

Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., referee comment RC1
<https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-2021-136-RC1>, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on amt-2021-136

Ghislain Motos (Referee)

Referee comment on "Assessment of real-time bioaerosol particle counters using reference chamber experiments" by Gian Lieberherr et al., Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss.,
<https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-2021-136-RC1>, 2021

This paper presents interesting data in a very concise and understandable way. The limitations of the study are explicated, and further improvements are detailed.

I noted very few minor comments:

-Lines 88, 98, 114: Does AMT require to specify the address of the manufacturer (at least region and country)?

-Line 173: It is interesting to note that the WIBS-NEO was unable to detect 10 um PSL, where it should operate up to 30 um. It would be worth digging a bit more here to at least give hypotheses on what could have happened. What does literature say about detection efficiency of this model of the WIBS for particles larger than 5 um? If some studies showed opposite results than yours, where did something go wrong?

-Line 175: You mention a lower detection limit at around 2 um for the Rapid-E, but you only tested 2 um (no detection) and 5 um (98% detection efficiency). How do you know the lower detection limit is not 3 um, or 4 um?

-Figure 2: No need to repeat "%" symbol in the y-axis labels, this is already in the legend.

-Line 256: You mention the WIBS did not give fluorescence results because it "provides a maximum of two data points per excitation wavelength". This is difficult to understand for non-WIBS experts. Could you detail what prevent you from showing WIBS results here? This is a relatively big limitation of the paper, so this would deserve more explanation.

Thank you!