_{dT}^*$  for the different cloud base measurements shown in Figs. 11 and 12. The  $N_{dT}^*$  agrees with  $N_d^*$  within the measurements uncertainties, as shown by the error bars. The bias of  $N_{dT}^*$  with respect to  $N_d^*$  for the CAS -DPOL is 1.00 with a standard deviation  $\pm 0.17$  around it. The respective result for the CDP is  $0.84 \pm 0.12$ . A weaker agreement is observed for comparisons between  $N_{dCCN}^*$  and  $N_d^*$  (see Fig. 13b), a factor of ~2 can be observed for some cases (AC14 and AC17). The bias of  $N_{dCCN}^*$  with respect to  $N_d^*$  for the CAS-DPOL is  $0.80 \pm 0.07$ . The respective result for the CDP is  $0.76 \pm 0.1$ .

565

### 5.2.3 Comparing estimated $N_d^*$ with $N_a$

570 Another possibility of cloud base closure is via comparison of  $N_d^*$  and  $N_a$  estimates from measurements of the vertical evolution of  $r_e$  in pristine and polluted conditions. In these situations, the estimated values for these parameters is expected to converge. Figure 14a shows the calculated  $N_a$  with CCP-CDP probe results from cloud measurements during flight AC17. The estimated  $N_a$  in this case is  $1496 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ , and, considering evaporation losses due to cloud mixing, the expected number of droplets at cloud base is  $1047 \text{ cm}^{-3}$  after applying the correction by division by 1.3 (Freud et al., 2011).  $N_d^*$  for the same flight segment is  $1207 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ , calculated from CCP-CDP data (see Fig. 7b). The factor of 1.3 applied to the estimates of  $N_a$  corroborates the methodology of Freud et al. (2011) for retrieving the effective number of droplets nucleated at cloud base, even a though different dataset was used in here.

[rb8] Comentário: New paragraph addressing reviewers comments.

A close relationship between  $M_v$  and  $r_e$  as a function of height is shown at Figure 14b. Similar results were found for cloud profile measurements during the other flights.

Values of  $N_a$  and  $N_d^*$  were calculated for all profile flights and cloud probes, and the results are shown in Fig. 15.

580 The uncertainties of  $N_a$  ( $N_d^*$ ) estimates from CAS-DPOL and CCP-CDP are ~25% (21 %) and ~14% (10%), respectively. The comparisons between the estimated  $N_a$  and  $N_d^*$  show a linear correlation with correlation coefficients greater than 0.9 for all cloud probes. The linear regression between  $N_d^*$  and  $N_a$  estimates shows a slope close to one for CAS-DPOL and CCP-CDP. More specifically, the bias of  $N_a$  with respect to  $N_d^*$  for the CAS - DPOL is  $1.12 \pm 0.19$ . The respective result for the CDP is  $0.78 \pm 0.19$ .

585 The lower slope for the CDP (Fig. 15b) than for the CAS-DPOL (Fig. 15a) can be explained by the relative overestimate of  $r_e$  of the CDP compared to the CAS-DPOL, which translates to an underestimate in  $N_a$ . This is inferred from Fig. 4, which shows that the CDP has about 20% more CWC compared to the CAS-DPOL and the hot wire CWC.

590 These results show good agreement with theoretical expectations, especially when based on the CAS-DPOL. The flights performed in near-pristine and polluted conditions can be distinguished based on the CAS-DPOL estimates of  $N_d^*$  and  $N_a$  values. For example, in flight AC19 performed over the Atlantic Ocean in clean conditions, the CAS-DPOL estimated values of  $N_d^*$  and  $N_a$  are  $\sim 270 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ , whereas for flights AC07 and AC11 performed under polluted conditions, the values of  $N_d^*$  and  $N_a$  are greater than  $1000 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ .

595 In general, the similarities of  $N_a$  and  $N_d^*$  values (see Figure 15) supports the methodology to calculate the effective number of droplets observed at cloud base of convective clouds from the vertical profile of measured  $r_e$  or  $M_v$ . Some qualification might exist for the most polluted flights, e.g., AC08, where  $N_a$  is larger than  $N_d^*$  by a factor of ~20-30%. The vertical profiles of the  $N_d$  measurements indicate that in these cases the  $N_d$  measurements up to 2-3 kilometers above cloud base were larger than those at cloud base. A higher aerosol concentration at these greater heights was also observed in aerosol probe measurements (not shown), suggesting that secondary droplet nucleation was taking place on the most polluted flights. The  $N_a$  calculation does not take into account the possibility of new nucleation above cloud base (Freud et al., 2011). Therefore, the assumption of adiabatic growth of droplets via condensation from cloud base to higher levels within cloud can lead to an overestimation by ~20-30% of the number of droplets at cloud base when calculating  $N_a$  in cases with secondary droplet nucleation.

## 605 6. Summary and conclusions

610 This study is focused on testing novel parameterizations that are used for the recently developed methodology of satellite retrievals of  $N_a$ ,  $W_b^*$ , and CCN in convective clouds, based on aircraft measurements during the ACRIDICON-CHUVA campaign in the Amazon. It is the first time that these new parameterizations are tested comprehensively alongside old parameterizations. Liquid water content measurements from a hot-wire device were taken as a reference for the quality assessment of estimated CWC from cloud probe DSDs near cloud base. The intercomparison of the DSDs and the CWC derived from the different instruments generally shows good agreement within the instrumental uncertainties. The values of  $N_d$  near cloud base were comparable within the measurement errors with their inferred values based on the measured  $W_b^*$  and  $N_{CCN(S)}$ . The values of  $W_b^*$  were calculated from

[rb9] Comentário: New conclusion section.

615 the measured spectrum of  $W_b$  using the parameterization of Rosenfeld et al. (2014a), which is also used for retriev-  
ing cloud base updraft from satellites (Zheng et al., 2015). In addition,  $N_d$  near cloud base was favorably (within  
 $\pm 20\%$ ) compared with  $N_a$ , obtained from the vertical evolution of cloud drop effective radius ( $r_e$ ) above cloud base.  
The values of  $N_a$  in this study were obtained with the same parameterization that has been recently developed for  
satellite calculated  $N_a$  based on the satellite retrieved vertical evolution of  $r_e$  in convective clouds (Freud et al., 2011;  
Rosenfeld et al., 2014a). These results support the methodology to derive  $N_a$  based on the rate of  $r_e$  growth with  
620 cloud depth and under the assumption that the entrainment and mixing of air into convective clouds is extremely  
inhomogeneous.

The measured effective droplet numbers ( $N_d^*$ ) at cloud base were also compared against  $N_{dt}^*$  which is its predicted  
value based on the old parameterization in Eq. 2 (Twomey, 1959), which uses  $W_b^*$  and the  $N_{CCN}(S)$  power law. A  
newer parameterization calculates  $N_{dCCN}^*$  by substituting  $S$  into the power law  $N_{CCN}(S)$ , where  $S$  is obtained from  
625 Eq. 3 (Pinsky et al., 2012). The agreement between  $N_d^*$  and  $N_{dCCN}^*$  was only within a factor of 2, underlying the yet  
unresolved challenge of aircraft measurements of  $S$  in clouds.

In summary, the measurements of  $N_{CCN}(S)$  and  $W_b$  did reproduce the observed  $N_d$ , when using Twomey's parameter-  
ization, while using measured in cloud  $S$  remains a challenge. Furthermore, the vertical evolution of  $r_e$  with height  
reproduced the observation-based adiabatic cloud base drop concentrations,  $N_a$ . The combination of these results  
630 provide aircraft observational support for the various components of the satellite retrieval methodology that was  
recently developed to retrieve  $N_{CCN}(S)$  below the base of convective clouds (Rosenfeld et al., 2016). This parameter-  
ization can now be applied more confidently and with the proper qualifications to cloud simulations and satellite  
retrievals.

## 635 Acknowledgements

The first two authors of this study were supported by project BACCHUS European Commission FP7-603445. The  
generous support of the ACRIDICON-CHUVA campaign by the Max Planck Society, the German Aerospace Center  
(DLR), FAPESP (São Paulo Research Foundation), and the German Science Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsge-  
640 meinschaft, DFG) within the DFG Priority Program (SPP 1294) "Atmospheric and Earth System Research with the  
Research Aircraft HALO (High Altitude and Long Range Research Aircraft)" is greatly appreciated. This study was  
also supported by EU Project HAIC under FP7-AAT-2012-3.5.1-1 and by the German Science Foundation within  
DFG SPP 1294 HALO by contract no VO1504/4-1 and contract no JU 3059/1-1. The first author also acknowledges  
the financial support from the Brazilian funding agencies CAPES and CNPq during his Ph.D. degree studies.

## 645 References

- Andreae, M. O.: Correlation between cloud condensation nuclei concentration and aerosol optical thickness in  
remote and polluted regions, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 9(2), 543–556, doi:10.5194/acp-9-543-2009, 2009.
- 650 Andreae, M. O., Rosenfeld, D., Artaxo, P., Costa, A. A., Frank, G. P., Longo, K. M. and Silva-Dias, M. A. F.:  
Smoking rain clouds over the Amazon, *Science*, 303(5662), 1337–42, doi:10.1126/science.1092779, 2004.
- Artaxo, P., Martins, J. V., Yamasoe, M. A., Procópio, A. S., Pauliquevis, T. M., Andreae, M. O., Guyon, P., Gatti, L.

- 655 V. and Leal, A. M. C.: Physical and chemical properties of aerosols in the wet and dry seasons in Rondônia, Amazonia, *J. Geophys. Res. D Atmos.*, 107(20), 1–14, doi:10.1029/2001JD000666, 2002.
- Baumgardner, D., Strapp, W. and Dye, J. E.: Evaluation of the forward scattering spectrometer probe. Part II: corrections for coincidence and dead-time losses, *J. Atmos. Ocean. Technol.*, 2(4), 626–632, doi:10.1175/1520-0426(1985)002<0626:EOTFSS>2.0.CO;2, 1985.
- 660 Baumgardner, D., Jonsson, H., Dawson, W., O'Connor, D. and Newton, R.: The cloud, aerosol and precipitation spectrometer: a new instrument for cloud investigations, *Atmos. Res.*, 59-60, 251–264, doi:10.1016/S0169-8095(01)00119-3, 2001.
- 665 Baumgardner, D., Chepfer, H., Raga, G. B. and Kok, G. L.: The shapes of very small cirrus particles derived from in situ measurements, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 32(1), 1–4, doi:10.1029/2004GL021300, 2005.
- 670 Beals, M. J., Fugal, J. P., Shaw, R. A., Lu, J., Spuler, S. M. and Stith, J. L.: Holographic measurements of inhomogeneous cloud mixing at the centimeter scale, *Science*, 350(6256), 87–90, doi:10.1126/science.aab0751, 2015.
- 675 Brenguier, J. L., Bachalo, W. D., Chuang, P. Y., Esposito, B. M., Fugal, J., Garrett, T., Gayet, J. F., Gerber, H., Heymsfield, A., Kokhanovsky, A., Korolev, A., Lawson, R. P., Rogers, D. C., Shaw, R. A., Strapp, W. and Wendisch, M.: In situ measurements of cloud and precipitation particles in airborne measurements for environmental research: methods and instruments, pp. 225–301., 2013.
- Burnet, F. and Brenguier, J. L.: Observational study of the entrainment-mixing process in warm convective clouds, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 64, 1995–2011, doi:10.1175/JAS3928.1, 2007.
- 680 Dye, J. E. and Baumgardner, D.: Evaluation of the forward scattering spectrometer probe. Part I: electronic and optical studies, *J. Atmos. Ocean. Technol.*, 1, 329–344, doi:10.1175/1520-0426(1984)001<0329:EOTFSS>2.0.CO;2, 1984.
- 685 Fan, J., Leung, L. R., Demott, P. J., Comstock, J. M., Singh, B., Rosenfeld, D., Tomlinson, J. M., White, A., Prather, K. A., Minnis, P., Ayers, J. K. and Min, Q.: Aerosol impacts on California winter clouds and precipitation during calwater 2011: local pollution versus long-range transported dust, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 14(1), 81–101, doi:10.5194/acp-14-81-2014f, 2014.
- 690 Freud, E. and Rosenfeld, D.: Linear relation between convective cloud drop number concentration and depth for rain initiation, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 117(2), 1–13, doi:10.1029/2011JD016457, 2012.
- 695 Freud, E., Rosenfeld, D., Andreae, M. O., Costa, A. A. and Artaxo, P.: Robust relations between CCN and the vertical evolution of cloud drop size distribution in deep convective clouds, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 8(6), 1661–1675, doi:10.5194/acp-8-1661-2008, 2008.
- Freud, E., Rosenfeld, D. and Kulkarni, J. R.: Resolving both entrainment-mixing and number of activated CCN in deep convective clouds, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11(24), 12887–12900, doi:10.5194/acp-11-12887-2011, 2011.
- 700 Frey, W., Borrmann, S., Kunkel, D., Weigel, R., De Reus, M., Schlager, H., Roiger, A., Voigt, C., Hoor, P., Curtius, J., Krämer, M., Schiller, C., Volk, C. M., Homan, C. D., Fierli, F., Di Donfrancesco, G., Ulanovsky, A., Ravegnani, F., Sitnikov, N. M., Viciani, S., D'Amato, F., Shur, G. N., Belyaev, G. V., Law, K. S. and Cairo, F.: In situ measurements of tropical cloud properties in the West African Monsoon: upper tropospheric ice clouds, mesoscale convective system outflow, and subvisual cirrus, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11(12), 5569–5590, doi:10.5194/acp-11-5569-2011, 2011.
- 705 Gayet, J.-F., V. Shcherbakov, C. Voigt, U. Schumann, D. Schäuble, P. Jeßberger, A. Petzold, A. Minikin, H., Schlager, O. Dubovik, and T. Lapyonok: The evolution of microphysical and optical properties of an A380 contrail in the vortex phase, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 12, 6629–6643, doi:10.5194/acp-12-6629-2012, 2012.

- 710 Ten Hoeve, J. E., Remer, L. A. and Jacobson, M. Z.: Microphysical and radiative effects of aerosols on warm clouds during the Amazon biomass burning season as observed by MODIS: Impacts of water vapor and land cover, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11(7), 3021–3036, doi:10.5194/acp-11-3021-2011, 2011.
- 715 Järvinen, E., Schnaiter, M., Mioche, G., Jourdan, O., Shcherbakov, V., Costa, A., Afchine, A., Krämer, M., Heidelberg, F., Jurkat, T., Voigt, C., Schlager, H., Niehman, L., Gallagher, M., Hirst, E., Schmitt, C., Bansemmer, A., Heymsfield, A., Lawson, P., U. Tricoli, Pfeilsticker, K., Vochezer, P., Möhler, O. and Leisner, T.: Quasi-spherical ice in convective clouds, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, doi:10.1175/JAS-D-15-0365.1, 2016.
- 720 Jeßberger, P., Voigt, C., Schumann, U., Sölch, I., Schlager, H., Kaufmann, S., Petzold, A., Schäuble, D. and Gayet, J. F.: Aircraft type influence on contrail properties, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13(23), 11965–11984, doi:10.5194/acp-13-11965-2013, 2013.
- 725 Jiang, H. and Feingold, G.: Effect of aerosol on warm convective clouds: aerosol-cloud-surface flux feedbacks in a new coupled large eddy model, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 111(D1), D01202, doi:10.1029/2005JD006138, 2006.
- King, W. D., Parkin, D. A. and Handsworth, R. J.: A hot-wire liquid water device having fully calculable response characteristics, *J. Appl. Meteorol.*, 17(12), 1809–1813, doi:10.1175/1520-0450(1978)017<1809:AHWLWD>2.0.CO;2, 1978.
- 730 Klingebiel, M., De Lozar, A., Molleker, S., Weigel, R., Roth, A., Schmidt, L., Meyer, J., Ehrlich, A., Neuber, R., Wendisch, M. and Borrmann, S.: Arctic low-level boundary layer clouds: In situ measurements and simulations of mono- and bimodal supercooled droplet size distributions at the top layer of liquid phase clouds, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15(2), 617–631, doi:10.5194/acp-15-617-2015, 2015.
- 735 Kohler, M.: Explicit prediction of ice clouds in general circulation models., 1999.
- Korolev, A. V., Makarov, Y. E. and Novikov, V. S.: On the calibration of cloud particle counter FSSP-, *Trans. Cent. Aerol. Obs.*, 158(January 1985), 43–49, 1985.
- 740 Krüger, M. L., Mertes, S., Klimach, T., Cheng, Y. F., Su, H., Schneider, J., Andreae, M. O., Pöschl, U., and Rose, D.: Assessment of cloud supersaturation by size-resolved aerosol particle and cloud condensation nuclei (CCN) measurements, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 7, 2615–2629, doi:10.5194/amt-7-2615-2014, 2014.
- 745 Kuhn, U., Ganzeveld, L., Thielmann, A., Dindorf, T., Schebeske, G., Welling, M., Sciare, J., Roberts, G., Meixner, F. X., Kesselmeier, J., Lelieveld, J., Kolle, O., Ciccioli, P., Lloyd, J., Trentmann, J., Artaxo, P. and Andreae, M. O.: Impact of Manaus city on the Amazon Green Ocean atmosphere: ozone production, precursor sensitivity and aerosol load, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10(19), 9251–9282, doi:10.5194/acp-10-9251-2010, 2010.
- 750 Lance, S.: Coincidence errors in a cloud droplet probe (CDP) and a cloud and aerosol spectrometer (CAS), and the improved performance of a modified CDP, *J. Atmos. Ocean. Technol.*, 29(10), 1532–1541, doi:10.1175/JTECH-D-11-00208.1, 2012.
- 755 Lance, S., Brock, C. A., Rogers, D. and Gordon, J. A.: Water droplet calibration of the cloud droplet probe (CDP) and in-flight performance in liquid, ice and mixed-phase clouds during ARCPAC, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 3(6), 1683–1706, doi:10.5194/amt-3-1683-2010, 2010.
- 760 Machado, L. A. T., Silva Dias, M. A. F., Morales, C., Fisch, G., Vila, D., Albrecht, R., Goodman, S. J., Calheiros, A. J. P., Biscaro, T., Kummerow, C., Cohen, J., Fitzjarrald, D., Nascimento, E. L., Sakamoto, M. S., Cunningham, C., Chaboureaud, J. P., Petersen, W. A., Adams, D. K., Baldini, L., Angelis, C. F., Sapucci, L. F., Salio, P., Barbosa, H. M. J., Landulfo, E., Souza, R. A. F., Blakeslee, R. J., Bailey, J., Freitas, S., Lima, W. F. A. and Tokay, A.: The CHUVA project: how does convection vary across Brazil?, *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 95(9), 1365–1380, doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-13-00084.1, 2014.
- Mallaun, C., Giez, A. and Baumann, R.: Calibration of 3-D wind measurements on a single-engine research aircraft,

- 765 Atmos. Meas. Tech., 8(8), 3177–3196, doi:10.5194/amt-8-3177-2015, 2015.
- Martin, S. T., Artaxo, P., Machado, L. A. T., Manzi, A. O., Souza, R. A. F., Schumacher, C., Wang, J., Andreae, M. O., Barbosa, H. M. J., Fan, J., Fisch, G., Goldstein, A. H., Guenther, A., Jimenez, J. L., Pöschl, U., Silva Dias, M. A., Smith, J. N. and Wendisch, M.: Introduction: Observations and modeling of the Green Ocean Amazon (GoAmazon2014/5), Atmos. Chem. Phys., 16(8), 4785–4797, doi:10.5194/acp-16-4785-2016, 2016.
- 770 Mikhailov, E., Vlasenko, S., Rose, D. and Pöschl, U.: Mass-based hygroscopicity parameter interaction model and measurement of atmospheric aerosol water uptake, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 13(2), 717–740, doi:10.5194/acp-13-717-2013, 2013.
- 775 Mollerker, S., Borrmann, S., Schlager, H., Luo, B., Frey, W., Klingebiel, M., Weigel, R., Ebert, M., Mitev, V., Matthey, R., Woiwode, W., Oelhaf, H., Dörnbrack, A., Stratmann, G., Groß, J. U., Günther, G., Vogel, B., Müller, R., Krämer, M., Meyer, J. and Cairo, F.: Microphysical properties of synoptic-scale polar stratospheric clouds: in situ measurements of unexpectedly large HNO<sub>3</sub>-containing particles in the arctic vortex, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 14(19), 10785–10801, doi:10.5194/acp-14-10785-2014, 2014.
- 780 Petters, M. D. and Kreidenweis, S. M.: A single parameter representation of hygroscopic growth and cloud/condensation nucleus activity, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 1961–1971, doi:10.5194/acp-7-1961-2007, 2007.
- 785 Pinsky, M., Khain, A., Mazin, I. and Korolev, A.: Analytical estimation of droplet concentration at cloud base, J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., 117(17), 1–14, doi:10.1029/2012JD017753, 2012.
- Pöhlker, M. L., Pöhlker, C., Klimach, T., Angelis, I. H. de, Barbosa, H. M. J., Brito, J., Samara Carbone, Cheng, Y., Chi, X., Ditas, F., Ditz, R., Gunthe, S. S., Kesselmeier, J., Könemann, T., Lavrić, J. V., Martin, S. T., Moran-Zuloaga, D., Rose, D., Saturno, J., Su, H., Thalman, R., Walter, D., Wang, J., Wolff, S., Artaxo, P., Andreae, M. O. and Pöschl, U.: Long-term observations of atmospheric aerosol, cloud condensation nuclei concentration and hygroscopicity in the Amazon rain forest – Part 1: size-resolved characterization and new model parameterizations for CCN prediction, Atmos. Chem. Phys., (July), doi:10.5194/acp-2016-519, 2016.
- 790 Pruppacher, H. R., Klett, J. D. and Wang, P. K.: Microphysics of clouds and precipitation, Aerosol Sci. Technol., 28, 381–382, doi:10.1080/02786829808965531, 1998.
- 795 Reutter, P., Su, H., Trentmann, J., Simmel, M., Rose, D., Gunthe, S. S., Wernli, H., Andreae, M. O. and Pöschl, U.: Aerosol- and updraft-limited regimes of cloud droplet formation: influence of particle number, size and hygroscopicity on the activation of cloud condensation nuclei (CCN), Atmos. Chem. Phys., 9(18), 7067–7080, doi:10.5194/acp-9-7067-2009, 2009.
- 800 Roberts, G. C. and Nenes, A.: A continuous-flow streamwise thermal-gradient CCN chamber for atmospheric measurements, Aerosol Sci. Technol., 39(3), 206–221, doi:10.1080/027868290913988, 2005.
- 805 Rose, D., Gunthe, S. S., Mikhailov, E., Frank, G. P., Dusek, U., Andreae, M. O., and Pöschl, U.: Calibration and measurement uncertainties of a continuous-flow cloud condensation nuclei counter (DMT-CCNC): CCN activation of ammonium sulfate and sodium chloride aerosol particles in theory and experiment: Atmos. Chem. Phys., 8, 1153–1179, 2008.
- 810 Rosenberg, P. D., Dean, A. R., Williams, P. I., Dorsey, J. R., Minikin, A., Pickering, M. A., and Petzold, A.: Particle sizing calibration with refractive index correction for light scattering optical particle counters and impacts upon PCASP and CDP data collected during the Fenrec campaign, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 5, 1147–1163, doi:10.5194/amt-5-1147-2012, 2012.
- 815 Rosenfeld, D. and Gutman, G.: Retrieving microphysical properties near the tops of potential rain clouds by multispectral analysis of AVHRR data, Atmos. Res., 34(1-4), 259–283, doi:10.1016/0169-8095(94)90096-5, 1994.
- 820 Rosenfeld, D., Woodley, W. L., Krauss, T. W. and Makitov, V.: Aircraft microphysical documentation from cloud base to anvils of hailstorm feeder clouds in Argentina, J. Appl. Meteorol. Climatol., 45(9), 1261–1281,

- doi:10.1175/JAM2403.1, 2006.
- 825 Rosenfeld, D., Lohmann, U. and Raga, G.: Flood or drought: how do aerosols affect precipitation?, *Science* (80-. ), 321(September), 1309–1313, 2008.
- Rosenfeld, D., Fischman, B., Zheng, Y., Goren, T. and Giguzin, D.: Combined satellite and radar retrievals of drop concentration and CCN at convective cloud base, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 41(9), 3259–3265, doi:10.1002/2014GL059453, 2014a.
- 830 Rosenfeld, D., Chemke, R., Prather, K., Suski, K., Comstock, J. M., Schmid, B., Tomlinson, J. and Jonsson, H.: Polluting of winter convective clouds upon transition from ocean inland over central California: contrasting case studies, *Atmos. Res.*, 135-136, 112–127, doi:10.1016/j.atmosres.2013.09.006, 2014b.
- 835 Rosenfeld, D., Y. Zheng, E. Hashimshoni, M. L. Pöhlker, A. Jefferson, C. Pöhlker, X. Yu, Y. Zhu, G. Liu, Z. Yue, B. Fischman, Z. Li, D. Giguzin, T. Goren, P. Artaxoi, H. M. J. Barbosai, U. Pöschl, and Meinrat O. Andreae, 2016: Satellite retrieval of cloud condensation nuclei concentrations by using clouds as CCN chambers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, doi:10.1073/pnas.1514044113.
- 840 Schumann, U., Mayer, B., Gierens, K., Unterstrasser, S., Jessberger, P., Petzold, A., Voigt, C. and Gayet, J.-F.: Effective radius of ice particles in cirrus and contrails, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 68, 300–321, doi:10.1175/2010JAS3562.1, 2011.
- 845 Silva Dias, M. A. F., Petersen, W., Silva Dias, P. L., Cifelli, R., Betts, A. K., Longo, M., Gomes, A. M., Fisch, G. F., Lima, M. A., Antonio, M. A. and Albrecht, R. I.: A case study of convective organization into precipitating lines in the southwest Amazon during the WETAMC and TRMM-LBA, *J. Geophys. Res. D Atmos.*, 107(20), doi:10.1029/2001JD000375, 2002.
- 850 Stephens, G.: The parameterization of radiation for numerical weather prediction and climate models, *Mon. Weather Rev.*, 1984.
- Strapp, J. W., Oldenburg, J., Ide, R., Lilie, L., Bacic, S., Vukovic, Z., Oleskiw, M., Miller, D., Emery, E. and Leone, G.: Wind tunnel measurements of the response of hot-wire liquid water content instruments to large droplets, *J. Atmos. Ocean. Technol.*, 20(6), 791–806, doi:10.1175/1520-0426(2003)020<0791:WTMOTR>2.0.CO;2, 2003.
- 855 Twomey, S.: The nuclei of natural cloud formation part II: the supersaturation in natural clouds and the variation of cloud droplet concentration, *Geofis. Pura e Appl.*, 43(1), 243–249, doi:10.1007/BF01993560, 1959.
- 860 Voigt, C., Schumann, U., Jurkat, T., Schäuble, D., Schlager, H., Petzold, A., Gayet, J. F., Krämer, M., Schneider, J., Borrmann, S., Schmale, J., Jessberger, P., Hamburger, T., Lichtenstern, M., Scheibe, M., Gourbeyre, C., Meyer, J., Kübbeler, M., Frey, W., Kalesse, H., Butler, T., Lawrence, M. G., Holzäpfel, F., Arnold, F., Wendisch, M., Döpelheuer, A., Gottschaldt, K., Baumann, R., Zöger, M., Sölch, I., Rautenhaus, M. and Dörnbrack, A.: In-situ observations of young contrails - overview and selected results from the CONCERT campaign, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10(18), 9039–9056, doi:10.5194/acp-10-9039-2010, 2010.
- 865 Voigt, C., Schumann, U., Jessberger, P., Jurkat, T., Petzold, A., Gayet, J. F., Krmer, M., Thornberry, T. and Fahey, D. W.: Extinction and optical depth of contrails, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 38(11), doi:10.1029/2011GL047189, 2011.
- 870 Voigt, C., Schumann, U., Minikin, A., Abdelmonem, A., Afchine, A., Borrmann, S., Boettcher, M., Buchholz, B., Bugliaro, L., Costa, A., Curtius, J., Dollner, M., Dörnbrack, A., Dreiling, V., Ebert, V., Ehrlich, A., Fix, A., Forster, L., Frank, F., Fütterer, D., Giez, A., Graf, K., Groß, J., Groß, S., Heimerl, K., Heinold, B., Hüneke, T., Järvinen, E., Jurkat, T., Kaufmann, S., Kenntner, M., Klingebiel, M., Klimach, T., Kohl, R., Krämer, M., Krisna, T., Luebke, A., Mayer, B., Mertes, S., Molleker, S., Petzold, A., Pfeilsticker, K., Port, M., Rapp, M., Reutter, P., Rolf, C., Rose, D., Sauer, D., Schäfler, A., Schlage, R., Schnaiter, M., Schneider, J., Spelten, N., Spichtinger, P., Stock, P., Walser, A., Weigel, R., Weinzierl, B., Wendisch, M., Werner, F., Wernli, H., Wirth, M., Zahn, A., Ziereis, H. and Zöger, M.: ML-CIRRUS - the airborne experiment on natural cirrus and contrail cirrus with the high-altitude long-range research aircraft HALO, *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00213.1, 2016.



- 880 Weigel, R., Spichtinger, P., Mahnke, C., Klingebiel, M., Afchine, A., Petzold, A., Krämer, M., Costa, A., Molleker, S., Jurkat, T., Minikin, A. and Borrmann, S.: Thermodynamic correction of particle concentrations measured by underwing probes on fast flying aircraft, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, **9**, 5135-5162, doi:10.5194/amt-9-5135, 2016.
- Wendisch, M., Keil, A. and Korolev, A. V.: FSSP characterization with monodisperse water droplets, *J. Atmos. Ocean. Technol.*, **13**(6), 1152–1165, doi:10.1175/1520-0426(1996)013<1152:FCWMWD>2.0.CO;2, 1996.
- 885 Wendisch, M., and J.-L. Brenguier (Eds.), 2013: Airborne measurements for environmental research: methods and instruments. *Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim, Germany*. ISBN: 978-3-527-40996-9. 655 pp., doi:10.1002/9783527653218
- 890 Wendisch, M., Pöschl, U., Andreae, M. O., Machado, L. A. T., Albrecht, R., Schlager, H., Rosenfeld, D., Martin, S. T., Abdelmonem, A., Afchine, A., Araújo, A., Artaxo, P., Aufimhoff, H., Barbosa, H. M. J., Borrmann, S., Braga, R., Buchholz, B., Cecchini, M. A., Costa, A., Curtius, J., Dollner, M., Dorf, M., Dreiling, V., Ebert, V., Ehrlich, A., Ewald, F., Fisch, G., Fix, A., Frank, F., Fütterer, D., Heckl, C., Heidelberg, F., Hüneke, T., Jäkel, E., Järvinen, E., Jurkat, T., Kanter, S., Kästner, U., Kenntner, M., Kesselmeier, J., Klimach, T., Knecht, M., Kohl, R., Kölling, T., Krämer, M., Krüger, M., Krisna, T. C., Lavric, J. V., Longo, K., Mahnke, C., Manzi, A. O., Mayer, B., Mertes, S., 895 Minikin, A., Molleker, S., Münch, S., Nillius, B., Pfeilsticker, K., Pöhlker, C., Roiger, A., Rose, D., Rosenow, D., Sauer, D., Schnaiter, M., Schneider, J., Schulz, C., de Souza, R. A. F., Spanu, A., Stock, P., Vila, D., Voigt, C., Walsler, A., Walter, D., Weigel, R., Weinzierl, B., Werner, F., Yamasoe, M. A., Ziereis, H., Zinner, T. and Zöger, M.: The ACRIDICON-CHUVA campaign: studying tropical deep convective clouds and precipitation over Amazonia using the new german research aircraft HALO, *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 160128144638003, doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-14-00255.1, 2016.
- 900 Zheng, Y., Rosenfeld, D., and Li, Z., 2015: Satellite Inference of Thermals and Cloud-Base Updraft Speeds Based on Retrieved Surface and Cloud-Base Temperatures. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **72**, 2411–2428. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-14-0283.1>
- 905

## Appendix – A

The uncertainties of  $N_{AT}$ ,  $N_{dCCN}$ ,  $S_{max}$ ,  $r_e$ ,  $CWC$ ,  $N_{a0}$ ,  $N_d^*$ ,  $N_{dI}^*$  and  $N_{dCCN}^*$  were estimated via the ‘analytic’ approximation of error propagation which is calculated by finding the partial derivatives of the function with respect to the independent variables. For example if you have a function  $f(x,y,z)$  with the variables  $x,y$  and  $z$  and the uncertainties  $s_x$ ,  $s_y$  and  $s_z$  you have the following result for the final uncertainty ( $sf$ ) of  $f$ :

$$sf = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\delta f}{\delta x}\right)^2 \cdot sx^2 + \left(\frac{\delta f}{\delta y}\right)^2 \cdot sy^2 + \left(\frac{\delta f}{\delta z}\right)^2 \cdot sz^2} \quad (A1)$$

## Appendix - B

### Calculating STDE CCNmax and STDE CCNmin

The  $N_0$  and  $k$  parameters standard errors (STDE) are associated with the statistical uncertainty of the power law function fit. To compute the STDE for the CCN estimates the uncertainties of  $S$  (~10%) are considered. Then, the maximum and the minimum STDE values expected for the CCN estimates are calculated as follows:

*Maximum STDE*

[rb10] Comentário: New appendix sections.

$$STDE\ CCN_{max} = \frac{[(N_0 + SD.N_0) \cdot (S_i \cdot 1.1)^{k+SD.k}] - N_0 \cdot S_i^k}{\sqrt{N}} \quad (A2)$$

where:

The averaging is done on I=1:N.

925 N is the number of  $NCCN_2$  cases for each group of measurements.

$SD.N_0$  is the statistical standard deviation of  $N_0$ ;

$SD.k$  is the statistical standard deviation of  $k$ ;

$S_i$  is the supersaturation in each step, forced to have the maximum value (multiplied by 1.1).

930 *Minimum STDE*

$$STDE\ CCN_{min} = \frac{N_0 \cdot S_i^k - [(N_0 - SD.N_0) * (S_i \cdot 0.9)^{k-SD.k}]}{\sqrt{N}} \quad (A3)$$

where:

The averaging is done on I=1:N.

N is the number of  $NCCN_2$  cases for each group of measurements.

935  $SD.N_0$  is the statistical standard deviation of  $N_0$ ;

$SD.k$  is the statistical standard deviation of  $k$ ;

$S_i$  is the supersaturation in each step, forced to have the minimum value (multiplied by 0.9).

**Error and uncertainties of Twomey's formula (Eq. 1)**

940 According to Krüger et al. (2014), the error in  $N_{CCN}(S)$  based on the counting error of the measured particle number ( $\Delta c = \sqrt{c + 1}$ ) and can be calculated by:

$$\Delta N = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\Delta c \cdot t}{q}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{c \cdot \Delta q \cdot t}{q^2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{c \cdot \Delta t}{q}\right)^2} \quad (A4)$$

where:

945  $t$  is the period of the time of measurements assumed (60 s);

$\Delta t$  is the error of the time;

$c$  is the measured particle number;

$q$  is the aerosol flow rate;

$\Delta q$  is the error of the aerosol flow rate (we assume 10% of  $q$ , i.e.  $0.007\text{ L min}^{-1}$ );

950

According to the Gaussian error propagation the error in  $N_{CCN}(S)$  is:

$$\Delta N_{CCN} = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\Delta m_{CCN2} \cdot Tm_{CCN1}}{m_{CCN1}}\right)^2 + \left(-\frac{m_{CCN2} \cdot \Delta m_{CCN1}}{Tm_{CCN1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\Delta Tm_{CCN1} \cdot Tm_{CCN2}}{m_{CCN1}}\right)^2} \quad (A5)$$

To calculate the error in  $k$  the calculations have been done with the upper and lower error ranges and the resulting error of  $k$  is 20 % of  $k$ . For  $N_0$  the calculated error is 23 %, associated with the Twomey equation fit (Eq. 1) and the  $N_{CCN}$  error.

### Appendix – C

Summary of the measurements and theoretical calculations at cloud base:

- 1)  $N_d$  - based on probe measurement;
- 2)  $N_d$  - based on vertical profile of  $r_e$ ;
- 3)  $S_{max} - S$  substituting  $N_d$  and  $W_b$  in Eq. 3.
- 4)  $N_{dT}$  - Obtained from substituting in Eq. 2  $W_b$  and  $N_{CCN}(S)$  parameters ( $k$  and  $N_0$ );
- 5)  $N_{dCCN}$  - Obtained from substituting  $S_{max}$  and  $N_{CCN}(S)$  parameters in Eq. 1.
- 6)  $W_b^*$  - Obtained from Eq. 6.
- 7)  $N_d^*$ ,  $N_{dT}^*$ ,  $N_{dCCN}^*$  -  $N_d$ ,  $N_{dT}$ ,  $N_{dCCN}$  that match  $W_b^*$ .

### Figure captions

Figure 1. Flight patterns below and in convective clouds during the ACRIDICON-CHUVA campaign.

Figure 2. HALO flight tracks during the ACRIDICON-CHUVA experiment. The flight numbers are indicated on the right (from Wendisch et al., 2016).

Figure 3. Cloud droplet effective radius ( $r_e$ ) as a function of altitude for clouds over clean (Flight AC19 - blue squares), polluted (Flight AC18 – green triangles) and very polluted (Flight AC13 – brown diamonds) environments. Dashed lines indicate the probability of rain from the coalescence process expressed as percentage on the top of the graphic.

Figure 4. Mean cloud water content from the hot-wire measurements and estimated from the cloud probes (CCP-CDP and CAS-DPOL from top to bottom, respectively) as a function of effective radius ( $r_e$ ) size (left panel). The ratios between the hot-wire liquid water content and the cloud water content derived from each probe are shown in red ( $CWC_r$ ). The total uncertainties for each probe and the hot-wire measurements are shown by the dotted lines. The number of cases (black continuous line), hot-wire measurement standard deviations (dashed black line), and probe CWC standard deviations (dashed colored line) for each  $r_e$  size are shown in the right panels.

Figure 5. Mean cloud droplet concentrations for CAS-DPOL and CCP-CDP as a function of effective radius ( $r_e$ ) (left panel). The systematic error for each probe is shown by the dashed line. The right panel indicates the standard deviation in  $\text{cm}^{-3}$  of each probe concentration as a function of  $r_e$ . The probes are identified by colors as shown at the top of the panels. The sample for each probe is the same as shown in Figure 3.

Figure 6. (left) Mean cloud droplet concentration (solid lines) and (right) cloud water content as a function of droplet

985 diameter in the left and right panels, respectively, for a)  $5 \mu\text{m} < r_e < 6 \mu\text{m}$ ; b)  $8 \mu\text{m} < r_e < 9 \mu\text{m}$ ; c)  $11 \mu\text{m} < r_e < 12$   
1000  $\mu\text{m}$ ; d)  $12 \mu\text{m} < r_e < 13 \mu\text{m}$ . The probes are identified by colors as shown at the top of the panels. The error bars  
indicate the uncertainty range of mean cloud droplet concentration and cloud water content values as a function of  
droplet diameter.

Figure 7. a) Frequency histogram of vertical wind speed ( $W_b$ ) from cloud base measurements on flight AC17 (la-  
990 beled on the left ordinate). The blue line indicates the cumulative probability function of  $W_b$  (labeled on the right  
ordinate). The cyan arrow indicates the value of  $W_b^*$  ( $1.83 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ ) that represents the 86th percentile of the  $W$  spectra;  
b) Similar for the cloud droplet concentrations measured with the CCP-CDP probe. The cyan line indicates the  $N_d^*$   
value ( $1207 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ ) at the 86th percentile in the  $N_d$  spectra. The indicated time is in UTC and shows the time of the  
first cloud penetration at cloud base and the total number of 1-s measured cloud data points.

995 Figure 8.  $CCN_1$  (red dots) and  $CCN_2$  (black dots) measurements for a segment of flight AC17 on 27 September  
2014. The abscissa shows the measurement time in UTC. The blue line indicates the altitude in meters above sea  
level and is labeled on the left ordinate (as well as  $CCN_1$  and  $CCN_2$ ).  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  measurements in % are indicated by  
the orange and green lines, respectively (both are labeled on the right ordinate). Cyan dots on the blue line indicate  
cloud penetrations (i.e., when cloud droplet concentrations are greater than  $20 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ ). In this case, cloud base heights  
1000 were observed around 2,300 meters above ground.

Figure 9. A comparison of the CCN spectra derived from the two CCN counter columns on board the HALO aircraft  
during flight AC17. Black (blue) smaller dots indicate  $CCN_1$  ( $CCN_2$ ) measurements for each second. Large  
diamonds in black (blue) indicate the  $mCCN_1$  ( $mCCN_2$ ) for each time step of measurements. The orange large  
diamonds indicate the  $NCCN_2$  values that are used to fit the power law equation of the group of measurements,  
1005 which is shown at the lower right corner of the plot. The standard error for the CCN spectra derived is shown in  
Table 2.

Figure 10. CCN spectra as measured on board the HALO aircraft during cloud profiling flights. Diamonds indicate  
the  $NCCN_2$  values, which are used to fit the power law equation of the group of measurements. The colors indicate  
the group of measurements and match the legend on the right side of the plot. The legend indicates the flight  
1010 number; the initial time of group measurements; the period of measurements in seconds; the power law fit and the  
correlation coefficient of the data. The standard errors for each CCN spectra derived are shown in Table 2.

Figure 11a-f.  $N_{dCCN}$ ,  $S$ ,  $N_{dT}$  and  $N_d$  values are presented as a function of the cloud base updrafts ( $W_b$ ). This plot is  
based on the ‘probability matching method’ (PMM), using same percentiles for  $W_b$  and  $N_d$  ( $N_{dCCN}$  or  $N_{dT}$ ). The  
values of  $N_{dCCN}$ ,  $N_{dT}$  and  $N_d$  are shown the left y-axis, those of  $S$  on the right y-axis. The black dashed lines are the  
1015  $N_{dT}$  uncertainties. The gray solid (dashed) lines are the  $N_{dCCN}$  values (uncertainties). The effective updraft  $W_b^*$  for  
each flight segment is shown by the cyan line. The data are based on the CAS-DPOL probe. The time, period of  
measurements (sample size in seconds), and  $N_{CCN}(S)$  equation are shown on the top of the figures.

Figure 12a-d. Same as Figure 11 for the CCP-CDP probe. No data were available for flight AC16. The CCP-CDP  
malfunctioned in flight AC13 during the cloud base measurements.

1020 Figure 13. a)  $N_d^*$  versus  $N_{dT}^*$  calculated with  $W_b^*$  from cloud base data shown in Figures 11-12. The CAS-DPOL  
values are indicated by plus symbols (+) and the CCP-CDP values are indicated by circles (o). The colors indicate

each flight segment (legend in the right side of the plot). Error bars indicate the uncertainties of variable estimates. Lines show the 1:1 and 1:2 relationships between  $N_{dT}^*$  versus  $N_d^*$  for each probe; b) Same for  $N_d^*$  versus  $N_{dCCN}^*$ .

1025 Figure 14 a). Mean volume drop mass ( $M_v$ ) versus liquid water content from the CCP-CDP measurements for adiabatic fraction greater than 0.25 ( $LWC_a$ ). Values are shown with different colors labeled as a function of height in kilometers above sea level (indicated by the colorbar on the right side of the graphic). The slope of the linear equation is the estimated  $N_a$  (i.e.,  $1496 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ ); b)  $M_v$  versus  $r_e$  as a function of height in kilometers above sea level (indicated by the color bar on the right side of the graphic).

1030 Figure 15.  $N_d^*$  versus  $N_a$  measured with CAS-DPOL and CCP-CDP (indicated on the top of panels) for profile flights during the ACRIDICON-CHUVA campaign. The color of the dots is associated with the flight number shown at the right side of the panels. Error bars indicates the uncertainties of variables estimates. The linear regression equation and the correlation coefficient  $R$  are shown at the top of each panel.

1035 **Table captions**

Table 1. Cloud probe size intervals and central bin diameters during HALO flights.

Table 2. Estimates of  $N_b$  and  $k$  below cloud base and their standard error (STDE) for each case study. Maximum and minimum STDE (STDE  $CCN_{max}$  and STDE  $CCN_{min}$ , respectively) for the  $CCN$  measurements are calculated considering errors in the supersaturation measurements ( $\sim 10\%$ ). The details about the calculation of these values are

1040 given in Appendix B.

Table 3. List of case studies for measurements below cloud base. The duration of measurements is given in seconds, starting at the initial time indicated. An asterisk indicates those flights where the two probes provided at least 20 seconds of measurements at cloud base. The data can be from different cloud passes in the same region of

1045 measurements below cloud base.

**Tables**

Table 1. Cloud probe size intervals and central bin diameters during HALO flights.

Cloud Probe	Size interval	Number of bins	Central bin diameter ( $\mu\text{m}$ )
CCP-CDP	3-50 $\mu\text{m}$	14	3.8, 6.1, 8.7, 10.9, 13.5, 17.1, 19.7, 22.5, 25.9, 28.3, 31.7, 36.6, 40.7, 44.2
CAS-DPOL	3-50 $\mu\text{m}$	10	3.9, 6, 10.8, 17.3, 22.3, 27.4, 32.4, 37.4, 42.4, 47.4

1050

Table 2. Estimates of  $N_0$  and  $k$  below cloud base and their standard error (STDE) for each case study. Maximum and minimum STDE (STDE  $CCN_{max}$  and STDE  $CCN_{min}$ , respectively) for the  $CCN$  measurements are calculated considering errors in the supersaturation measurements ( $\sim 10\%$ ). The details about the calculation of these values are given in Appendix B.

1055

Flight	Time	$N_0$	$k$	STDE $N_0$	STDE $k$	STDE $CCN_{max}$ [ $\text{cm}^{-3}$ ]	STDE $CCN_{min}$ [ $\text{cm}^{-3}$ ]
AC11	14:58:21	1985	0.73	81.6	0.035	25.5	24.8
AC11	17:38:20	2927	1.14	82.8	0.032	43.9	43.8
AC12	15:56:00	1764	0.3	71.4	0.046	19.0	22.7
AC13	16:29:01	4145	0.92	64.7	0.016	69.7	54.8
AC14	15:21:40	1509	0.97	44.8	0.028	24.7	18.9
AC15	13:33:35	2209	0.94	70.4	0.038	47.4	31.2
AC16	20:21:40	1966	0.67	69.5	0.029	26.5	21.2
AC17	16:50:50	2743	0.72	38.7	0.013	31.9	30.5
AC17	19:38:20	1015	0.54	18.5	0.018	10.7	9.4


1060

Table 3. List of case studies for measurements below cloud base. The duration of measurements is given in seconds, starting at the initial time indicated. An asterisk indicates those flights where the two probes provided at least 20 seconds of measurements at cloud base. The data can be from different cloud passes in the same region of measurements below cloud base.

<b>Measurements below cloud base</b>			
<b>Flight</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Initial time (UTC)</b>	<b>Period of analysis (s)</b>
AC11	16/09/2014	14:58:21	593
AC11*	16/09/2014	17:38:20	710
AC12	18/09/2014	15:56:00	440
AC13*	19/09/2014	16:29:01	722
AC14*	21/09/2014	15:21:40	800
AC15	23/09/2014	13:33:35	555
AC16*	25/09/2014	20:21:40	550
AC17*	27/09/2014	16:50:50	831
AC17*	27/09/2014	19:38:20	840

1065

Figures



1070 Figure 1. Flight patterns below and in convective clouds during the ACRIDICON-CHUVA campaign.


1075

1080

1085

1090





1095


Figure 2. HALO flight tracks during the ACRIDICON-CHUVA experiment. The flight numbers are indicated on the right (from Wendisch et al., 2016).

1100


1105

1110

1115



1120 Figure 3. Cloud droplet effective radius ( $r_e$ ) as a function of altitude for clouds over clean (Flight AC19 - blue color squares), polluted (Flight AC18 - green color triangles) and very polluted (Flight AC13 - brown color diamonds) environments. Dashed lines indicate the probability of rain from the coalescence process expressed in percentage on the top of the graphic.




1125

1130

**Figure 4.** Mean cloud water content from the hot-wire measurements and estimated from the cloud probes (CCP-CDP and CAS-DPOL from top to bottom, respectively) as a function of effective radius ( $r_e$ ) size (left panel). The ratios between the hot-wire liquid water content and the cloud water content derived from each probe are shown in red (CWC<sub>r</sub>). The total uncertainty for each probe and the hot-wire measurements are shown by the dotted lines. The number of cases (black continuous line), hot-wire measurement standard deviations (dashed black line), and probe CWC standard deviations (dashed colored line) for each  $r_e$  size are shown in the right panels.

[rb11] Comentário: New figure which addresses a reviewer request.








1135 Figure 5. Mean cloud droplet concentrations for CAS-DPOL and CCP-CDP as a function of effective radius ( $r_e$ ) (left  
 1140 panel). The systematic error for each probes shown by the dashed line. The right panel indicates the standard deviation in  
 1145  $\text{cm}^{-3}$  of each probe concentration as a function of  $r_e$ . The probes are identified by colors as shown in the top of the panels.  
 1150 The sample for each probe is the same as shown in Figure 3.

1140

1145

1150





1160

1165

**Figure 6.** (left) Mean cloud droplet concentration (solid lines) and (right) cloud water content as a function of droplet diameter in the left and right panels, respectively, for a)  $5 \mu\text{m} < r_e < 6 \mu\text{m}$ ; b)  $8 \mu\text{m} < r_e < 9 \mu\text{m}$ ; c)  $11 \mu\text{m} < r_e < 12 \mu\text{m}$ ; d)  $12 \mu\text{m} < r_e < 13 \mu\text{m}$ . The probes are identified by colors as shown at the top of the panels. The error bars indicate the uncertainty range of mean cloud droplet concentration and cloud water content values as a function of droplet diameter.

[rb12] Comentário: New figures to address reviewers requests.





Figure 7. a) Frequency histogram for vertical wind speed ( $W_b$ ) from cloud base measurements on flight AC17 (labeled on the left ordinate). The blue line indicates the cumulative probability function of  $W_b$  (labeled on the right ordinate). The cyan arrow indicates the value of  $W_b^*$  ( $1.83 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ ), which represents the 86th percentile of the  $W$  spectra; b) Similar for the cloud droplet concentrations measured with the CCP-CDP probe. The cyan line indicates the  $N_d^*$  value ( $1207 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ ) at the 86th percentile in the  $N_d$  spectra. The indicated time is in UTC and shows the time of the first cloud penetration at cloud base and the total number of 1-s measured cloud data points.



1180


Figure 8.  $CCN_1$  (red dots) and  $CCN_2$  (black dots) measurements for a segment of flight AC17 on 27 September 2014. The abscissa shows the measurement time in UTC. The blue line indicates the altitude in meters above sea level and is labeled on the left ordinate (as well as  $CCN_1$  and  $CCN_2$ ).  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  measurements in % are indicated by the orange and green lines, respectively (both are labeled on the right ordinate). Cyan dots on the blue line indicate cloud penetrations (i.e., when cloud droplets concentrations are greater than  $20 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ ). In this case, cloud base heights were observed around 2,300 meters above ground.

1185

1190

1195






1200 Figure 9. A comparison of the *CCN* spectra derived from the two *CCN* counter columns on board the HALO aircraft  
 1205 during flight AC17. Black (blue) smaller dots indicate *CCN*<sub>1</sub> (*CCN*<sub>2</sub>) measurements for each second. Large diamonds in  
 black (blue) indicate the *mCCN*<sub>1</sub> (*mCCN*<sub>2</sub>) for each time step of measurements. The orange large diamonds indicate the  
*NCCN*<sub>2</sub> values, which are used to fit the power law equation of the group of measurements, which is shown at the lower  
 right corner of the plot. The standard error for *CCN* spectra derived is shown at Table 2.



1210

1215




1220 Figure 10. *CCN* spectra as measured on board the HALO aircraft during cloud profiling flights. Diamonds indicate the  $N_{CCN_2}$  values, which are used to fit the power law equation of the group of measurements. The colors indicate the group of measurements and match the legend on the right side of the plot. The legend indicates the flight number; the initial time of group measurements; the period of measurements in seconds; the power law fit and the correlation coefficient of the data. The standard errors for each *CCN* spectra derived are shown at Table 2.


1225




c) FLIGHT AC14 TIME: 15:06(184 s) CCN=1509.7 · S<sup>0.973</sup>




d) FLIGHT AC16 TIME: 20:10(58 s) CCN=1966.2 · S<sup>0.872</sup>






1240 Figure 11a-f.  $N_{dCCN}$ ,  $S$ ,  $N_{dT}$  and  $N_d$  values are presented as a function of the cloud base updrafts ( $W_b$ ). This plot is based on  
 the ‘probability matching method’ (PMM), using same percentiles for  $W_b$  and  $N_d$  ( $N_{dCCN}$  or  $N_{dT}$ ). The values of  $N_{dCCN}$ ,  $N_{dT}$   
 and  $N_d$  are shown the left y-axis, those of  $S$  on the right y-axis. The black dashed lines are the  $N_{dT}$  uncertainties. The gray  
 solid (dashed) lines are the  $N_{dCCN}$  values (uncertainties). The effective updraft  $W_b^*$  for each flight segment is shown by the  
 cyan line. The data are based on the CAS-DPOL probe. The time, period of measurements (sample size in seconds), and  
 1245  $N_{CCN}(S)$  equation are shown on the top of the figures.

a) FLIGHT AC11 TIME: 17:52(61 s) CCN=2927.4 · S<sup>1.137</sup>



b) FLIGHT AC14 TIME: 15:06(111 s) CCN=1509.7 · S<sup>0.973</sup>



1250








Figure 12a-d. Same as Figure 11 for the CCP-CDP probe. No data were available for flight AC16. The CCP-CDP malfunctioned in flight AC13 during the cloud base measurements.



1260 Figure 13. a)  $N_{dr}^*$  versus  $N_d^*$  calculated with  $W_b^*$  from cloud base data shown in Figures 11-12. The CAS-DPOL values are indicated by plus symbols (+) and the CCP-CDP values indicate by circles (o). The colors indicate each flight segment (legend in the right side of the plot). Error bars indicates the uncertainties of variables estimates. Lines show the 1:1 and 1:2 relationships between  $N_{dr}^*$  versus  $N_d^*$  for each probe; b) Same for  $N_d^*$  versus  $N_{accn}^*$ .





1265 Figure 14 a). Mean volume drop mass ( $M_v$ ) versus liquid water content from the CCP-CDP measurements for adiabatic  
fraction greater than 0.25 ( $LWC_a$ ). Values are shown with different colors labeled as a function of height in kilometers  
above sea level (indicated by the colorbar on the right side of the graphic). The slope of the linear equation is the  
estimated  $N_a$  (i.e.,  $1496 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ ); b)  $M_v$  versus  $r_e$  as a function of height in kilometers above sea level (indicated by the  
colorbar on the right side of the graphic).

1270




Figure 15.  $N_d^*$  versus  $N_a$  measured with CAS-DPOL and CCP-CDP (indicated on the top of panels) for profile flights during the ACRIDICON-CHUVA campaign. The color of the dots is associated with the flight number shown at the right side of the panels. Error bars indicates the uncertainties of variables estimates. The linear regression equation and the correlation coefficient  $R$  are shown in the top of each panel.

1275