

Interactive comment on “Intercomparison of 15 aerodynamic particle size spectrometers (APS 3321): uncertainties in particle sizing and number size distribution” by S. Pfeifer et al.

G. Kulkarni

Gourihar.Kulkarni@pnnl.gov

Received and published: 18 November 2015

Dear Authors, As myself a regular user of APS instrument, this is a very nice study. I have two general questions. Do you see any trend between the time lag (last calibration and intercomparison workshop) and instrument performance? Does the new instrument (ID = TROPOS F) performed any better than others? It is concluded that the instrument sizing accuracy is best within the range from 0.9 to 3.0 μm and results below 0.9 μm should be rejected. These results are based on instrument-to-instrument comparison, and I think it would be misleading to apply these general conclusions to newer instrument as it performed fairly well (figure 4). Any thoughts? Thanks.

C3940

-Gourihar Kulkarni

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 8, 11513, 2015.

C3941