

Interactive comment on “Observing ice particle growth along fall streaks in mixed-phase clouds using spectral polarimetric radar data” by Lukas Pfitzenmaier et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 12 March 2018

This paper reports spectral polarisation radar measurements within a rather complex ice cloud system, and subjects these data to careful analysis using a “fall streak reconstruction” technique. The main virtue of the paper is the effort to pull together all the measurements to reveal a story about the evolution of the ice particles. This story is qualitative rather than quantitative, but this is fair enough - most other studies of this kind in the literature have the same limitation.

I think this is well within ACP’s scope. It’s pretty well-written, the results and methodology used are of interest to the community, and the paper makes a worthwhile addition to the existing literature on this topic. I have a number of minor corrections below - I

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



think the paper is publishable once these have been addressed.

ACPD

Introduction

page 2, line 8 onwards. You make a big deal here about how it's important to study precipitating mixed-phase clouds and melting of ice particles, linking the ice above the melting layer to the rain below. I saw very few links in your paper to this aspect. Essentially your focus is on the ice-phase bit of a cloud that happens to be raining at the surface. I suggest that you change the emphasis a bit here to fit better with what you are doing.

You also make a link here to attenuation and attempt to establish a dichotomy between cloud radars (W, Ka, X bands) and precipitation radars (C- and S-band), then latter being relatively immune to attenuation. This seems to be a link to motivate the use of TARA which is S-band. I personally think the distinction is overplayed, but I acknowledge that the longer wavelength has some advantages for the interpretation of the data. I'm not sure I would make such a big deal of it myself, but I leave that to the authors.

Studies by Bader et al, Field et al were S-band not C-band.

You might consider adding Keat et al (2017, JGR) to your review of relevant literature here. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/2017JD026754/abstract> again identified oriented pristine crystals and inferred the presence of supercooled liquid water. Seems relevant to your case 2.

Section 2.

page 4, line 30,31. You say cloud top from MIRA is at least 0.5km higher than the one from TARA. Always? Surely this is case-dependent. I suggest it is better to quote the minimum detectable dBZ at, say, 5km height for the two radars.

Section 3.

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



The arrow at the bottom of figure 2 confused me. First because it points backwards compared to the evolution of the particles in the cartoons. Second because it implies ZDR goes down as the particles grow, but this is not the case in your vapour deposition cartoon where ZDR is maintained. So I suggest removing this.

Orientation of particles. This issue first arises in section 3 (line 14, page 5) but continues throughout the paper. The terminology you use here mixes two distinct physical characteristics: shape (where the idea of prolate, oblate makes some kind of sense) and orientation (which is completely distinct and controlled by aerodynamics). You use the term "prolate" to mean a particle which is broadly in the shape of a prolate spheroid, which has its long axis vertical. Conical graupel can be an example of this. But there are other particles (like needles) which are prolate in shape but have a horizontal preferred orientation. So I strongly recommend you disentangle shape and orientation here and in the rest of the paper.

Page 5, line 18. Say diffusional growth of ice happens when vapour diffuses towards the crystals instead of forming supercooled droplets. Why instead? It is perfectly possible to grow both if the supersaturation is large enough.

line 20 - during diffusional growth particles keep their characteristic shape. I would like some clarification on this. I can think of two obvious counter examples: (1) dendrites for example often grow wider and wider without thickening significantly, and can end up with aspect ratios of 100:1. (2) when an in particle falls into a different temperature from its earlier growth - e.g. rosettes grow plate-like appendages, columns get plate caps, etc. So perhaps you can be more direct in your meaning here, and what you are assuming which is actually critical for the analysis that follows vs general information

line 23-30 These are relevant bits of literature, but personally I think the evidence is not so clear cut. Suggest softening the wording in this paragraph to explain these studies have suggested or indicated what nature might be doing. Then when you pick these ideas up later and find evidence to support rapid aggregation of needles for example,

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



that also makes the contribution of your new results more apparent.

Section 4.

Page 6 line 2. The reference to the text books here is not necessary, you have already introduced these processes. There are a few other places in the text where I felt the referencing was repetitive (e.g. Westbrook et al 2007 on page 10, line 20)

Interactive comment

line 17-19 - recommend remove discussion about sZDR in rain. It is irrelevant to what follows and confused me when I was trying to understand this paragraph.

line 23-29. I found this hard to understand. Is diffusion dominant in this scenario? or aggregation? or both? could be clearer. the first line of the paragraph says "a signature of diffusional growth", but then there is lots of talk of aggregation.

Figure 3 could potentially be annotated to help make it clearer - e.g. with text and arrows saying for example things like "rimed particles" "crystals growing from vapour" etc

I think generally in section 4 it would help to be clear that this is your conceptual picture of how these processes play out in a typical cloud, rather than asserting these signatures are universal - which would require detailed evidence

Section 5.

Fall streak reconstruction. Any strengths and limitations to the technique worth summarising here? (for reader who does not go back to your previous paper)

Page 8 line 13. "3 time bins" - can you specify in seconds please

Section 6.

Page 8, line 18. "S-band radar profiler TARA" - repetitive. Already introduced.

line 31-32. homogeneous wind conditions. can you be quantitative?

Panels in figure 6, 10, 12 could be neater. "differential reflectivity [dB]" label on fig 6



Interactive
comment

panel (e) is impinging on the panel next to it (f). Quite a mix of font sizes etc.

Page 10, line 10. "a supercooled liquid water layer... is identified". How? From RH close to 100%? or some more sophisticated balloon-borne sensor. If the former do need to acknowledge this is not direct (but I do believe it)

Talk a lot about needles in case 1. How do you define a needle? Do you count a hexagonal column as a needle?

In case 2 and case 3 there are parts of the sZDR spectra which are negative. However you also acknowledge that there is a lot of fluctuation in these sZDR values. This raises the question - what is the expected random fluctuation on a sZDR data point? Can you estimate that? I think that would help the discussion a lot if you could.

Page 12, line 27. "newly generated particles... lead to an increase of Z in the rain pattern below the melting layer". This wasn't obvious to me. Can you be more explicit how you determined this to be the case?

Page 13, line 13. 114730UTC. Similar format for time elsewhere. I've not met this way of expressing time before. I guess it is just HHMMSS but you mix this around in the text with the more usual HHMM. Can I suggest you clarify this somewhere.

Page 13, line 4 (and elsewhere). When you do the fall streak reconstruction, you talk about using a "cloud base height" of 2.25km (for example). These aren't really cloud base heights though (CBH is a physical characteristic of the cloud) - instead they are simply boundary conditions for the reconstruction. So suggest rephrase. In case 3 the choice of 2.25km seems almost immediately invalidated by your arguments for not analysing any data below 3km. Can you justify this?

line 16. Aggregation. So aggregation is occurring 5-4km. But then why does it stop below that?

Interactive comment on *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2017-1032>,

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



2018.

ACPD

Interactive
comment