

Interactive comment on “Global analysis of continental boundary layer new particle formation based on long-term measurements” by Tuomo Nieminen et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 1 May 2018

This manuscript compiles and re-analyzes new particle formation and growth statistics from 36 surface sites. It is great to have all of these data in one places and analyzed homogeneously. I am very happy with the manuscript, and I only have a few minor comments. I feel it is ready to be published in ACP once these comments are addressed.

L6-7: Why, specifically, are only March-May and Dec-Feb being compared here? Is March-May the max and Dec-Feb the min? It would be good to say this, because now the choice seems arbitrary.

Throughout: “Westervelt” is misspelled as “Westerveld” is several places.

C1

L88-97 and L509-516: Why is the free troposphere not mentioned here? Nucleation in the FT is hugely important for CCN (Merikanto et al., 2009).

L408-410: This sentence is strange. It’s discussing the factors that determine J_{nuc} when J_{nuc} is inferred from $dN(10-25nm)/dt$, GR, and CoagSink; however, the sentence is written as if J_{nuc} *depends* on these values. J_{nuc} depends on vapor concentrations and temperature. It’s only inferred using $dN(10-25nm)/dt$, GR, and CoagSink.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2018-304>, 2018.

C2