

Interactive comment on “Dry particle generation with a 3D printed fluidized bed generator” by Michael Roesch et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 9 March 2017

Authors describe a new design to generate small quantities of powder material. There are several techniques available in the market but the new design is slightly different and unique particularly as authors claim that it is small and low-cost. The characterization performance results are convincing, however, and this is optional if authors could also present some research application results. Major comment is it is not clear ‘what are the limitations of the existing aerosol generators.’ It is mentioned that (page 2 line 13) the existing flask design requires multiple instruments and supervision of the setup. This is incorrect. Further, they say FBAG and SSPD involves mechanical moving parts and larger weight. It is not clear how having multiple moving parts and weight (< 50 lbs) impedes the research ability of the instrument to generate the dry powder. Some detailed discussion on this topic would be very useful.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

