

Interactive  
Comment

## ***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  $\mu\text{m}$  and results below 0.9  $\mu\text{m}$  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

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



-Gourihar Kulkarni

---

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

**AMTD**

8, C3940–C3941, 2015

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C3941

