

Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., referee comment RC1
<https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-2022-109-RC1>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on amt-2022-109

Anonymous Referee #3

Referee comment on "Design and fabrication of an electrostatic precipitator for infrared spectroscopy" by Nikunj Dudani and Satoshi Takahama, Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-2022-109-RC1>, 2022

I have no general nor technical comments. The methodology is promising and I hope the authors will venture in utilizing the methods to see how results will vary if we have to consider other aerosols for the study, as mentioned on their future study priority #2.

Minor comments/changes as follows:

Line 67: recommend adding a statement why ABS was used for 3D printing.

Line 94: add the word "the" after the word making

Line 138: Is "satisficed" the correct term or are you referring to "satisfied"?

Line 201: recommend adding a statement/s on why ammonium sulfate was selected as an ideal compound for the study.

Line 384: Are we missing some information after refractive indices?