



1 **Profiling aerosol optical, microphysical and hygroscopic**
2 **properties in ambient conditions by combining in-situ and**
3 **remote sensing**

4

5 **Alexandra Tsekeri¹, Vassilis Amiridis¹, Franco Marengo², Athanasios Nenes^{3,4,5},**
6 **Eleni Marinou^{1,6}, Stavros Solomos¹, Phil Rosenberg⁷, Jamie Trembath⁸, Graeme**
7 **J. Nott⁸, James Allan^{9,10}, Michael Le Breton⁹, Asan Bacak⁹, Hugh Coe⁹, Carl**
8 **Percival⁹, and Nikolaos Mihalopoulos⁴**

9 [1]{IAASARS, National Observatory of Athens, Athens, Greece}

10 [2]{Satellite Applications, Met Office, Exeter, UK}

11 [3]{School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences and Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering,
12 Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia, USA}

13 [4]{IERSD, National Observatory of Athens, Athens, Greece}

14 [5]{ICE-HT, Foundation for Research and Technology Hellas, Patras, Greece}

15 [6]{Laboratory of Atmospheric Physics, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki,
16 Greece}

17 [7] {School of Earth and Environment, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK}

18 [8] {Facility for Airborne Atmospheric Measurements (FAAM), Cranfield, UK}

19 [9]{School of Earth, Atmospheric and Environmental Sciences, University of Manchester,
20 Manchester, UK}

21 [10]{National Centre for Atmospheric Science, The University of Manchester, Manchester,
22 UK}

23

24

25 Correspondence to: A. Tsekeri (atsekeri@noa.gr)

26

27



1 **Abstract**

2 We present the **In-situ/Remote sensing aerosol Retrieval Algorithm (IRRA)** that combines
3 airborne in-situ and lidar remote sensing data to retrieve vertical profiles of ambient aerosol
4 optical, microphysical and hygroscopic properties, employing the ISORROPIA II model for
5 acquiring the hygroscopic growth. Here we apply the algorithm on data collected from the
6 Facility for Airborne Atmospheric Measurements (FAAM) BAe-146 research aircraft during
7 the ACEMED campaign in Eastern Mediterranean: vertical profiles of aerosol microphysical
8 properties have been derived successfully for an aged smoke plume near the city of Thessaloniki
9 with typical lidar ratios of ~60-80 sr at 532 nm, along with single scattering albedos of ~0.9-
10 0.95 at 550 nm. The aerosol layer reaches the 3.5 km with aerosol optical depth at ~0.4 at 532
11 nm. Our analysis shows that the smoke particles are highly hydrated above land, with 55% and
12 80% water volume content for ambient relative humidity of 80% and 90%, respectively. The
13 proposed methodology is highly advantageous for aerosol characterization in humid conditions
14 and can find valuable applications in aerosol-cloud interaction schemes. Moreover, it can be
15 used for the validation of active space-borne sensors, as is demonstrated here for the case of
16 CALIPSO.

17

18 **1 Introduction**

19 Liquid water is by far the most abundant species found in atmospheric particulates, being on
20 average 2–3 times the total aerosol dry mass on a global average (e.g. Pilinis et al., 1995; Liao
21 and Seinfeld, 2005). Aerosol water uptake changes the particle size and refractive index with
22 profound implications for radiative transfer and cloud formation (e.g., Quinn et al., 2005). For
23 example, at a Relative Humidity (RH) of 90%, the scattering cross section can increase by a
24 factor of 5 compared to that of the dry particle (Malm and Day, 2001). On that account, the
25 particle liquid water uptake may greatly affect the aerosol direct radiative cooling (Pilinis et al.,
26 1995; Hegg et al., 1997), currently estimated to range between -0.95 and $+0.05 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ (IPCC,
27 2013).

28 Acquiring the hydrated particle properties is far from trivial, especially when it comes to
29 vertical profiling. In-situ techniques can provide vertically-resolved information when applied
30 by an airborne platform, a solution that is both costly and sparse over space and time. Moreover,
31 the commonly used techniques are subject to limitations, since their application can cause
32 alterations in the particle ambient state even when minimally-invasive instruments are used



1 (e.g. open-path optical sensors; Snider and Petters, 2008). To address these biases, ambient
2 particle samples are first dried and then rehydrated in the controlled environment of an in-situ
3 sensor; aerosol properties and changes thereof are then used to understand the behaviour of
4 ambient aerosol for any meteorological state (Engelhart et al., 2011; Pikridas et al., 2012).

5 In contrast to in-situ techniques, remote sensing is not invasive and may sample large
6 atmospheric volumes allowing an unprecedented global aerosol monitoring. Passive remote
7 sensing techniques provide columnar particle properties, while active sensors can provide
8 vertically-resolved properties. A well-known active remote sensing instrument is the lidar
9 (Light Detection and Ranging), a sensor that is capable of providing vertical profiles of the
10 backscatter and extinction coefficients at one or more wavelengths. Unfortunately, due to the
11 limited information in lidar measurement content, the ill-posed nature of the aerosol property
12 retrieval remains the inherent disadvantage of the lidar technique, although considerable
13 hardware and algorithmic developments have been achieved over the last decade. These include
14 for example the employment of sophisticated multi-wavelength elastic/Raman lidar
15 measurements in lidar stand-alone retrievals (e.g. Müller et al., 2015), or the combination of
16 elastic lidar with sunphotometer measurements (e.g. Chaikovsky et al, 2015; Lopatin et al.,
17 2013). Although these advancements have provided the means for accurate aerosol profiling,
18 the lidar stand-alone retrievals work well only for fine particles while the lidar/sunphotometer
19 retrievals do not fully resolve the particle microphysical property profiles; they rather provide
20 only the particle concentration profile and consider a constant size distribution and refractive
21 index for the whole atmospheric column.

22 An alternative hybrid approach for obtaining well-constrained ambient aerosol profiling is
23 through the utilization of the synergy of active remote sensing observations with concurrent in-
24 situ measurements. To date, most efforts towards this direction have focused on low-humidity
25 profiles, so that the dry in-situ measurements refer to ambient particles (e.g. Weinzierl et. al,
26 2009). High-humidity conditions have also been studied, but only for fine mode particle
27 properties (e.g. Ziemba et al. 2013), as the coarse particle hygroscopic growth is not easily
28 constrained with in-situ airborne techniques, mainly due to inlet losses. The IRRA approach
29 presented here addresses these limitations through a combination of in-situ, active remote
30 sensing and hygroscopic modelling, making possible the vertical profiling of fine and coarse
31 particles even for humid conditions. For this purpose, the retrieval combines typical airborne
32 in-situ instrumentation, measuring the dry particle size distribution and chemical composition,



1 together with a simple backscatter lidar. The ambient remote sensing measurements are linked
2 to the dry in-situ data through modelling of the particle hygroscopic growth with ISORROPIA
3 II model (Fountoukis and Nenes, 2007; Guo et al., 2015).

4 In the current study IRRA is applied on data collected in the framework of the EUFAR-
5 ACEMED campaign (“evaluation of CALIPSO’s Aerosol Classification scheme over Eastern
6 **MED**iterranean”), during which the FAAM BAe-146 research aircraft performed two under-
7 flights of the Cloud–Aerosol Lidar and Infrared Pathfinder Satellite Observation (CALIPSO)
8 satellite. The Mediterranean is considered ideal for the application and evaluation of IRRA
9 retrieval scheme, as almost all globally-relevant aerosol types are encountered in the region, i.e.
10 dust storms from desert or semi-arid areas in Africa, fresh and aged smoke from biomass
11 burning, maritime aerosols, biogenic emissions, and anthropogenic aerosols (e.g. Lelieveld et
12 al., 2002).

13 In the following sections, the IRRA methodology is presented in section 2, along with a detailed
14 description of the airborne in-situ and lidar measurements acquired during the ACEMED
15 campaign, as well as the ISORROPIA II and other models used. Section 3 presents the IRRA
16 results for the ACEMED flight over Thessaloniki, Greece, along with a comparison with the
17 CALIPSO overpass products. In section 4 we discuss our findings, and finally in section 5 we
18 provide our conclusions and the future prospects of this study.

19

20 **2 Data and methods**

21 IRRA methodology is based on the remote sensing and in-situ measurement synergy, using
22 observations performed during the ACEMED campaign. Specifically, airborne active remote
23 sensing observations were performed with the Leosphere ALS450 lidar system acquiring
24 backscatter and depolarization profiles at 355 nm (Marenco et al., 2011; Chazette et al., 2012).
25 The in-situ instruments (Table 1) included the TSI Integrating Nephelometer 3563 for the
26 measurement of the particle scattering coefficient, the Radiance Research Particle Soot
27 Absorption Photometer (PSAP) for retrieving the absorption coefficient, the Passive Cavity
28 Aerosol Spectrometer Probe 100-X (PCASP) and the 1.129 Grimm Technik Sky-Optical
29 Particle Counter (GRIMM) for retrieving particle number size distribution, as well as the
30 Aerodyne time-of-flight Aerosol Mass Spectrometer (AMS) for aerosol chemical composition.
31 Moreover, measurements of trace gases were acquired with the Chemical Ionization Mass
32 Spectrometer (CIMS) and the fast fluorescence CO analyser, water vapour measurements were



1 provided by the Water Vapour Sensing System 2nd Generation (WVSS-II), along with
2 temperature and pressure of the ambient air from the Rosemount deiced temperature sensor and
3 the Reduced Vertical Separation Minimum system, respectively. More details about the
4 instruments and measurements are given in section 2.2 with flight details given in section 3.1.

5 **2.1 IRRA methodology for retrieving the ambient particle microphysics**

6 IRRA characterizes ambient aerosol profiles by utilizing both the in-situ and remote sensing
7 data through an automated iterative scheme shown schematically in Fig. 1. In brief, the
8 measured dry particle parameters are “rehydrated” using the ISORROPIA II model to obtain
9 an estimate of the ambient particle size distribution and refractive index. Then, the dry particle
10 scattering and absorption coefficients, together with the ambient particle extinction and
11 backscatter coefficients, are calculated with the Mie theory (Mie, 1908; Bohren and Huffman,
12 1983). The retrieval is considered successful only if the calculations reproduce the airborne in-
13 situ and lidar measurements; if this is not the case the input parameters are adjusted and the
14 process is repeated.

15 More specifically, for each straight level run (SLR) at a fixed altitude, the in-situ dry particle
16 size distribution and refractive index acquired from the PCASP, GRIMM and AMS
17 measurements are used in the retrieval as a first guess for the dry particle characteristics. Then,
18 the dry particle scattering and absorption coefficients are calculated using the Mie code of
19 Bohren and Huffman (1983), assuming spherical particles in the atmosphere, as indicated from
20 the low depolarization measurements acquired with the airborne lidar. The Mie calculations are
21 performed such as to reproduce the scattering and absorption coefficients measured by the in-
22 situ optical instrumentation (i.e TSI nephelometer and PSAP), that are affected from inlet and
23 pipeline losses, as described in section 2.3.3. In order to optimize for these limitations, we use
24 at this stage a bimodal lognormal fit applied on the in-situ measurements (Eq. 1, red line in Fig.
25 2) truncated up to 1.5 μm in radius (black dash line in Fig. 2).

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dN}{d\ln(r)_d} = & \frac{N_{fd}}{\sqrt{2\pi} * \ln(\sigma_{fd})} \exp\left(-\frac{(\ln(r) - \ln(r_{mfd}))^2}{2\ln(\sigma_{fd})^2}\right) \\ & + \frac{N_{cd}}{\sqrt{2\pi} * \ln(\sigma_{cd})} \exp\left(-\frac{(\ln(r) - \ln(r_{mcd}))^2}{2\ln(\sigma_{cd})^2}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$



1 $\frac{dN}{d\ln(r)_d}$ is the dry particle number size distribution, N_{fd}, N_{cd} are the total number concentrations,
2 r_{mfd}, r_{mcd} are the geometric mean radii and σ_{fd}, σ_{cd} are the geometric standard deviation of
3 fine and coarse modes, respectively.

4 Moreover, the dry particle refractive index is assumed to be spectrally constant and common
5 for fine and coarse particles. That is because the information content in IRRA is not sufficient
6 to resolve the refractive index spectral and size dependence. As a first guess we use the
7 refractive index calculated from the in-situ chemical composition measurements, but this value
8 is only an approximation and is expected to change, since the in-situ data do not provide a full
9 chemical characterization of the particles.

10 The next step, after defining the dry particle size distribution and refractive index, is to estimate
11 the ambient particle properties by modelling their hygroscopic growth with ISORROPIA II
12 model (a detailed model description is given in section 2.3.1). The ambient particle number size
13 distribution is parameterized similarly to the dry particle number size distribution, considering
14 that the geometric mean radius equals to the dry geometric mean radius multiplied by the
15 hygroscopic growth factor f_g of the corresponding mode (Eq. 2, 3):

$$r_{mfa} = f_{gf} * r_{mfd} \quad (2)$$

$$r_{mca} = f_{gc} * r_{mcd} \quad (3)$$

16 The subscripts f and c denote the fine and coarse particle modes, respectively. The
17 corresponding f_g values are calculated from the water uptake predicted with ISORROPIA II.
18 r_{mfa} and r_{mca} are the geometric mean radii of the modes. An example of an ambient size
19 distribution retrieval is shown in Fig. 2 (blue line) for RH=81%.

20 The real and imaginary parts of the ambient particle refractive index are calculated as following:

$$n_{af,c}(\lambda) = (1 - f_{wf,c}) * n_{df,c} + f_{wf,c} * n_w(\lambda) \quad (4)$$

$$k_{af,c}(\lambda) = (1 - f_{wf,c}) * k_{df,c} + f_{wf,c} * k_w(\lambda) \quad (5)$$

21 where $n_{af,c}(\lambda)$ and $k_{af,c}(\lambda)$ are the real and imaginary parts of the ambient refractive index,
22 $n_{df,c}$ and $k_{df,c}$ are the same for dry particles, $n_w(\lambda) + ik_w(\lambda)$ is the water refractive index, λ
23 is the wavelength and $f_{wf,c}$ are the water volume fractions in total volume of the ambient
24 particles, provided by ISORROPIA II model.



1 Finally, IRRA aims to achieve a closure of the Mie-calculated optical properties of the ambient
2 and dry particles, with the lidar and in-situ measurements. These properties are the backscatter
3 and extinction coefficients at 355 nm calculated from the ambient properties, and the scattering
4 coefficients at 450, 550, 700 nm and absorption coefficient at 567 nm calculated from the dry
5 properties. The closure is achieved through the minimization of a cost function, using the Trust-
6 Region-Reflective optimization algorithm (based on the interior-reflective Newton method
7 described in Coleman and Li, 1994; 1996) with the non-linear least-squares solver “lsqcurvefit”
8 of MATLAB. The cost function is the sum of the squares of the differences between the
9 measured and calculated optical properties, weighted by their “importance” for the retrieval, as
10 described in more detail in Appendix A. Briefly, starting from a first guess for the parameters
11 of the dry particle size distribution and refractive index, the optimization algorithm iteratively
12 searches the parameter space for a set that minimizes the cost function. The search stops after
13 different stopping criteria have been reached. For example, the cost function reduction is
14 smaller than the uncertainty of the measurements or the search step size is smaller than the
15 uncertainty of the parameter space (Dubovik, 2004). In our case these criteria cannot be strictly
16 quantified, due to inadequate information on measurement and parameter uncertainties, thus
17 the optimization procedure is set to stop after few (~10) iterations, after which there is no
18 considerable change in the cost function reduction or in the step size. The retrieval errors can
19 be quantified using the measurement uncertainties and the Jacobian matrix of the final
20 optimization step (Rodgers, 2000; Dubovik, 2004). Although they are not provided in the
21 current version of IRRA code, we plan to include them in the future versions.

22 **2.2 Data**

23 **2.2.1 Airborne lidar**

24 The airborne active remote sensing observations used in IRRA for the ACEMED campaign,
25 were performed with the nadir-pointing Leosphere ALS450 lidar system, capable of acquiring
26 particle backscatter and depolarization profiles at 355 nm (Marenco et al., 2011; Chazette et al.,
27 2012). The measurements were acquired at night-flight, and the absence of daylight allowed
28 the airborne lidar to measure with good signal to noise ratio (SNR). Lidar signals were measured
29 with an integration time of 2 s and a vertical resolution of 1.5 m, and are smoothed vertically
30 to a 45 m vertical resolution in order to improve SNR further. The vertical profiles of lidar



1 signals are then cloud-screened by eliminating those in the presence of clouds using the
2 thresholds in Allen et al. (2014).

3 The particle backscatter and extinction coefficients from the ALS450 system observations are
4 calculated following the solution by Klett (1985), assuming a variable LR at 355 nm with
5 height, and an aerosol extinction coefficient at 355 nm at a reference height in the far range.
6 Both LR and reference extinction are calculated from the retrieved ambient size distribution
7 and refractive index at each height.

8 **2.2.2 Airborne in-situ**

9 **2.2.2.1. Particle drying from in-situ instruments**

10 The inlets to the aircraft in-situ instruments dry the sampled air due to adiabatic compression
11 in the inlet during sampling, in addition to the cabin temperature and radiant heat from the lights
12 in the instruments. There is a chance this drying is only partial, with some residual water
13 remaining in the sample (e.g. Strapp et al., 1992; Snider and Petters, 2008). The partial drying
14 is estimated from the instrument RH (and the particle chemical composition) and is taken into
15 account in modelling the particle hygroscopic growth with ISORROPIA II. Unfortunately,
16 instrument RH measurements are provided only for the nephelometer, with values ranging at
17 ~25-40%. We assume that these values are the same for PSAP. For PCASP and GRIMM optical
18 particle counter (OPC) measurements we consider a low RH of 30%, based on the work of
19 Strapp et al. (1992). Strapp et al (1992) indicate that particles with radius less than 5 μm should
20 be dehydrated due to the residence time of 0.1-0.3 s in the low humidity environment of the
21 instrument. Even if this is not the case, the RH of 30% has a minor effect on particle hydration
22 for the samples analysed here, causing ~1% growth in particle size. For the sake of simplicity
23 herein we call the partially dried particles as “dry particles”.

24 **2.2.2.2. Particle size distribution measurements**

25 The number size distributions were measured with PCASP and GRIMM OPCs. Both
26 instruments measure the particle number size distribution by impinging light on the air sample
27 and inferring the number and size of the particles from the light each particle scatters over a
28 specified angular range (Rosenberg et al., 2012; Heim et al., 2008). PCASP operates a He-Ne
29 laser at 0.6328 μm , measuring the particle scattering at 35-120° (primary angles) and 60° -145°
30 (secondary angles), providing a (nominal) size range of 0.05–1.5 μm radius. GRIMM uses the



1 light of a laser diode at $0.683 \mu\text{m}$, measuring at 30° - 150° (primary angles) and 81 - 99°
2 (secondary angles), providing a (nominal) size range of 0.125 - $16 \mu\text{m}$ radius. The number of
3 particles equals to the scattered light pulses, since each particle in the sample generates a light
4 pulse. The particle size is calculated comparing the height and width of the pulse with that from
5 calibration standards of known size distribution and refractive index, assuming that the sample
6 has the same refractive index as the calibration standard. This is the “nominal size” and the true
7 size can be then derived correcting for the particle refractive index, as described in Rosenberg
8 et al. (2012). For the PCASP we use the calibration standards from the Fennec 2011 campaign
9 (Rosenberg et al., 2012), and for the GRIMM we generate calibration standards assuming a bin
10 width uncertainty of 5%, based upon the manufacturers’ specification. A detailed description
11 of handling and correcting the OPC size distribution data is provided in Appendix B.

12 The PCASP was wing-mounted on the BAe-146 aircraft, whereas the GRIMM was internally
13 mounted and connected with a Rosemount inlet, thus sampled the air differently, through
14 different inlets and pipelines. The effects of inlet efficiencies (enhancement/losses) and losses
15 along the pipelines varied with altitude and ambient size distribution, affecting mainly the
16 coarse mode particles (Ryder et al., 2013; Trembath et al., 2012). Inlet efficiency corrections
17 are applied to PCASP using the methods of Belyaev and Levin (1974). The GRIMM OPC was
18 not corrected for particle losses, and we expect the main losses to be for the largest particles.

19 As a validation of correctly handling the PCASP and GRIMM data, we compare the derived
20 PCASP and GRIMM number size distributions (after converting them to volume size
21 distributions) with the ambient volume size distributions provided by AERONET
22 measurements on the days before and after the BAe-146 aircraft night flight (Fig. 3). Note that
23 the AERONET does not provide vertically-resolved products, but rather the effective-column
24 volume size distribution with units $\mu\text{m}^3 \mu\text{m}^{-2}$. For a direct comparison with PCASP and
25 GRIMM data (in $\mu\text{m}^3 \text{cm}^{-3}$) we divide the AERONET size distribution with the aerosol layer
26 height (derived by the lidar measurements to be equal to ~ 3.5 km). The OPC data uncertainties
27 in the plot of Fig. 3 are calculated considering the refractive index uncertainty (Rosenberg et
28 al. 2012) and counting statistics (see Appendix B). For fine mode there is a very good agreement
29 among the two OPCs, but this is not the case for particles with radius $>1.5 \mu\text{m}$. The AERONET
30 volume size distributions are quite similar with the in-situ measurements for the fine mode,
31 with the AERONET particle volume (observations before the flight) to be within $\sim \pm 60\%$ of the
32 PCASP and GRIMM particle volume for particles with radius $<1.5 \mu\text{m}$. Similar results are



1 shown in Haywood et al. (2003) for 0.1-1.0 μm radius range, for their fresh smoke aerosol
2 plumes. For particles with radius $>1.5 \mu\text{m}$ the agreement is worse, especially for GRIMM data,
3 owing to the Rosemount inlet enhancement of the super-micron particles (as described in
4 Trembath et al. (2012)). This is to be expected, since for sizes $>1.5 \mu\text{m}$ the agreement between
5 PCASP and GRIMM deteriorates as well. In any case, the comparison with AERONET data
6 should be done with caution, since it refers to ambient particles, and the measurements are
7 offset by ~ 9 hours. Moreover, differences can be also attributed to the AERONET size
8 distribution cut-off at $15 \mu\text{m}$. In general though, the good agreement for particles with radius
9 $<1.5 \mu\text{m}$ for all three datasets indicates that the airborne in-situ measurements of PCASP and
10 GRIMM instruments provide trustworthy data for this size range, fitted to be used in our
11 analysis.

12 **2.2.2.3. Chemical composition and refractive index**

13 The aerosol composition and mass distribution of volatile and semi-volatile components of
14 aerosols as a function of particle size (with radius from 0.025 to 0.4 μm) were measured with
15 the AMS (Allan et al., 2003; Morgan et al., 2010; Athanasopoulou et al., 2015). AMS measures
16 the mass loadings of the refractive aerosol fractions: sulphates, nitrates, ammonium, chloride
17 and organics. Figure 4 shows the AMS measurements for the ACEMED case analysed here,
18 indicating mixtures of inorganics/organics in the range of $\sim 50/50$ (the chloride mass
19 concentration is very low and is not shown in the plot). Although the data refer mainly to fine
20 mode particles, in our analysis we assume that they are representative of the coarse mode as
21 well, since there are no measurements for the coarse particle chemical composition (the “coarse
22 mode” denotes here to particles with radius $>0.8 \mu\text{m}$ -see Fig. 3).

23 The chemical composition provided by the AMS can be used to estimate the particle refractive
24 index, assuming that the particles are internally mixed and applying a volume mixing law to
25 account for the contributions of the corresponding chemical groups (Highwood et al., 2012).
26 For the calculations we need to consider a characteristic refractive index for each chemical
27 group as well as a density to convert the AMS-measured dry mass to volume. Here we use the
28 values provided in Highwood et al. (2012) (see Table 2): We assume the sulphate, nitrate and
29 ammonium particles to be in the form of ammonium sulfate ($(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{SO}_4$) and ammonium
30 nitrate (NH_4NO_3), with density and refractive index provided by Toon (1976) and Weast
31 (1985), respectively. For organics, we consider the properties of the organic carbon of the
32 Swanee River Fulvic Acid, as reported in Dinar et al. (2006) and Dinar et al. (2008). This



1 approach is quite approximate, especially considering the refractive index variability of the
2 “organics” group. In addition, the aerosol sampled is influenced by biomass burning (mainly
3 due to high HCN and CO concentrations measured –see section 3.1) and may be strongly
4 absorbing – this means that the uncertainty on the imaginary part is quite large. For these
5 reasons the AMS-derived refractive index is used only as a first guess in our analysis and its
6 real and imaginary parts are calculated from the iterative scheme described in the methodology
7 section 2.1. A similar approach was followed from McConnell et al. (2010), although focusing
8 mainly on the imaginary part retrieval.

9 **2.2.2.4. Scattering and absorption**

10 The dry particle scattering coefficients at 450, 550 and 700 nm were measured on-board with
11 the TSI Integrating Nephelometer 3563 and the absorption coefficient at 567 nm was measured
12 with the PSAP (Orgen 2010). The scattering coefficient measurements are corrected for angular
13 truncation, temperature and pressure (Anderson and Orgen 1998; Turnbull 2010). The
14 absorption measurements are corrected for pressure, flow rate and spot size effects (Bond et al.,
15 1999; Orgen 2010; Turnbull 2010). Both instruments were connected to modified Rosemount
16 inlets (Trembath et al., 2012), suffering from inlet enhancement/losses as well as losses along
17 the pipelines, and consequently did not measure the scattering properties of the whole size range
18 of particles. For this reason, we consider a sampling cut-off for particles with radius $>1.5 \mu\text{m}$
19 for the TSI nephelometer and PSAP measurements.

20 **2.2.2.5. Ambient relative humidity**

21 The ambient RH is estimated from the water vapour measurements from WVSS-II instrument
22 (Fleming and May, 2004). The WVSS-II uses a near-infrared tunable diode laser absorption
23 spectrometer. Two WVSS-II instruments were mounted on the BAe-146 aircraft, sampling the
24 air through the standard flush inlet and a modified Rosemount inlet, respectively. The water
25 vapor measurements provided by the two instruments can be different (Vance et al., 2015), but
26 for the case presented here the differences are quite small, of the order of less than 2% in
27 ambient RH, thus what we used in our analysis is their average. The ambient RH calculation
28 from the WVSS-II water vapour measurements is provided in Appendix C.



1 **2.2.3 CALIPSO product**

2 CALIOP is an elastic backscatter lidar on CALIPSO operating at 532 and 1064 nm, equipped
3 with a depolarization channel at 532 nm, delivering global vertical profiles of aerosols and
4 clouds. The CALIPSO Level-2 (L2) aerosol layer products used in the current study are
5 generated by automated algorithms and provide a description of the aerosol layers in respect to
6 horizontal and vertical extend, along with particle backscatter and extinction coefficient data.
7 A detailed description of the L2 algorithms is provided in Vaughan et al. (2004) and Winker et
8 al. (2009).

9 The CALIPSO Vertical Feature Mask (VFM) L2 product (Vaughan et al. 2004), classifies
10 aerosols and clouds based on their optical properties and external information of geographical
11 location, surface type and season (Omar et al, 2005; 2009). The classification scheme
12 differentiates six subtypes of aerosol particles: polluted continental, smoke, dust, polluted dust,
13 clean marine and clean continental. An example of the attenuated backscatter coefficient and
14 the associated VFM classification, for the case analysed here, is shown in Fig. 7. Burton et al.
15 (2013) have validated the CALIPSO classification scheme using collocated airborne High
16 Spectral Resolution Lidar (HSRL) measurements during 109 CALIPSO under-flights and
17 reported a relatively trustworthy classification for mineral dust (80%) which falls to 62% for
18 marine particles, 54% for polluted continental, 35% for polluted dust and only 13% for smoke.
19 Note that the aforementioned study was conducted over North America, a region with much less
20 complexity than the Mediterranean region of the current study.

21 **2.3 Models**

22 **2.3.1 Hygroscopic growth model**

23 ISORROPIA II (Nenes et al., 1997; Fountoukis and Nenes, 2007) models the phase state and
24 composition of aerosol composed of Na, NH₄, NO₃, Cl, SO₄, Mg, K, Ca and H₂O in equilibrium
25 with a gas phase composed of NH₃, HNO₃ and HCl. The model performance has been evaluated
26 against comprehensive ambient datasets over a wide range of acidities, RH, and temperatures
27 (Fountoukis and Nenes, 2006; 2007; Hennigan et al., 2015; Guo et al., 2015; Weber et al., 2016;
28 Guo et al., 2016). In our analysis, we also consider the contribution of hygroscopic organics to
29 the water uptake and hygroscopic growth of the aerosol using the approach of Guo et al. (2015).
30 ISORROPIA-II takes as input the aerosol precursor composition, along with the temperature,
31 pressure and RH of the sample inside the instrument, and the temperature, pressure and RH of



1 the ambient atmosphere, and it calculates the hygroscopic growth of fine and coarse modes, as
2 well as the uptake water volume fraction to the total volume for each mode. Since we assume
3 the same chemical composition for fine and coarse particles, the hygroscopic growth and the
4 water uptake is the same for both. The calculations involve some uncertainty, mainly due to the
5 variable hygroscopicity of the organic matter, the uncertainties and/or the variability in the RH
6 measurements and the size-dependence of composition (that is not considered) within each
7 mode and between modes.

8 Overall, ISORROPIA II provides an excellent estimation of the particle hygroscopic growth,
9 especially at high RHs where the hydration has the greatest effect on the particle properties
10 (e.g., Guo et al., 2015). The cumulative effect of particle composition on water uptake can be
11 expressed using the hygroscopicity parameter κ (Petters and Kreidenweis, 2007), derived from
12 f_g and RH as in Eq. 6:

$$\kappa = \frac{f_g^3 - 1}{RH/100 - RH} \quad (6)$$

13 For mixtures of inorganics/organics in the range of ~50/50, as is the case here, the
14 hygroscopicity parameter is 0.2 – 0.3 for RH>80% (Petters and Kreidenweis, 2007; Chang et
15 al., 2010; Mikhailov et al., 2013). Airborne measurements performed above the Aegean Sea
16 during the Aegean-Game campaign (Bezantakos et al., 2013), which was coupled with
17 ACEMED, showed similar values for κ . Over multiple years, measurements of particle
18 hygroscopicity at the South Aegean site of Finokalia, Crete also exhibits very similar values
19 (Bougiatioti et al., 2009; 2011; 2016; Kalkavouras et al., 2016). ISORROPIA II retrieves
20 $\kappa \approx 0.25$ for RH > 80%, and lower values for smaller RHs (see Fig. 5). Given that the
21 hygroscopic growth data reported by Bezantakos et al., (2013) corresponds to RH>80%, this
22 consistency between predictions and observations is a strong indication that the internal mixture
23 assumption applies, and that the AMS composition data is representative of the ambient aerosol.
24 Moreover, the drop in predicted hygroscopicity for RH<80% is consistent with observed
25 behaviour for aerosol particles (e.g. Guo et al., 2015).

26 2.3.2 Source-receptor simulations

27 In order to investigate the origin of the aerosol plumes in the scene analysed here, a number of
28 backward and forward Lagrangian simulations of particle dispersion are performed with
29 FLEXPART-WRF model (Brioude et al., 2013). These simulations are driven by WRF_ARW



1 (Skamarock et al., 2008) hourly fields at 4×4 km horizontal resolution. Initial and boundary
2 conditions for the WRF model are from the National Centers for Environmental Prediction
3 (NCEP) final analysis (FNL) product at 1°×1° resolution. The sea surface temperature (SST) is
4 the daily NCEP SST analysis at 0.5°×0.5° resolution. Furthermore, in order to derive
5 information of smoke dispersion for the forward runs, fire hot spots are obtained from the
6 Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) Fire Information for Resource
7 Management System (FIRMS) database.

8

9 **3 Results**

10 **3.1 ACEMED flight overview**

11 From 31 August to 9 September 2011, the FAAM (<http://www.faam.ac.uk/>) research aircraft
12 was based in Chania in the island of Crete (Greece) for the Aegean-Game (**A**egean **P**ollution:
13 **G**aseous and **A**erosol airborne **M**Easurements) campaign (Tombrou et al., 2015). The scope of
14 the concurrent ACEMED EUFAR campaign was the evaluation of the CALIPSO aerosol
15 classification scheme using high quality airborne aerosol measurements along with ground-
16 based lidar, sunphotometric and in-situ observations. Two CALIPSO under-flights were
17 performed for ACEMED, on 2 September and during the night between 8 and 9 September.
18 Here only the latter night-time flight is considered (FAAM flight B644, Fig. 6), due to higher
19 SNR lidar measurements during the night.

20 The BAe-146 aircraft approached Thessaloniki area from the Southeast, flying at an altitude of
21 ~5 km above mean sea level. Once in the operating area, it flew on a SSW to NNE transect
22 back and forth between 40N and 41.2N, sampling at different altitudes over both land and ocean
23 (coastline at 40.6N, see Fig. 6). A first SLR was done at 5.1 km altitude, in order to fly above
24 the aerosol layers so as to provide full profiles with the use of the on-board lidar. Then, the
25 aircraft flew a series of SLRs at altitudes 3.9, 3.2, 2.7, 2.1, 1.8 and 1.3 km, and in each of these,
26 data have been collected with the in situ instrumentation. The aircraft then profiled the
27 atmosphere, returning to high level (4.8 km) for an additional remote sensing survey in the
28 shape of a box pattern around the sampling area. The lidar measurements used in the current
29 analysis were acquired at 5.1 and 4.8 km and the in-situ measurements at 3.2, 2.7, 2.1, 1.8 and
30 1.3 km (at 5 and 3.9 km the in-situ data showed no presence of particles).



1 Figure 7 shows the vertical profiling of the atmosphere along the flight, as depicted in the range-
2 corrected backscatter signal at 355 nm from the airborne lidar (Fig. 7a), and the curtain of the
3 attenuated backscatter coefficient as this is provided by CALIPSO L1 product at 532 nm (Fig.
4 7b). In both figures there is strong indication of cloud formation at ~3 km in part of the flight
5 above land (shown as white features). Large RHs have also been observed in the airborne
6 WVSS-II RH measurements in Fig. 8 at that height, where the cloudy parts above land show
7 RHs of 92-98%. These cloudy parts are excluded from the CALIPSO aerosol subtype VFM
8 product (see Fig. 7c) and the corresponding lidar vertical profiles are excluded from our
9 analysis. At the cloud-free parts the RH is higher above land (80-90% at 2-3.5 km and 60%
10 below 2 km) and lower above ocean (70-80% at 2-3 km and <60% below 2 km) (Fig. 8).

11 FLEXPART source-receptor simulations show the advection of smoke from biomass burning
12 towards the region of interest in Fig. 9. The wind direction over the Balkans was mainly NW.
13 However due to the complex topography at the area and the development of low-level thermal
14 circulations along the coastlines (sea-breeze) the wind pattern at the lowest 1 km in the
15 troposphere was rapidly changing with time - affecting also the dispersion of smoke. Such wind
16 channelling and sea-breeze formation is adequately resolved in the finer WRF grids. The
17 emission sensitivity (residence time) for a 24-hour backwards simulation and for two
18 representative locations (one over land and one over ocean) is shown in Fig. 9a. The red
19 triangles denote the position of the active fires during this period as obtained by the MODIS
20 fire product (<https://earthdata.nasa.gov/earth-observation-data/near-real-time/firms>). These
21 results identify a number of six hot spots that fall within the emission sensitivity area and so are
22 most likely responsible for the smoke transport over the region of interest.

23 Taking into account the positions and times of detection of the six emission points we perform
24 a forward simulation of smoke dispersion, assuming constant emission rates of 0.15 kg/s and
25 constant smoke injection heights at 1 km. The vertical cross section of smoke total particulate
26 matter (TPM) is shown in Fig. 9b (the location of the cross section is indicated by the dashed
27 black line in Fig. 9a). In order to compensate for the possible time lags in modelled smoke
28 transport we compute the average TPM concentration for the period 00:00-02:00 UTC from the
29 corresponding 30-minute model outputs (i.e., 00:00, 00:30, 01:00, 01:30 and 02:00 UTC).
30 Figure 9b shows elevated smoke plumes over the northern land part at about 3 km and near the
31 surface (the latter though being below the FAAM BAe-146 flight level). The results indicate



1 also the presence of a lower (1-2.5 km) smoke plume over the ocean. The elevated smoke
2 plumes above the southern land part in Fig. 9b are out of the FAAM BAe-146 flight range.

3 The smoke presence above Thessaloniki is also supported by the biomass burning proxies HCN
4 and CO measurements, acquired with CIMS (Le Breton et al., 2013) and the fast fluorescence
5 CO analyser (Gerbig et al., 1999), respectively. The HCN is used as a biomass burning tracer
6 (Lobert et al., 1990) since its lifetime in the smoke plume can potentially exceed several weeks.
7 As indicated in Le Breton et al. (2013), HCN concentrations higher than six standard deviations
8 from the median background concentration are highly correlated with CO concentrations
9 indicating biomass burning plumes. Indeed, the HCN concentrations seem to exceed the smoke
10 plume detection threshold at altitudes from 2 to 3.5 km (Fig. 10). These values are strongly
11 correlated with the corresponding CO concentrations, with a correlation of $R^2 = 0.8$ (not shown
12 here), strongly indicating the smoke presence. The measurements agree well with source-
13 receptor simulations in Fig. 9, except for the lower part of the smoke plume above the ocean,
14 which is not depicted in the HCN data.

15 Although the CALIPSO L2 aerosol classification product identifies the smoke over
16 Thessaloniki city (at the land part of the flight), it seems that at the southern part of the scene,
17 above ocean, the algorithm misclassifies the layers almost completely (Fig. 7c). We believe that
18 this is partly due to the different classification criteria for smoke above land versus above ocean,
19 as these are defined by Omar et al. (2009) for the CALIPSO classification scheme. More
20 specifically, as can be seen in Fig. 2 in Omar et al. (2009) the non-depolarizing aerosol plumes
21 are classified as smoke plumes above ocean only if they are “elevated layers” (base > 2.5 km,
22 or if $0.5 \text{ km} < \text{base} < 2.5 \text{ km}$ then $\text{top} > 4 \text{ km}$ or $\text{depth} > 2 \text{ km}$; J. Tackett, personal
23 communication). More analysis on the CALIPSO “hard limit” that can be potentially imposed
24 on the aerosol classification at coastal areas due to the different land/ocean classification
25 criteria, can be found in the work of Kanitz et al. (2014). Due to this discontinuity we decided
26 to perform our analysis at the land and ocean parts separately, in order to examine the possible
27 differences present in CALIPSO L2 product. For the ocean retrieval we use the area from 40 to
28 40.6 degrees latitude (marked with the light blue rectangle in Fig. 7c), whereas for land we use
29 only the two cloud-free 5-km segments (corresponding to CALIPSO L2 5-km-profiles)
30 indicated with the orange rectangle in Fig. 7c, in the area from 40.6 to 41.2 degrees latitude.



1 3.2 Flight above land

2 Using the combination of airborne in-situ and active remote sensing measurements with the
3 IRRA retrieval scheme described in section 2.1, we manage to retrieve profiles of the ambient
4 particle properties above land and ocean. For the retrieval above land we use the lidar
5 measurements taken at 5 km and the in-situ measurements acquired during the SLRs at 3.2, 2.7
6 and 1.8 km. The comparisons between the measured and calculated dry and ambient particle
7 optical properties show both excellent agreement (Fig. 11 and Table D1 in Appendix D), with
8 the relative differences to be below 5 %. The only exception is the lidar extinction coefficient
9 at 1.8 km, with ~10 % relative difference. This may be due to the incoherence of the lidar and
10 in-situ measurements there, due to temporal variability of the atmospheric properties, with the
11 lidar measurements to be an average of the flight segment at ~5 km between 00:20 and 00:27
12 UTC, and the in-situ measurements to refer at 1.8 km between 01:38 and 01:42 UTC (see Fig.
13 6b).

14 Overall, as seen in Fig. 11 and 12 the very high RHs that exceed 90% at 3.2 km and 80% at 2.7
15 km (Fig. 8), have a large hydration effect on the ambient particle optical and microphysical
16 properties. Figure 11 shows quite vividly the hydration effect on the ambient backscatter and
17 extinction coefficients at 355 nm, at 2.7 and 3.2 km, whereas at 1.8 km the effect is small. The
18 comparison of dry (red dots) with ambient calculations (blue dots) for the backscatter and
19 extinction coefficients, highlight the deficiency of dry in-situ measurements to reproduce the
20 ambient particle optical properties in humid conditions.

21 A similar conclusion can be drawn from the retrieved ambient (number and volume) size
22 distributions provided in Fig. 12 and Table 3 and the respective refractive indices in Table 4.
23 The hydration effect of both fine and coarse modes is obvious, especially for the high-RH layers
24 at 2.7 and 3.2 km, with a water content of 55% and 80% of the total volume, respectively. The
25 retrieved dry particle fine mode is well-fitted to the measured PCASP and GRIMM data, with
26 95% of the calculated size distribution data points to be within two error bars of the measured
27 data. For the coarse mode the fit is also acceptable, although the high uncertainty in the in-situ
28 measurements does not allow a definite conclusion.

29 The retrieved ambient lidar ratio at 355 nm of ~70-90 sr and the dry SSA at 550 nm of ~0.9-
30 0.95 (Fig. 11) indicate the presence of absorbing particles along the flight path, in good
31 agreement with the source-receptor simulations, as well as with the HCN and CO airborne in-
32 situ measurements, all showing the advection of smoke over Thessaloniki area. The retrieved



1 geometric mean radius and standard deviation of the fine mode are similar to measurements
2 detailed in Johnson et al., (2016) for the SAMBBA, DABEX and SAFARI-2000 campaigns for
3 aged smoke. The retrieved dry particle refractive indices of $1.54-1.6 + i0.008-0.021$ are within
4 the range of typical values for biomass burning particles, and the corresponding ambient
5 refractive indices ($1.38-1.55 + i 0.002-0.019$) are close to the AERONET 8-year global aerosol
6 climatology of Dubovik et al. (2002). More specifically, Dubovik et al. (2002) report a range
7 of 1.47 ± 0.03 to 1.52 ± 0.01 for the real part and 0.00093 ± 0.003 to 0.021 ± 0.004 for the imaginary
8 part.

9 **3.3 Flight above ocean**

10 For the retrieval above ocean we use the airborne lidar measurements at 5 km and the in-situ
11 measurements from the SLRs at 3.2, 2.7, 2.1 and 1.3 km. The calculated optical properties
12 reproduce well the measurements, as shown in Fig. 13 (and in Table D2 of Appendix D), with
13 most of the relative differences to be below 15%. For the lidar backscatter and extinction
14 coefficients at the lower SLRs at 2.1 and 1.3 km these differences are larger and range at ~30-
15 100 %. As explained for the retrieval above the land as well, this may be due to the temporal
16 variability of the atmosphere, resulting in the lidar seeing a different aerosol plume than the in-
17 situ measurements, especially for the lower SLRs (see Fig. 6b).

18 The results support the presence of smoke mixed with other aerosol types (e.g. urban pollution),
19 with the ambient lidar ratio at 355 nm to be ~55-75 sr and the dry particles SSA at 550 nm to
20 be ~0.9-0.95. Figure 14 and Table 5 show the retrieved (number and volume) size distributions
21 of dry and ambient particles, at different altitudes and Table 6 shows the corresponding
22 refractive indices. As with the land retrieval, the fine mode PCASP and GRIMM measurements
23 are well-fitted, whereas for the coarse mode the uncertainty is higher. The hydration effect is
24 mostly obvious at 3.2 km (RH of ~80% with 40% water content in the particle total volume),
25 whereas it is very small at 1.3 km (RH at ~55%).

26 The retrieved geometric mean radius and standard deviation of the fine mode are smaller than
27 the values reported in Johnson et al., (2016) indicating mixing with finer aerosol (e.g. urban
28 pollution). The retrieved dry refractive indices of $\sim 1.50-1.66 + i0.01-0.019$ have similar values
29 with the refractive indices above land, although the real part of 1.66 at 2.7 km is higher.
30 Moreover, the ambient refractive index values of $\sim 1.48-1.6 + i0.006-0.015$ are comparable to



1 AERONET climatological values (Dubovik et al., 2002), indicating the smoke particle presence
2 above the ocean as well.

3 **3.4 Comparison with CALIPSO L2 product**

4 Using the retrieved ambient size distribution and refractive index at different altitudes we
5 calculate the ambient backscatter, extinction coefficient and lidar ratio at 532 nm and compare
6 them with the corresponding CALIPSO L2 products. Above land, the smoke layer at ~2-3.5 km
7 is correctly identified by the CALIPSO aerosol classification scheme (Fig. 7c), and a prescribed
8 LR at 532 nm of 70 sr (assigned for smoke particles) is used for the CALIPSO L2 backscatter
9 and extinction coefficient retrievals. Figure 15 presents the results for the above-land retrieval,
10 showing good agreement with the CALIPSO L2 product. The small differences seen are within
11 the spatial variability and can be due to the time difference of CALIPSO overpass (at 00:30
12 UTC) and the longer FAAM BAe-146 flight (at 00:05-01:45 UTC). The LRs at 532 nm
13 calculated with the retrieved ambient size distributions and refractive indices are 70-80 sr,
14 supporting the presence of the smoke particles. The optical properties are calculated also using
15 the dry particle size distribution and refractive index (red circles in Fig. 15) to highlight the
16 problems that arise when using dry in-situ measurements for satellite validation for cases of
17 high RH.

18 Over the ocean the retrieved ambient LRs at 532 nm at ~60-75 sr are lower than over land,
19 indicating smoke particles mixed with other aerosol types. CALIPSO detects the aerosols
20 correctly, but does not classify them as smoke (except only for one 5-km profile), and as shown
21 in Fig. 7c, it classifies the particles either as polluted dust (LR=65 sr), or polluted continental
22 (LR=70 sr) or marine aerosol (LR=20 sr), resulting in variable and lower LRs (25-70 sr). The
23 mean LR is close to 60 sr, thus the backscatter and extinction coefficients are not excessively
24 affected by this misclassification. The CALIPSO misclassification results due to the constraint
25 applied in the algorithm to identify only the elevated layers as smoke layers above the ocean.

26 **3.5 Scattering growth factor**

27 The enhancement of aerosol scattering due to the hygroscopic growth is shown in Fig. 17 with
28 the scattering growth factor at 532 nm. The scattering growth factor is the ratio of the ambient
29 aerosol scattering coefficient, to the dry aerosol scattering coefficient. Figure 17 shows that the
30 scattering at RH=94% is almost 4 times larger than in the dry state. These values fall within the



1 range of Kohler curves for aged smoke particles and can be used in climate models for the
2 estimation of hydrated aged smoke particle scattering (e.g. Johnson et al., 2016).

3

4 **4 Discussion**

5 The results presented here are very encouraging for the IRRA retrieval scheme performance.
6 First, IRRA succeeds to reproduce both dry in-situ and ambient remote sensing measurements,
7 even in humid conditions of $RH > 80-90\%$, by considering both dry and ambient particle states
8 in the retrieval scheme and by effectively modelling the particle hygroscopic growth with
9 ISORROPIA II model. Second, IRRA manages to provide the complete set of the particle
10 microphysical properties, overcoming the deficiencies in the in-situ measurements due to the
11 insufficient coarse mode size distribution and chemical composition sampling. We do not claim
12 that the coarse mode retrieval is highly accurate with IRRA, but at least it closely reproduces
13 the measurements and provides similar results to the climatological values of biomass burning
14 particles, for the smoke plume case we analysed here. A more complete set of inputs, as in-situ
15 coarse mode sampling and multi-wavelength lidar measurements, should increase the retrieval
16 input information content and provide more accurate results. Third, IRRA retrieval is not
17 gravely affected by possible uncertainties in the in-situ measured microphysical properties,
18 since these are only used as a first guess in the iterative retrieval scheme. The unknown coarse
19 mode chemical composition is an exception, since it directly affects the estimation of the coarse
20 mode hygroscopic growth in ISORROPIA II model.

21

22 **5 Conclusions**

23 IRRA utilizes successfully the airborne active remote sensing and in-situ measurements in order
24 to provide a consistent characterization of the ambient aerosol at different altitudes, using
25 typical airborne instruments employed by the FAAM BAe-146 aircraft flight. The retrieved
26 ambient properties found to be mostly consistent also with the collocated CALIPSO L2 product.
27 Specifically, smoke plumes are identified along the flight path, which are detected from
28 CALIPSO classification scheme above land, but not above ocean.

29 One of the main shortfalls of the case analysed here is the large uncertainty in the airborne in-
30 situ measurements regarding the coarse particle size distribution and chemical composition. In
31 future IRRA applications, in-situ particle sizers achieving high accuracy measurements of the



1 coarse mode should be employed, along with filter sampling of the coarse particles. We should
2 note though that despite of the limited coarse mode information, our retrieval provides plausible
3 results for the coarse particles as well, for the case presented here.

4 The achievement of IRRA is the overall successful profiling of the ambient aerosol
5 microphysical, optical and hygroscopic properties utilizing the combination of dry particle
6 property measurements, active remote sensing and ISORROPIA II hygroscopic growth
7 modelling, all in one retrieval scheme. The potential of IRRA lies beyond the case study
8 analysed here, providing an effective aerosol characterization in ambient conditions of high
9 importance for aerosol/cloud interaction, radiative transfer and climate studies.

10 We should highlight that IRRA is optimized with the measurement set acquired during the
11 ACEMED campaign, but this is not a limiting factor of its applicability. The basic concept of
12 combining vertically-resolved in-situ and active remote sensing measurements can be satisfied
13 using a different measurement strategy as well. For example, after applying minor changes,
14 IRRA can combine vertically-resolved in-situ measurements from aircraft or less-costly
15 unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) platforms, with ground-based or satellite lidar measurements.

16 IRRA can also be developed further in the future, to include ground-based or airborne
17 polarization measurements which should help to decrease the aerosol retrieval uncertainty,
18 especially for the particle refractive index (Mishchenko and Travis, 1997). Another feature we
19 plan to implement, is the retrieval of non-spherical particle properties, employing non-spherical
20 particle scattering codes in the algorithm (e.g. the T-matrix code as in Dubovik et al. (2006), or
21 the Advanced Discrete Dipole Approximation as in Gasteiger et al. (2011)). This will extend
22 the applicability of IRRA to dust particle characterization as well.

23 For the application presented here, it has been shown that it is feasible with IRRA to evaluate
24 space-borne profiling measurements. Beyond CALIPSO, IRRA can be further applied for the
25 validation of the new NASA CATS mission but also future ESA missions like ADM-Aeolus
26 and EarthCARE.

27

28 **Appendix A: IRRA optimization retrieval scheme**

29 IRRA retrieval methodology shown in Fig. 1 is automated utilizing the non-linear least-squares
30 solver “lsqcurvefit” of MATLAB. The lsqcurvefit calculates the dry and ambient particle size
31 distributions and refractive indices that minimize the difference between the calculated and



1 measured optical properties in a least-squares sense (Eq. A1). Then, the retrieved dry particle
 2 properties are “rehydrated” to provide the ambient particle properties.
 3

$$\min \|F(SD_d, m_d, f_{gf,c}, f_{wf,c}) - y\|_2^2 = \min \sum_i \left(F(SD_d, m_d, f_{gf,c}, f_{wf,c})_i - y_i \right)^2 \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$y = \{sc_{450}, sc_{550}, sc_{700}, abs_{565}, \alpha_{355}, \beta_{355}, NC_{0.8}, NC_{1.1}\} \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$F(SD_d, m_d, f_{gf,c}, f_{wf,c}) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} F_{sc_{450}}(SD_d, m_d), F_{sc_{550}}(SD_d, m_d), F_{sc_{700}}(SD_d, m_d), F_{abs_{565}}(SD_d, m_d), \\ F_{\alpha_{355}}(SD_d, m_d, f_{gf,c}, f_{wf,c}), F_{\beta_{355}}(SD_d, m_d, f_{gf,c}, f_{wf,c}), F_{NC_{0.8}}(SD_d), F_{NC_{1.1}}(SD_d) \end{array} \right\} \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$SD_d = \{r_{mfd}, \sigma_{fd}, N_{fd}, r_{mcd}, \sigma_{cd}, N_{cd}\} \quad (\text{A4})$$

4
 5 The retrieval is performed for each height separately. In Eq. A1, the summation over “*i*” denotes
 6 the different optical properties, *y* is the vector of the measured optical properties (Eq. A2) and
 7 *F* is the vector of the calculated ones (Eq. A3). *SD_d* is the vector of the dry size distribution
 8 parameters (Eq. A4), *m_d* is the dry particle refractive index and *f_{gf,c}*, *f_{wf,c}* are the hygroscopic
 9 growth and water volume fraction of fine and coarse ambient particles. The retrieved parameters
 10 are the *SD_d* and *m_d*, whereas *f_{gf,c}*, *f_{wf,c}* are provided from ISORROPIA II.

11 The *y* vector contains the in-situ measurements of the scattering coefficients at 450, 550 and
 12 700 nm (*sc₄₅₀*, *sc₅₅₀*, *sc₇₀₀*, respectively), the absorption coefficient at 565 nm (*abs₅₆₅*), as
 13 well as the lidar measurements of extinction (*α₃₅₅*) and backscatter coefficient at 355 nm (*β₃₅₅*).
 14 In order for the retrieval not to be under-constrained, with less measurements than retrieved
 15 parameters, *y* also contains the in-situ measured number concentration of dry particles at 0.8
 16 and 1.1 μm (*NC_{0.8}* and *NC_{1.1}*). We use these coarse particle concentration values to constrain
 17 more effectively the coarse mode retrieval, for which the in-situ measurements provide
 18 accepted accuracy for sizes <1.5 μm (radius) (see discussion in Section 2.2.2).



1 F vector contains the corresponding calculated values of y : $F_{sc_{450}}$, $F_{sc_{550}}$, $F_{sc_{700}}$ and $F_{abs_{565}}$ are
2 the scattering coefficients at 450, 550 and 700 nm and the absorption coefficient at 565 nm,
3 calculated from the dry particle number size distribution (SD_d) and refractive index (m_d),
4 utilizing Mie scattering calculations. Moreover, $F_{\alpha_{355}}$ and $F_{\beta_{355}}$ are the extinction and
5 backscatter coefficients at 355 nm, calculated from the ambient number size distribution
6 (derived from SD_d and $f_{gf,c}$, as in Eq. 2, 3) and refractive index (derived from m_d and $f_{wf,c}$,
7 as in Eq. 4, 5), with Mie scattering calculations. Finally, $F_{NC_{0.8}}$ and $F_{NC_{1.1}}$ are the values of SD_d
8 at 0.8 and 1.1 μm .

9 The lsqcurvefit function employs the Trust-Region-Reflective optimization algorithm (based
10 on the interior-reflective Newton method described in Coleman and Li, 1994; 1996) to
11 minimize the cost function in Eq. A1. For the first iteration the parameters SD_d and m_d are set
12 equal to a first guess, derived from the in-situ measurements. Subsequently, the algorithm
13 searches for a set of parameters that minimizes the cost function. The minimization is done
14 using a simpler function (defined by the first two terms of the Taylor approximation of the cost
15 function) which models reasonably well the cost function behaviour in a “trust region” around
16 the parameter set. A trial step is then computed by minimizing the modelled function. If the
17 cost function is minimized as well, then the parameter set is updated using the trial step, and
18 the trust region is expanded. Otherwise, the parameter set remains unchanged, the trust region
19 is shrunk and the trial computation is repeated. The optimization procedure stops after
20 predefined stopping criteria are reached. These may include the minimum cost function value,
21 the minimum size of the trial step or a maximum number of iterations. The first two criteria are
22 defined from the input measurement and the retrieved parameter uncertainties, respectively,
23 which are not available for the current analysis. Thus, for the case analyzed here, we used a
24 maximum number of iterations as the stopping criterion.

25 Moreover, the algorithm has the capability to use constrains for the lower and upper bounds of
26 the retrieved parameters. We utilize this feature for the dry particle fine and coarse mode
27 parameters, so as the retrieved parameters are not very different than the in-situ measurements.
28 The dry particle refractive index is also constrained, so as to be within realistic values, with the
29 real part from 1.3 to 1.7 and the imaginary part from 0 to 0.1. These values cover well the range
30 of values provided from the worldwide aerosol climatology from 8-year AERONET data by
31 Dubovik et al. (2002).



1 Last, the fitted parameters of y do not have all the same importance for our retrieval. More
2 specifically, we are not interested in reproducing with high accuracy the number concentration
3 measurements at 0.8 and 1.1 μm ($NC_{0.8}$ and $NC_{1.1}$), or at least not as much as the measured
4 optical properties. For this reason we “weight” the fit, by first normalizing to 1 each parameter
5 in y (dividing it with its value) and then multiplying with a weight that is a measure of the
6 importance of the parameter fitting. The same multiplication factors are applied on the
7 parameters of F vector. For the case analysed here we used weights of 1 for the optical
8 properties and of 0.1 for the number concentrations at 0.8 and 1.1 μm . The “weighting” of the
9 fit can be very useful in the general case of combining measurements of different accuracies
10 and it has been used in other retrievals in the literature (e.g. Dubovik and King, 2000). The
11 weights should be derived based on the measurement accuracy, but if this is not easy to define
12 (as is the case here), even qualitative numbers of “more” or “less” confidence in the
13 measurements can help the retrieval.

14

15 **Appendix B: Size distribution data handling and calibration**

16 The number size distribution data from PCASP and GRIMM instruments come in the form of
17 number of particles, per cm^3 , per size bin. The number concentration for each size bin is
18 normalized by $d\ln(r_{max}) - d\ln(r_{min})$ (r_{min} and r_{max} refer to the minimum and maximum bin
19 radius, respectively) to get the log-normal number size distribution $dN/d\ln(r)$. The log-normal
20 volume size distribution $dV/d\ln(r)$ is then calculated by multiplying $dN/d\ln(r)$ with the volume
21 of the particles in each bin.

22 The data are also inspected for spurious values, using the associated counting error, which for
23 each size bin is defined as the inverse square root of the number of particles in the bin. The data
24 associated with counting errors larger than 0.3 (corresponding to less than three particles in the
25 size bin) are screened out. Moreover, the data are corrected for the refractive index assumption
26 using the true refractive index and calibration standards, with the mieconscat and the
27 cstodconverter software (<http://sourceforge.net/projects/mieconscat/> and
28 <http://sourceforge.net/projects/cstodconverter/>, respectively), as described in Rosenberg et al.
29 (2012). For this correction we assume that the particles are homogeneous and spherical, which
30 is most probably true, considering that the airborne lidar depolarization measurements showed
31 non-depolarizing particles. The uncertainty for the bin width is provided from the



1 cstdconverter software and the uncertainty in the volume of the bin is calculated using the
 2 uncertainty in the bin width and the counting uncertainty of each bin.

3

4 **Appendix C: RH calculation**

5 The ambient RH is calculated from the WVSS-II water vapour volume mixing ratio (WV_{VMR})
 6 measurements and the ambient pressure (P) measurements as following:

7

$$RH = \frac{WV_{VMR} * P}{e} * 100 \quad (C1)$$

8 Where the WV_{VMR} is in m^3m^{-3} , P is in hPa , e (in hPa) is the vapour pressure of water
 9 calculated from the temperature (T) measurements (in C) as in Lowe and Ficke (1974):

10

$$e = a_0 + T * \left(a_1 + T * \left(a_2 + T * \left(a_3 + T * \left(a_4 + T * \left(a_5 + a_6 T \right) \right) \right) \right) \right) \quad (C2)$$

11 With $a_0 = 6.107799961$, $a_1 = 4.436518521 * 10^{-0}$, $a_2 = 1.428945805 * 10^{-0}$, $a_3 =$
 12 $2.650648471 * 10^{-0}$, $a_4 = 3.031240396 * 10^{-0}$, $a_5 = 2.034080948 * 10^{-0}$ and $a_6 =$
 13 $6.136820929 * 10^{-01}$.

14

15 **Appendix D: Measured and retrieved optical properties**

16 Table D1. Measured versus calculated (bold) in-situ measurements of the dry particle scattering
 17 coefficient and SSA, and remote sensing measurements of the ambient backscatter and
 18 extinction coefficients at 355 nm, above land. The spatial (horizontal) variability of the
 19 measurements is provided as the standard deviation around the mean value.

	Airborne in-situ			Airborne remote sensing		
Height (km)	Scattering coefficient	Scattering coefficient	Scattering coefficient	SSA at 550 nm	Backscatter coefficient	Extinction coefficient



	at 450 nm (km ⁻¹)	at 550 nm (km ⁻¹)	at 700 nm (km ⁻¹)		at 355 nm (km ⁻¹)	at 355 nm (km ⁻¹)
3.2	0.076±0.002 0.074	0.054±0.002 0.054	0.032±0.002 0.034	0.95±0.01 0.95	0.004 0.004	0.310 0.307
2.7	0.082±0.004 0.080	0.055±0.003 0.056	0.033±0.002 0.033	0.91±0.01 0.91	0.002 0.002	0.192 0.200
1.8	0.071±0.004 0.070	0.051±0.002 0.051	0.031±0.002 0.031	0.90±0.01 0.90	0.001 0.001	0.099 0.108

1

2 Table D2. As for Table D1, for the retrieval above ocean.

Height (km)	Airborne in-situ			SSA at 550 nm	Airborne remote sensing	
	Scattering coefficient at 450 nm (km ⁻¹)	Scattering coefficient at 550 nm (km ⁻¹)	Scattering coefficient at 700 nm (km ⁻¹)		Backscatter coefficient at 355 nm (km ⁻¹)	Extinction coefficient at 355 nm (km ⁻¹)
	3.2	0.070±0.011 0.072	0.049±0.008 0.053		0.030±0.005 0.033	0.93±0.03 0.94
2.7	0.070±0.017 0.077	0.050±0.012 0.056	0.030±0.008 0.035	0.91±0.02 0.92	0.002 0.002	0.111 0.121
2.1	0.083±0.007 0.089	0.060±0.005 0.067	0.038±0.004 0.044	0.91±0.01 0.92	0.003 0.002	0.155 0.153
1.3	0.116±0.005 0.110	0.085±0.004 0.086	0.053±0.003 0.058	0.92±0.01 0.93	0.001 0.002	0.089 0.168

3

4



1 **Acknowledgements**

2 The research leading to these results received funding from the European Community's Seventh
3 Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement n°227159 (EUFAR: European
4 Facility for Airborne Research in Environmental and Geo-sciences) and the UK Natural
5 Environment Research Council [Grant ref: NE/E018092/1]. Airborne data was obtained using
6 the BAe-146-301 Atmospheric Research Aircraft [ARA] flown by Directflight Ltd and
7 managed by the Facility for Airborne Atmospheric Measurements [FAAM], which is a joint
8 entity of the Natural Environment Research Council [NERC] and the Met Office. This research
9 has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation
10 programme under grant agreement No 654109. The publication was supported by the
11 European Union Seventh Framework Programme (FP7-REGPOT-2012-2013-1), in the
12 framework of the project BEYOND, under grant agreement no. 316210 (BEYOND– Building
13 Capacity for a Centre of Excellence for EO-based monitoring of Natural Disasters).
14 Athanasios Nenes acknowledges support from a Georgia Power Faculty Scholar Chair and a
15 Cullen-Peck Faculty Fellowship.

16 The authors would also like to acknowledge the contribution of Jim Haywood, Alan Vance and
17 Kate Turnbull from the UK Met Office and of Jason Tackett from the CALIPSO Lidar Science
18 Working Group at NASA Langley Research Center.

19

20



1 References

- 2 Allan, J. D., Jimenez, J. L., Williams, P. I., Alfarra, M. R., Bower, K. N., Jayne, J. T., Coe, H.,
3 and Worsnop, D. R.: Quantitative sampling using an Aerodyne Aerosol Mass Spectrometer.
4 Part 1: Techniques of data interpretation and error analysis, *Journal of Geophysical Research-*
5 *Atmospheres*, 108(D3), 4090, doi:10.1029/2002JD002358, 2003.
- 6 Allen, G., Illingworth, S. M., O'Shea, S. J., Newman, S., Vance, A., Bauguitte, S. J.-B.,
7 Marengo, F., Kent, J., Bower, K., Gallagher, M. W., Muller, J., Percival, C. J., Harlow, C., Lee,
8 J., and Taylor, J. P.: Atmospheric composition and thermodynamic retrievals from the ARIES
9 airborne TIR-FTS system – Part 2: Validation and results from aircraft campaigns, *Atmos.*
10 *Meas. Tech. Discuss.*, 7, 3397-3441, doi:10.5194/amt-7-3397-2014, 2014.
- 11 Amiridis, V., Marinou, E., Tsekeri, A., Wandinger, U., Schwarz, A., Giannakaki, E., Mamouri,
12 R., Kokkalis, P., Biniotoglou, I., Solomos, S., Herekakis, T., Kazadzis, S., Gerasopoulos, E.,
13 Proestakis, E., Kottas, M., Balis, D., Papayannis, A., Kontoes, C., Kourtidis, K.,
14 Papagiannopoulos, N., Mona, L., Pappalardo, G., Le Rille, O., and Ansmann, A.: LIVAS: a 3-
15 D multi-wavelength aerosol/cloud database based on CALIPSO and EARLINET, *Atmos.*
16 *Chem. Phys.*, 15, 7127-7153, doi:10.5194/acp-15-7127-2015, 2015.
- 17 Anderson, T. L. and Ogren, J. A.: Determining aerosol radiative properties using the TSI 3563
18 integrating nephelometer, *Aerosol Sci. Technol.*, 29, 57–69, 1998.
- 19 Athanopoulou, E., Protonotariou, A. P., Bossioli, E., Dandou, A., Tombrou, M., Allan, J. D.,
20 Coe, H., Mihalopoulos, N., Kalogiros, J., Bacak, A., Sciare, J., and Biskos, G.: Aerosol
21 chemistry above an extended archipelago of the eastern Mediterranean basin during strong
22 northern winds, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15, 8401-8421, 10.5194/acp-15-8401-2015, 2015.
- 23 Belyaev, S. P., and Levin, L. M.: Investigation of aerosol aspiration by photographing particle
24 tracks under flash illumination, *Journal of Aerosol Science*, 3(2), 127–140, 1972.
- 25 Bezantakos, S., Barmounis, K., Giamarelou, M., Bossioli, E., Tombrou, M., Mihalopoulos,
26 N., Eleftheriadis, K., Kalogiros, J., D. Allan, J., Bacak, A., Percival, C. J., Coe, H., and Biskos,
27 G.: Chemical composition and hygroscopic properties of aerosol particles over the Aegean Sea,
28 *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 11595-11608, doi:10.5194/acp-13-11595-2013, 2013.
- 29 Bohren, C. F. and Huffman, D. R.: *Absorption and Scattering of Light by Small Particles*, John
30 Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1983.



- 1 Bond, T. C., Anderson, T. L., and Campbell, D.: Calibration and intercomparison of filter-based
2 measurements of visible light absorption by aerosols, *Aerosol Sci. Technol.*, 30, 582–600,
3 doi:10.1080/027868299304435, 1999.
- 4 Brioude, J., Arnold, D., Stohl, A., Cassiani, M., Morton, D., Seibert, P., Angevine, W., Evan,
5 S., Dingwell, A., Fast, J. D., Easter, R. C., Pisso, I., Burkhardt, J., and Wotawa, G.: The
6 Lagrangian particle dispersion model FLEXPART-WRF version 3.1, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 6,
7 1889-1904, doi:10.5194/gmd-6-1889-2013, 2013.
- 8 Bougiatioti, A., Fountoukis, C., Kalivitis, N., Pandis, S. N., Nenes, A. and Mihalopoulos, N.:
9 Cloud Condensation Nuclei Measurements in the Marine Boundary Layer of the Eastern
10 Mediterranean: CCN closure and droplet growth kinetics, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 9, 7053-7066,
11 2009.
- 12 Bougiatioti, A., Nenes, A., Fountoukis, C., Kalivitis, N., Pandis, S. N., and Mihalopoulos, N.:
13 Size-resolved CCN distributions and activation kinetics of aged continental and marine aerosol,
14 *Atmos.Chem.Phys.*, 11, 8791-8808, 2011.
- 15 Bougiatioti, A., Bezantakos, S., Stavroulas, I., Kokkalis, P., Biskos, G., Mihalopoulos, N.,
16 Papayannis, A., Nenes, A.: Contribution of biomass burning to CCN number and
17 hygroscopicity during summertime in the Eastern Mediterranean, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, in
18 review, 2016.
- 19 Burton, S. P., Ferrare, R. A., Vaughan, M. A., Omar, A. H., Rogers, R. R., Hostetler, C. A., and
20 Hair, J. W.: Aerosol classification from airborne HSRL and comparisons with the CALIPSO
21 vertical feature mask, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 6, 1397-1412, doi:10.5194/amt-6-1397-2013, 2013.
- 22 Chaikovsky, A., Dubovik, O., Holben, B., Bril, A., Goloub, P., Tanré, D., Pappalardo, G.,
23 Wandinger, U., Chaikovskaya, L., Denisov, S., Grudo, Y., Lopatin, A., Karol, Y., Lapyonok,
24 T., Amiridis, V., Ansmann, A., Apituley, A., Allados-Arboledas, L., Biniotoglou, I., Boselli,
25 A., D'Amico, G., Freudenthaler, V., Giles, D., Granados-Muñoz, M. J., Kokkalis, P., Nicolae,
26 D., Oshchepkov, S., Papayannis, A., Perrone, M. R., Pietruczuk, A., Rocadenbosch, F., Sicard,
27 M., Slutsker, I., Talianu, C., De Tomasi, F., Tsekeri, A., Wagner, J., and Wang, X.: Lidar-
28 Radiometer Inversion Code (LIRIC) for the retrieval of vertical aerosol properties from
29 combined lidar/radiometer data: development and distribution in EARLINET, *Atmos. Meas.*
30 *Tech. Discuss.*, 8, 12759-12822, doi:10.5194/amtd-8-12759-2015, 2015.



- 1 Chang, R. Y.-W., Slowik, J. G., Shantz, N. C., Vlasenko, A., Liggio, J., Sjostedt, S. J., Leaitch,
2 W. R., and Abbatt, J. P. D.: The hygroscopicity parameter (κ) of ambient organic aerosol at a
3 field site subject to biogenic and anthropogenic influences: relationship to degree of aerosol
4 oxidation, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 5047-5064, doi:10.5194/acp-10-5047-2010, 2010.
- 5 Chazette, P., Bocquet, M., Royer, P., Winiarek, V., Raut, J. -C., Labazuy, P., Gouhier, M.,
6 Lardier, M. and Cariou, J. -P.: Eyjafjallajökull ash concentrations derived from both lidar and
7 modeling, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, D00U14, doi:10.1029/2011JD015755, 2012.
- 8 Coleman, T. F. and Li, Y.: On the Convergence of Reflective Newton Methods for Large-Scale
9 Nonlinear Minimization Subject to Bounds, *Mathematical Programming*, Vol. 67, Number 2,
10 pp. 189-224, 1994.
- 11 Coleman, T. F. and Li, Y.: An Interior, Trust Region Approach for Nonlinear Minimization
12 Subject to Bounds, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, Vol. 6, pp. 418-445, 1996.
- 13 Dubovik, O., Holben, B., Eck, T. F., Smirnov, A., Kaufman, Y. J., King, M. D., Tanré, D., and
14 Slutsker, I.: Variability of Absorption and Optical Properties of Key Aerosol Types Observed
15 in Worldwide Locations, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 59, 590-608, doi:10.1175/1520-
16 0469(2002)059<0590:VOAAOP>2.0.CO;2, 2002
- 17 Dinar, E., Mentel, T. F., and Rudich, Y.: The density of humic acids and humic like substances
18 (HULIS) from fresh and aged wood burning and pollution aerosol particles, *Atmos. Chem.*
19 *Phys.*, 6, 5213-5224, doi:10.5194/acp-6-5213-2006, 2006.
- 20 Dinar, E., Riziq, A. A., Spindler, C., Erlick, C., Kiss, G., and Rudich, Y.: The complex
21 refractive index of atmospheric and model humic-like substances (HULIS) retrieved by a cavity
22 ring down aerosol spectrometer (CRD-AS), *Faraday Discuss.*, 137, 279-295, 2008.
- 23 Dubovik, O.: Optimization of Numerical Inversion in Photopolarimetric Remote Sensing, in:
24 *Photopolarimetry in Remote Sensing*, edited by: Videen, G., Yatskiv, Y., and Mishchenko,
25 M., Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, the Netherlands, 65-106, 2004. Fleming, R. J. and
26 May, R. D.: The 2nd Generation Water Vapor Sensing System and Benefits of Its Use on
27 Commercial Air craft for Air Carriers and Society, UCAR, Boulder, CO, available at:
28 <https://www.eol.ucar.edu/system/files/spectrasensors.pdf> (last access: 16 December 2014),
29 2004.



- 1 Engelhart, G. J., Hildebrandt, L., Kostenidou, E., Mihalopoulos, N., Donahue, N. M., and
2 Pandis, S. N.: Water content of aged aerosol, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 911-920,
3 doi:10.5194/acp-11-911-2011, 2011.
- 4 Ervens, B., Turpin, B. J., and Weber, R. J.: Secondary organic aerosol formation in cloud
5 droplets and aqueous particles (aqSOA): a review of laboratory, field and model studies, *Atmos.*
6 *Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 11, 22301–22383, doi:10.5194/acpd-11-22301-2011, 2011
- 7 Fountoukis, C., Nenes, A., Sullivan, A., Weber, R., VanReken, T., Fischer, M., Matias, E.,
8 Moya, M. Farmer, D., and Cohen, R.: Thermodynamic characterization of Mexico City Aerosol
9 during MILAGRO 2006, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 9, 2141-2156, 2009.
- 10 Fountoukis, C. and Nenes, A.: ISORROPIA II: a computationally efficient thermodynamic
11 equilibrium model for $K^+Ca^{2+}Mg^{2+}NH_4^+Na^+SO_4^{2-}NO_3^-Cl^-H_2O$ aerosols, *Atmos.*
12 *Chem. Phys.*, 7, 4639-4659, 2007.
- 13 Gasteiger, J., Wiegner, M., Groß, S., Freudenthaler, V., Toledano, C., Tesche, M., and Kandler,
14 K.: Modelling lidar-relevant optical properties of complex mineral dust aerosols, *Tellus B*, 63,
15 725–741, doi:10.1111/j.1600-0889.2011.00559.x,2011.
- 16 Gerbig, C., Schmitgen, S., Kley, D., and Volz-Thomas, A.: An improved fast-response vacuum
17 UV resonance fluorescence CO instrument, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 104, 1699–1704, 1999.
- 18 Guo, H., Xu, L., Bougiatioti, A., Cerully, K. M., Capps, S. L., Hite Jr., J. R., Carlton, A. G.,
19 Lee, S.-H., Bergin, M. H., Ng, N. L., Nenes, A., and Weber, R. J.: Fine-particle water and pH
20 in the southeastern United States, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15, 5211-5228, doi:10.5194/acp-15-
21 5211-2015, 2015.
- 22 Guo, H., Sullivan, A. P., Campuzano-Jost, P., Schroder, J. C., Lopez-Hilfiger, F. D., Dibb, J.
23 E., Jimenez, J. L., Thornton, J. A., Brown, S. S., Nenes, A., and Weber, R. J.: Fine particle pH
24 and the partitioning of nitric acid during winter in the northeastern United States, *Atmos. Chem.*
25 *Phys.*, in review, 2016.
- 26 Haywood, J., Francis, P., Dubovik, O., Glew, M., Holben, B.: Comparison of aerosol size
27 distributions, radiative properties, and optical depths determined by aircraft observations and
28 Sun photometers during SAFARI 2000, *J. Geophys. Res.* 108 (D13), 8471,
29 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2002JD002250>, 2003.



- 1 Hegg, D. A., Livingston, J., Hobbs, P. V., Novakov, T., Russell, P.: Chemical apportionment
2 of aerosol column optical depth off the mid-Atlantic coast of the United States, *Journal of*
3 *Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 102.D21 (1997): 25293-25303, 1997.
- 4 Heim M., Mullins J. M., Umhauer H., Kasper G.: Performance evaluation of three optical
5 particle counters with an efficient “multimodal” calibration method, *Journal of Aerosol*
6 *Science*, 39, 1019–1031, 2008.
- 7 Hennigan, C. J., Izumi, J., Sullivan, A. P., Weber, R. J. and Nenes, A.: A Critical Evaluation of
8 Proxy Methods used to Estimate the Acidity of Atmospheric Particles, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*,
9 15, 2775-2790, 2015.
- 10 Highwood, E. J., Northway, M. J., McMeeking, G. R., Morgan, W. T., Liu, D., Osborne, S.,
11 Bower, K., Coe, H., Ryder, C., and Williams, P.: Aerosol scattering and absorption during the
12 EUCAARI-LONGREX flights of the Facility for Airborne Atmospheric Measurements
13 (FAAM) BAe-146: can measurements and models agree?, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 12, 7251-7267,
14 doi:10.5194/acp-12-7251-2012, 2012.
- 15 Holben, B. N., Eck, T. F., Slutsker, I., Tanré, D., Buis, J. P., Setzer, A., Vermote, E., Reagan,
16 J. A., Kaufman, Y. J., Nakajima, T., Lavenu, F., Jankowiak, I., and Smirnov, A.: AERONET –
17 A federated instrument network and data archive for aerosol characterization. *Remote Sens.*
18 *Environ.* 66, 1-16, 1998.
- 19 IPCC: *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to*
20 *the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, Cambridge
21 University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 1535 pp., 2013.
- 22 Johnson, B. T., Haywood, J. M., Langridge, J. M., Darbyshire, E., Morgan, W. T., Szpek, K.,
23 Brooke, J., Marengo, F., Coe, H., Artaxo, P., Longo, K. M., Mulcahy, J., Mann, G., Dalvi, M.,
24 and Bellouin, N.: Evaluation of biomass burning aerosols in the HadGEM3 climate model with
25 observations from SAMBBA, in preparation for *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 2016.
- 26 Kalkavouras P., Bossioli E., Bezantakos S., Bougiatioti A., Kalivitis N., Stavroulas I.,
27 Kouvarakis G., Protonotariou A. P., Dandou A., Biskos G., Mihalopoulos N., Nenes A.,
28 Tombrou M.: New Particle Formation in the South Aegean Sea during the Etesians: importance
29 for CCN production and cloud droplet number, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, in review, 2016.
- 30 Kanitz, T., Ansmann, A., Foth, A., Seifert, P., Wandinger, U., Engelmann, R., Baars, H.,
31 Althausen, D., Casiccia, C., and Zamorano, F.: Surface matters: limitations of CALIPSO V3



- 1 aerosol typing in coastal regions, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 7, 2061-2072, doi:10.5194/amt-7-2061-
2 2014, 2014.
- 3 Klett, D.: Lidar inversion with variable backscatter/extinction ratios, *Appl. Optics*, 31, 1638–
4 1643, 1985.
- 5 Le Breton, M., Bacak, A., Muller, J. B. A., O'Shea, S. J., Xiao, P., Ashfold, M. N. R., Cooke,
6 M. C., Batt, R., Shallcross, D. E., Oram, D. E., Forster, G., Bauguitte, S. J. -B., Palmer, P. I.,
7 Parrington, M., Lewis, A. C., Lee, J. D., and Percival, C. J.: Airborne hydrogen light blueide
8 measurements using a chemical ionisation mass spectrometer for the plume identification of
9 biomass burning forest fires, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 9217-9232, doi:10.5194/acp-13-9217-
10 2013, 2013.
- 11 Lelieveld, J., Berresheim, H., Borrmann, S., Crutzen, P. J., Dentener, F. J., Fischer, H., Feichter,
12 J., Flatau, P. J., Heland, J., Holzinger, R., Korrman, R., Lawrence, M. G., Levin, Z.,
13 Markowicz, K. M., Mihalopoulos, N., Minikin, A., Ramanathan, V., de Reus, M., Roelofs, G.
14 J., Scheeren, H. A., Sciare, J., Schlager, H., Schultz, M., Siegmund, P., Steil, B., Stephanou, I.,
15 E. G., Stier, P., Traub, M., Warneke, C., Williams, J., Ziereis, H.: Global Air Pollution
16 Crossroads over the Mediterranean, *Science*, 298, 794-799, 2002.
- 17 Liao, H., and Seinfeld J. H.: Global impacts of gas-phase chemistry-aerosol interactions on
18 direct radiative forcing by anthropogenic aerosols and ozone, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 110, D18208,
19 doi:10.1029/2005JD005907, 2005.
- 20 Lobert, J. M., Scharffe, D. H., Hao, W. M., and Crutzen, P. J.: Importance of biomass burning
21 in the atmospheric budgets of nitrogen containing gases, *Nature*, 346, 552–554, 1990.
- 22 Lopatin, A., Dubovik, O., Chaikovsky, A., Goloub, P., Lapyonok, T., Tanré, D., and Litvinov,
23 P.: Enhancement of aerosol characterization using synergy of lidar and sun-photometer
24 coincident observations: the GARRLiC algorithm, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 6, 2065-2088,
25 doi:10.5194/amt-6-2065-2013, 2013.
- 26 Lowe, P. R. and Ficke, J. M.: The computation of saturation vapor pressure. Tech. Paper No.
27 4-74, Environmental Prediction Research Facility, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA,
28 27 pp, 1974.
- 29 Malm, K. C., and Day, D. E.: Estimates of aerosol species scattering characteristics as a function
30 of relative humidity. *Atmos. Environ.*, 35, 2845-2860, 2001.



- 1 Marengo, F., Johnson, B., Turnbull, K., Newman, S., Haywood, J., Webster, H., and Ricketts,
2 H.: Airborne Lidar Observations of the 2010 Eyjafjallajökull Volcanic Ash Plume, *J. Geophys.*
3 *Res.*, 116, D00U05, doi:10.1029/2011JD016396, 2011.
- 4 McConnell, C. L., Formenti, P., Highwood, E. J., and Harrison, M. A. J.: Using aircraft
5 measurements to determine the refractive index of Saharan dust during the DODO Experiments,
6 *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 3081–3098, doi:10.5194/acp-10-3081-2010, 2010.
- 7 Mishchenko, M.I., and Travis, L.D.: Satellite retrieval of aerosol properties over the ocean using
8 polarization as well as intensity of reflected sunlight, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 102, 16989-17013,
9 1997.
- 10 Mikhailov, E., Vlasenko, S., Rose, D., and Pöschl, U.: Mass-based hygroscopicity parameter
11 interaction model and measurement of atmospheric aerosol water uptake, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*,
12 13, 717-740, doi:10.5194/acp-13-717-2013, 2013.
- 13 Morgan, W. T., Allan, J. D., Bower, K. N., Highwood, E. J., Liu, D., McMeeking, G. R.,
14 Northway, M. J., Williams, P. I., Krejci, R., and Coe, H.: Airborne measurements of the spatial
15 distribution of aerosol chemical composition across Europe and evolution of the organic
16 fraction, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 4065-4083, DOI 10.5194/acp-10-4065-2010, 2010.
- 17 Müller, D., Böckmann, C., Kolgotin, A., Schneidenbach, L., Chemyakin, E., Rosemann, J.,
18 Znak, P., and Romanov, A.: Microphysical particle properties derived from inversion
19 algorithms developed in the framework of EARLINET, *Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss.*, 8, 12823-
20 12885, doi:10.5194/amtd-8-12823-2015, 2015.
- 21 Omar, A. H., Won, J. -G., Winker, D. M., Yoon, S. -C., Dubovik, O., and McCormick, M. P.:
22 Development of global aerosol models using cluster analysis of Aerosol Robotic Network
23 (AERONET) measurements, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 110, D10S14, doi:10.1029/2004JD004874,
24 2005.
- 25 Omar, A. H., Winker, D. M., Vaughan, M. A., Hu, Y., Trepte, C. R., Ferrare, R. A., Lee, K. -
26 P., Hostetler, C. A., Kittaka, C., Rogers, R. R., Kuehn, R. E. and Liu, Z.: The CALIPSO
27 Automated Aerosol Classification and Lidar Ratio Selection Algorithm, *J. Atmos. Oceanic*
28 *Technol.*, 26, 1994–2014 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/2009JTECHA1231.1>, 2009.
- 29 Ogren, J. A.: Comment on “Calibration and Intercomparison of Filter-Based Measurements of
30 Visible Light Absorption by Aerosols”, *Aerosol Sci. Technol.*, 44, 589—591,
31 doi:10.1080/02786826.2010.482111, 2010.



- 1 Pappalardo, G., Amodeo, A., Apituley, A., Comeron, A., Freudenthaler, V., Linné, H.,
2 Ansmann, A., Bösenberg, J., D'Amico, G., Mattis, I., Mona, L., Wandinger, U., Amiridis, V.,
3 Alados-Arboledas, L., Nicolae, D., and Wiegner, M.: EARLINET: towards an advanced
4 sustainable European aerosol lidar network, *Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss.*, 7, 2929-2980,
5 doi:10.5194/amtd-7-2929-2014, 2014.
- 6 Petters, M. D. and Kreidenweis, S. M.: A single parameter representation of hygroscopic
7 growth and cloud condensation nucleus activity, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 7, 1961-1971,
8 doi:10.5194/acp-7-1961-2007, 2007.
- 9 Pikridas, M., Riipinen, I., Hildebrandt, L., Kostenidou E., Manninen, H., Mihalopoulos, N.,
10 Kalivitis, N., Burkhardt J. F., Stohl, A., Kulmala, M., Pandis S. N.: New particle formation at a
11 remote site in the eastern Mediterranean, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, D12205,
12 doi:10.1029/2012JD017570, 2012.
- 13 Quinn, P. K., Bates, T. S., Baynard, T., Clarke, A. D., Onasch, T. B., Wang, W., Rood, M. J.,
14 Andrews, E., Allan, J., Carrico, C. M., Coffman, D., and Worsnop, D.: Impact of particulate
15 organic matter on the relative humidity dependence of light scattering: A simplified
16 parameterization, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 32, L22809, doi: 10.1029/2005GL024322, 2005.
- 17 Pilinis, C., Pandis, S. N., and Seinfeld J. H.: Sensitivity of direct climate forcing by atmospheric
18 aerosols to aerosol size and composition, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 100(D9), 18739–18754,
19 doi:10.1029/95JD02119, 1995.
- 20 Rodgers, C.: *Inverse Methods for Atmospheric Sounding: Theory and Practice*, World
21 Scientific, Singapore, 2000.
- 22 Rosenberg, P. D., Dean, A. R., Williams, P. I., Dorsey, J. R., Minikin, A., Pickering, M. A.,
23 and Petzold, A.: Particle sizing calibration with refractive index correction for light scattering
24 optical particle counters and impacts upon PCASP and CDP data collected during the Fennec
25 campaign, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 5, 1147-1163, doi:10.5194/amt-5-1147-2012, 2012.
- 26 Ryder, C. L., Highwood, E. J., Rosenberg, P. D., Trembath, J., Brooke, J. K., Bart, M., Dean,
27 A., Crosier, J., Dorsey, J., Brindley, H., Banks, J., Marsham, J. H., McQuaid, J. B., Sodemann,
28 H., and Washington, R.: Optical properties of Saharan dust aerosol and contribution from the
29 coarse mode as measured during the Fennec 2011 aircraft campaign, *Atmospheric Chemistry
30 and Physics*, 13 (1), 303 – 325, ISSN 1680-7316, 2013.



- 1 Seinfeld, J. H. and Pandis, S. N.: Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics: from Air Pollution to
2 Climate Change 2nd Edn., John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey, 2006.
- 3 Skamarock, W., Klemp, J. B., Dudhia, J., Gill, D. O., Barker, D., Duda, M. G., Huang, X. -Y.,
4 and Wang, W.: A description of the Advanced Research WRF version 3, NCAR Technical
5 Note NCAR/TN-475+STR, DOI: 10.5065/D68S4MVH, 2008.
- 6 Snider, J. R. and Petters, M. D.: Optical particle counter measurement of marine aerosol
7 hygroscopic growth, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 8, 1949-1962, doi:10.5194/acp-8-1949-2008, 2008.
- 8 Strapp, J. W., Leaitch, W. R., Liu P. S. K.: Hydrated and dried aerosol-size distribution
9 measurements from the particle measuring systems FSSP-300 probe and the deiced PSASP-
10 100X probe. J. Atmos. Oceanic Technol., 9, 548 – 555, 1992.
- 11 Strapp, J., Leaitch, W., Liu, P.: Hydrated and dried aerosol-size distribution measurements
12 from the particle measuring systems FSSP-300 probe and the deiced PSASP-100X probe, J.
13 Atmos. Oceanic Technol., 9, 548 – 555, 1992. Tang, I. N. and Munkelwitz, H. R.: Chemical and
14 size effects of hygroscopic aerosols on light scattering coefficients, J. Geophys. Res., 101,
15 19,245-19,250, 1996.
- 16 Tombrou, M., Bossioli, E., Kalogiros, J., Allan, J.D., Bacak, A., Biskos, G., Coe, H., Dandou,
17 A., Kouvarakis, G., Mihalopoulos, N., Percival, C.J., Protonotariou, A.P., and Szabó-Takács,
18 B.: Physical and chemical processes of air masses in the Aegean Sea during Etesians: Aegean-
19 GAME airborne campaign, Science of The Total Environment, 506–507, 201-216,
20 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.10.098, 2015.
- 21 Toon, O. B., Pollack, J. B., and Khare, B. N.: The optical constants of several atmospheric
22 aerosol species: ammonium sulphate, aluminium oxide and sodium chloride, J. Geophys. Res.,
23 81, 5733–5748, 1976.
- 24 Trembath, J., Bart, M., and Brooke, J.: FAAM Technical Note: Efficiencies of modified
25 Rosemount housings for sampling aerosol on a fast atmospheric research aircraft, Facility for
26 Airborne Atmospheric Measurements, FAAM, Cranfield, UK,
27 <http://www.faam.ac.uk/index.php/component/docman/catview/140-science-instruments> (last
28 access: 7 January 2013), 2012.
- 29 Turnbull, K.: PSAP Corrections, Met Office, OBR, UK Met Office, Exeter, UK, Technical
30 Note No. 80, [http://www.faam.ac.uk/index.php/component/docman/catview/140-science-](http://www.faam.ac.uk/index.php/component/docman/catview/140-science-instruments)
31 [instruments](http://www.faam.ac.uk/index.php/component/docman/catview/140-science-instruments) (last access: 7 January 2013), 2010.



- 1 Vance, A. K., Abel, S. J., Cotton, R. J., and Woolley, A. M.: Performance of WVSS-II
2 hygrometers on the FAAM research aircraft, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 8, 1617-1625,
3 doi:10.5194/amt-8-1617-2015, 2015.
- 4 Vaughan, M., Young, S., Winker, D., Powell, K., Omar, A., Liu, Z., Hu, Y., and Hostetler, C.:
5 Fully automated analysis of space-based lidar data: An overview of the CALIPSO retrieval
6 algorithms and data products, *Proc. SPIE*, 5575, 16–30, 2004.
- 7 Weast, R. C. (Ed): *CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics* (67th edition), CRC press, Boca
8 Raton, Florida, 1985.
- 9 Weber, R.J., Guo, H., Russell, A.G., Nenes, A.: High aerosol acidity despite declining
10 atmospheric sulfate concentrations over the past 15 years, *Nature Geosci.*,
11 doi:10.1038/ngeo2665, 2016.
- 12 Weinzierl, B., Petzold, A., Esselborn, M., Wirth, M., Rasp, K., Kandler, K., Schutz, L., Koepke,
13 P. and Fiebig, M.: Airborne measurements of dust layer properties, particle size distribution
14 and mixing state of Saharan dust during SAMUM 2006, *Tellus B*, 61: 96–117, doi:
15 10.1111/j.1600-0889.2008.00392.x, 2009.
- 16 Winker, D. M., Vaughan, M. A., Omar, A., Hu, Y., Powell, K. A., Liu, Z., Hunt, W. H., and
17 Young, S. A.: Overview of the CALIPSO Mission and CALIOP Data Processing Algorithms,
18 *J. Atmos. Oceanic Technol.*, 26, 2310–2323, doi:
19 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/2009JTECHA1281.1>, 2009.
- 20 Young, S. A. and Vaughan, M. A.: The retrieval of profiles of particulate extinction from
21 Cloud-Aerosol Lidar Infrared Pathfinder Satellite Observations (CALIPSO) data: Algorithm
22 description, *J. Atmos. Ocean. Tech.*, 26, 1105–1119, 2009.
- 23 Yuan, Y.X.: Recent advance in trust region algorithms, *Mathematical Programming Series B*,
24 151, 249–281, 2015.
- 25 Ziemba, L. D., Thornhill, L., Ferrare, R., Barrick, J., Beyersdorf, A., Chen, G., Crumeyrolle,
26 S., Hair, J. W., Hostetler, C., Hudgins, C., Obland, M., Rogers, R. R., Scarino, A. J., Winstead,
27 E. L., and Anderson B. E.: Airborne observations of aerosol extinction by in situ and remote-
28 sensing techniques: Evaluation of particle hygroscopicity, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 40, 417-422,
29 doi:10.1029/2012GL054428, 2013.



- 1 Table 1. The in-situ instruments and data acquired from the FAAM BAe-146 research aircraft
 2 during the ACEMED campaign.

Property measured	Instrument	Important information about the data
Dry aerosol number size distribution	Passive cavity aerosol spectrometer probe 100-X (PCASP)	Nominal size range: 0.05 - 1.5 μm (radius)
	1.129 GRIMM Technik Sky-Optical Particle Counter (GRIMM)	Nominal size range: 0.125 - 16 μm (radius)
Dry aerosol chemical composition and mass	Aerodyne time-of-flight aerosol mass spectrometer (AMS)	Nominal size range: 0.025 - 0.4 μm (radius)
Dry aerosol light scattering coefficient at 450, 550 and 700 nm	TSI Integrating Nephelometer 3563 (Nephelometer)	We consider a sampling cut-off at 1.5 μm (radius)
Dry aerosol light absorption coefficient at 567 nm	Radianc Research Particle Soot Absorption Photometer (PSAP)	We consider a sampling cut-off at 1.5 μm (radius)
HCN	Chemical Ionization Mass Spectrometer (CIMS)	-
CO	Fast fluorescence CO analyser	-
Water vapor volume mixing ratio	Water Vapor Sensing System version two (WVSS-II)	-
Air temperature	Rosemount deiced temperature sensor	-
Static air pressure	Reduced Vertical Separation Minimum system	-



- 1 Table 2. Refractive indices and densities used for the refractive index calculation from AMS
- 2 data acquired from the FAAM BAe-146 research aircraft during the ACEMED campaign.

Chemical species	Refractive index at 550 nm	Density ($g\ cm^{-3}$)	References
Ammonium Sulphate (NH_4) ₂ SO ₄	1.53-0i	1.77	Toon (1976)
Ammonium Nitrate NH ₄ NO ₃	1.611-0i	1.8	Weast (1985)
Organic carbon of the Swannee River Fulvic Acid	1.538-0.02i	1.5	Dinar et al. (2006) Dinar et al. (2008)

3



1 Table 3. Retrieved number size distribution parameters of dry and ambient particles, for the
 2 retrieval above land. The total number concentration and geometric standard deviation is the
 3 same for dry and ambient particles.

Height (km)	Dry particles			Ambient particles		
	Total number concentrations N_{fd}, N_{cd}	Geometric mean radii r_{mfd}, r_{mcd} (μm)	Geometric standard deviations σ_{fd}, σ_{cd}	Total number concentrations N_{fa}, N_{ca}	Geometric mean radii r_{mfa}, r_{mca} (μm)	Geometric standard deviations σ_{fa}, σ_{ca}
3.2	778, 0.7	0.1, 0.7	1.5, 1.6	778, 0.7	0.2, 1.1	1.5, 1.6
2.7	1317, 0.9	0.1, 0.5	1.5, 1.9	1317, 0.9	0.1, 0.7	1.5, 1.9
1.8	726, 0.8	0.1, 0.4	1.4, 1.9	726, 0.8	0.1, 0.5	1.4, 1.9

4



1 Table 4. Retrieved refractive indices of dry and ambient particles, for the retrieval above land.

Height (km)	Retrieved refractive index	
	Dry particles	Ambient particles
3.2	1.54+i0.008	1.38+ i0.002
2.7	1.60+i0.018	1.46+ i0.008
1.8	1.58+i0.021	1.55+i0.019

2



1 Table 5. Same as Table 3, for the retrieval above ocean.

Height (km)	Dry particles			Ambient particles		
	Total number concentrations N_{fd}, N_{cd}	Geometric mean radii r_{mfd}, r_{mcd} (μm)	Geometric standard deviations σ_{fd}, σ_{cd}	Total number concentrations N_{fa}, N_{ca}	Geometric mean radii r_{mfa}, r_{mca} (μm)	Geometric standard deviations σ_{fa}, σ_{ca}
3.2	2814, 0.2	0.05, 1.6	1.8, 1.4	2814, 0.2	0.06, 1.9	1.8, 1.4
2.7	1500, 0.6	0.08, 0.6	1.5, 2.4	1500, 0.6	0.08, 0.6	1.5, 2.4
2.1	1833, 0.6	0.08, 1.3	1.6, 1.8	1833, 0.6	0.08, 1.4	1.6, 1.8
1.3	1427, 0.4	0.1, 1.1	1.6, 1.6	1427, 0.4	0.1, 1.1	1.6, 1.6


2



1 Table 6. Same as Table 4, for the retrieval above ocean.

Height (km)	Retrieved refractive index	
	Dry particles	Ambient particles
3.2	1.59+i0.01	1.48+i0.006
2.7	1.66+i0.019	1.6+i0.015
2.1	1.59+i0.015	1.56+i0.013
1.3	1.50+i0.015	1.50+i0.014


2



1

2


3 Figure 1. IRRA iterative retrieval scheme used for the estimation of the ambient particle
 4 microphysical property profiles, based on the in-situ and remote sensing measurements
 5 available during the ACEMED campaign, and the hygroscopic growth modelling of
 6 ISORROPIA II.



1

2


3 Figure 2: Number size distributions used for the aerosol optical property calculations. The red
4 line denotes the bimodal lognormal fit on the measurements, the black dash line the truncated
5 size distribution used to model the dry in-situ measured scattering and absorption coefficients,
6 and the blue line the size distribution used to model the ambient backscatter and extinction
7 coefficient lidar measurements. The measured in-situ number size distributions are denoted
8 with pink and light blue dots, for PCASP and GRIMM OPC data, respectively. The data are
9 acquired at 2.7 km above Thessaloniki, on 9 September 2011, at 01:04-01:12 UTC, during the
10 ACEMED campaign.



1

2


3 Figure 3. The measured dry volume size distributions from PCASP (pink) and GRIMM (light
4 blue), acquired at 2.7 km above Thessaloniki, on 9 September 2011, at 01:04-01:12 UTC. The
5 vertical error bars denote the volume uncertainty estimates, and the horizontal error bars the bin
6 width uncertainties. The black lines indicate the column ambient size distributions from
7 AERONET before (at September 8, 2011, 15:28 UTC, denoted with filled circles) and after the
8 flight (at September 9, 2011, 08:25 UTC, denoted with open circles).



1

2


3 Figure 4. The measured dry mass concentrations from AMS for organics, sulphate, ammonium
4 and nitrate, acquired during the ACEMED campaign, above Thessaloniki, on 9 September
5 2011, at 00:05-01:45 UTC. The error bars denote the horizontal variability on each SLR.






1

2

3 Figure 5. Hygroscopicity parameter calculated with ISORROPIA II for the flight above
4 Thessaloniki, Greece, on September 9, 2011, during the ACEMED campaign.






4

5 Figure 7. a) The Leosphere ALS450 lidar range corrected signal at 355 nm, for the FAAM BAe-
 6 146 flight, above Thessaloniki, Greece, on September 9, 2011, at 00:05-00:27 UTC (the white




- 1 line separates the ocean and land parts, at 40.6 N latitude), b) The CALIPSO attenuated
- 2 backscatter coefficient at 532 nm and the c) CALIPSO aerosol subtypes (VFM), for the
- 3 CALIPSO overpass at 00:30 UTC. The light blue and orange rectangles mark the area used to
- 4 compare with the FAAM BAe-146 flight measurements above ocean and land, respectively.



1


2

3 Figure 8. Averaged RH measurements from the WVSS-II instrument, above land (orange
4 circles for cloud-free area and pink circles for cloudy area) and ocean (light blue circles), during
5 the FAAM BAe-146 aircraft flight above Thessaloniki, Greece, on September 9, 2011, at 00:48-
6 01:50 UTC.



2


3 Figure 9. a) 24-hour emission sensitivity (in logarithmic scale) [$\text{s m}^3 \text{kg}^{-1}$] for particles that
4 originate from the first 2.5 km of the FLEXPART-WRF model and are observed on 9
5 September 2011, 00:30 UTC at heights between 1-4 km above land and ocean, at Thessaloniki
6 area. The red triangles indicate MODIS hot spot locations during that period. b) Cross-section
7 of two-hour average concentration of smoke TPM ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) predicted with the dispersion model
8 forward simulation along the FAAM-BAe-146 flight, on September 9, 2011, 00:00-02:00 UTC,
9 indicated with the dashed black line in (a).



1

2


3 Figure 10. HCN concentration during the FAAM BAe-146 flight above Thessaloniki, Greece,
4 on September 9, 2011, at 00:48-01:50 UTC. The data are marked for the flight path above land
5 (orange circles) and ocean (light blue circles). The black line at 280 ppt marks the biomass
6 burning plume threshold detection, equal to six standard deviations of the median background
7 HCN concentration (Le Breton et al., 2013).



1

2


3 Figure 11. Airborne in-situ and remote sensing optical properties, along with the corresponding
 4 calculated optical properties. From left to right: scattering coefficients at 450, 550 and 700
 5 nm from TSI nephelometer (blue, green and red stars for measurements and dots for calculations),
 6 single scattering albedo (SSA) at 550 nm from PSAP and TSI nephelometer (black stars for
 7 measurements and dots for calculations), backscatter and extinction coefficients at 355 nm (blue
 8 line) retrieved from the lidar measurements, along with the corresponding calculated optical
 9 properties for dry and ambient particles (red and dark blue dots, respectively), and the calculated
 10 lidar ratio at 355 nm for dry and ambient particles. The data refer to the flight segment above
 11 land, above Thessaloniki, Greece, on September 9, 2011, at 00:20-01:42 UTC. The error bars
 12 in the first two plots denote the spatial variability of the measurements during each SLR, rather
 13 than instrumental uncertainty. The calculated optical properties corresponding to the in-situ
 14 measurements are calculated with truncated size distributions at 1.5 μm , whereas for the remote
 15 sensing calculations the size distributions are not truncated.



1

2

3 Figure 12. Retrieved number (left) and volume (right) size distributions along with the airborne
 4 in-situ measurements from PCASP and GRIMM OPCs at the altitudes of 1.8, 2.7 and 3.2 km.
 5 The red line denotes the dry particles and the blue line the ambient particles. The PCASP and
 6 GRIMM size distributions are truncated at 1.5 μm , showing the effect of the inlets in the
 7 sampled volume. The data refer to the flight segment above land, above Thessaloniki, Greece,
 8 on September 9, 2011, at 00:56-01:42 UTC.




1

2

3 Figure 13. As for Fig. 11, for the flight segment above ocean, above Thessaloniki, on September


4 9, 2011, at 00:06-01:50 UTC.



1


2

3 Figure 14. As for Fig. 12, for the flight segment above ocean, above Thessaloniki, on
 4 September 9, 2011, at 00:45-01:50 UTC.



1
2


3 Figure 15. Backscatter (left), extinction (middle) and LR (right) at 532 nm, calculated from the
4 retrieved ambient particle properties of FAAM BAe-146 flight above land (dark blue circles),
5 and provided by the CALIPSO L2 product (green line) for the CALIPSO overpass above
6 Thessaloniki, Greece, on September 9, 2011, at 00:30 UTC. The errorbars in CALIPSO profiles
7 denote the spatial variability and not the uncertainty of the CALIPSO L2 product. The
8 calculated dry particle optical properties are also shown with red circles.



1

2

3 Figure 16. As for Fig.15, for the flight segment above the ocean.



1

2

3 Figure 17. The scattering growth factor at 532 nm, acquired from the retrieved aerosol
4 microphysical properties during the ACEMED campaign, above Thessaloniki, on 9 September
5 2011.