Use of an Uncrewed Aerial System to Investigate Aerosol Direct and Indirect Radiative Forcing Effects in the Marine Atmosphere

Patricia K. Quinn[1], Timothy S. Bates[2], Derek J. Coffman[1], James E. Johnson[2], and Lucia M. Upchurch[2]

[1]NOAA Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory, Seattle, WA 98115, USA
[2]University of Washington Cooperative Institute for Climate, Ocean, and Ecosystem Studies, Seattle, WA 98105, USA

Correspondence to: Patricia K. Quinn (patricia.k.quinn@noaa.gov)

Abstract

An uncrewed aerial system (UAS) has been developed for observations of aerosol and cloud properties relevant to aerosol direct and indirect forcing in the marine atmosphere. The UAS is a hybrid quadrotor – fixed wing aircraft designed for launch and recovery from a confined space such as a ship deck. Two payloads, Clear Sky and Cloudy Sky, house instrumentation required to characterize aerosol radiative forcing effects. The observing platform (UAS plus payloads) has been deployed from a ship and from a coastal site for observations in the marine atmosphere. We describe here the details of the UAS, the payloads, and first observations from the *TowBoatUS Richard L. Becker* (March 2022) and from the Tillamook UAS Test Range (August 2022). The development of this UAS technology for flights from ships and coastal locations is expected to greatly increase observations of aerosol radiative effects in the marine boundary layer over both temporal and spatial scales.

1. Introduction

Atmospheric aerosol particles affect the Earth's radiation budget directly by scattering and absorbing incoming solar radiation and indirectly by taking up water and forming cloud droplets. Chemical composition of the particles determines, in part, whether they scatter incoming solar radiation back to space which leads to cooling at the Earth's surface or absorb radiation and warm layers within the atmosphere (e.g., Li et al., 2022). The amount of heating depends on the vertical distribution of the absorbing aerosol layer, whether it is located above or below clouds, and the albedo of the surface (Takemura et al., 2002; Haywood and Ramaswamy, 1998). Whether particles act as cloud condensation nuclei (CCN) and nucleate cloud droplets depends on their size and chemical composition (Lohmann and Feichter, 2005). If the particles are large enough and contain sufficient soluble material, an increase in particle number can lead to an increase in cloud droplet number concentration and cloud albedo thereby leading to a cooling at the Earth's surface. The degree to which aerosol direct and indirect forcing are cooling the planet and offsetting warming by greenhouse gases is highly uncertain. According to the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), aerosols contribute the largest uncertainty in quantifying present-day climate change (IPCC, 2021).

Vertical profiles of aerosol and cloud properties are required to improve models and decrease uncertainties, particularly over oceans due to the susceptibility of marine clouds to small changes in aerosol concentrations

38   (Rosenfeld et al., 2019). While satellite observations have the advantage of providing global coverage, *in situ*
39   observations have the highest level of accuracy available to constrain radiative forcing and reduce uncertainties in
40   forcing estimates (Li et al., 2022). Crewed aircraft have been used for the past several decades to characterize
41   horizontal and vertical distributions of aerosol and cloud properties relevant to radiative forcing (e.g., Russell et al.,
42   1999; Yoon and Kim, 2006; Zhang et al., 2017). These measurements come at a relatively high cost and require
43   extensive logistical coordination.
44
45   Uncrewed aerial systems, or UAS, have the advantage of lower costs and flexibility and frequency of flights
46   compared to crewed aircraft. In addition, they offer higher spatial resolution due to their relatively slow flight speed.
47   UAS have been used since the mid-2000s to measure aerosol and cloud properties relevant to radiative forcing
48   including particle number concentration and size distribution, light absorption, aerosol optical depth, and cloud drop
49   number and effective radius. These measurements have been made with vertical-take-off-and landing (VTOL) UAS,
50   either quadcopters (Brady et al., 2016) or hexacopters (e.g., Chilinski et al., 2016; Aurell et al., 2017), or fixed wing
51   UAS (Corrigan et al., 2008; Bates et al., 2013). The VTOL UAS that have been used have the advantage of not
52   needing a catapult or runway to be launched and recovered but typically have short endurance (< 30 min) and a
53   limited altitude ceiling (~1 km). The fixed wing aircraft that have been used require a launch and recovery apparatus
54   or a runway but have the advantage of longer duration (hours) and can reach high altitudes of 3 km or more. While
55   some VTOLs used can carry relatively heavy payloads (6 kg or more), they can only do so for ~ 15 min while some
56   of the fixed wing UAS can carry heavy payloads for hours.
57
58   We report here on measurements of aerosol and cloud properties using a hybrid quadrotor – fixed wing UAS, the
59   Fixed Wing VTOL Rotator or FVR-55, developed by L3Harris Latitude Engineering. The hybrid quadrotor – fixed
60   wing concept combines the advantages of fixed wing flight with the ability to take-off and land vertically thus
61   eliminating the need for a runway and allowing for launch and recovery from ships and other confined spaces. The
62   FVR-55 has an endurance of more than 4 hours, a height ceiling of at least 3 km, and can carry a 6 kg payload.
63   NOAA PMEL has developed two UAS payloads -- one for the measurement of aerosol properties relevant to direct
64   radiative forcing (Clear Sky) and one for the measurement of aerosol and cloud properties relevant to indirect
65   forcing (Cloudy Sky). The FVR-55 and instrumentation in the two payloads are described herein along with the
66   results of its first shipboard and coastal flights.
67
68   **2. Methods**
69
70   **2.1. FVR-55**
71
72   The FVR-55, a class II medium endurance UAS, was developed by Latitude Engineering (since acquired by
73   L3Harris) with support from NOAA Phase I and II SBIRs (Small Business Innovation Research awards) (see Figure
74   1). The focus of the SBIR was a UAS able to carry a 5.5 kg payload, have a flight ceiling of up to 3 km, an

75   endurance of 3 hrs or more, and a pusher engine. The hybrid quadrotor – fixed wing design of the FVR-55 combines

76   the high-power density of electric motors and propellers with the high-energy density of a piston engine and liquid

77   fuel. The electric-quadrotor system is used during launch and recovery (high power, short endurance) and the gas

78   engine is used for fixed wing flight (low power, long endurance). The aircraft has an empty weight of 20 kg and a

79   maximum take-off weight of 29.5 kg. It cruises at 25 m s^{-1}. A Cloud Cap Piccolo autopilot flight controller is used

80   for autonomous flight. In the case of a lost link, the avionics guides the UAS to a predetermined return to base

81   location and, if communication is not re-established, to land at an established target. A mobile ground control station

82   (Windows tablet or Laptop with Datalink) provides ground command and control. A differential GPS (dGPS)

83   system is used for computing the aircraft's heading to circumvent the challenges created by the hull of a ship

84   distorting the Earth's magnetic field. The fuselage of the FVR-55 was designed for a maximum spacing of the two

85   dGPS antennas to increase the accuracy of the computed heading. VTOL motors and propellers provide enough

86   overall power for the FVR-55 to handle turbulence created by relative wind blowing over the superstructure of a

87   ship. A "pusher engine" is used to minimize contamination of sample air in flight by exhausting the engine aft while

88   the UAS flies forward. When the flight track includes circles or spirals engine contamination can occur but is readily

89   identifiable by short-lived increases in particle number concentration. We removed all data during these

90   contaminated periods. Individual payloads are integrated into a nose cone to allow for easy swapping of payloads

91   between flights. Payloads are powered at 12VDC from the plane with 200 W of power available.

92

93   Figure 1. FVR-55 with a) Clear Sky and b) Cloudy Sky payloads onboard.

94

95

96   Table 1. Specifications of the FVR-55 UAS.

97

Cruise speed	25 m s^{-1}
Weight with no payload or fuel	20 kg
Maximum take-off weight	29.5 kg
Endurance at maximum take-off weight including a 6.0 kg payload	4.5 hrs
Altitude ceiling	3,050 m
VTOL landing on land or ship	6 m x 6 m recover area
Size	4 m x 2.1 m x 0.3 m

98

99
100   **2.2. Payloads**

101

102   2.2.1. Inlet, sample air flow, and data acquisition

103   An isokinetic inlet is mounted on the nose cone of the FVR-55 to bring sample air into the payload under vacuum

104   (See Figure 2). No changes in particle number concentration coinciding with the UAS transitioning from large

105   spirals (1 to 2 km) to level leg flights were observed, indicating the performance of the isokinetic inlet was not

106   impacted by a spiral flight pattern. Since particle number concentrations are dominated by the submicron size range

107   this metric does not rule out effects in supermicron size ranges. In addition, the slow air speed of the UAS (25 m sec^{-1}

108   ) is expected to decrease impacts of the flight pattern on transmission of submicron particle through the inlet into

109   the payload. Wind tunnel tests are planned for the determination of the particle passing efficiency as a function of air

110   speed and particle size.

111

112   Sample air first encounters an inline water trap where water droplets are removed through impaction. The water trap

113   has two outlets -- one outlet is for the sample line, which is under vacuum. The larger outlet exhausts condensate

114   through a drain line that also allows excess ram air to passively exit the sampling system. Individual instruments

115   sub-sample off of the sample inlet. For the Clear Sky payload, a perma pure drier is located downstream of the water

116   trap and upstream of all instruments except the filter sampler (Figure 2a). For the Cloudy Sky payload, a perma pure

117   drier is located downstream of the water trap and upstream of the mSEMS (Figure 2b). A restricting orifice and filter

118   on the inlet of the perma pure sheath air combined with a vacuum on the outlet of the sheath air was used to remove

119   moisture from the sample stream. Instruments are cooled in flight by air flow through vent shafts cut into the nose

120   cone frame. More details about the instruments in each payload are provided in Sections 2.2.2. (Clear Sky) and

121   2.2.3. (Cloudy Sky).

122

123

124   *Figure 2. Flow diagrams for a) Clear Sky and b) Cloudy Sky payloads.*

125
126

127   The data acquisition (DAQ) systems for the two payloads use different hardware and software but have the same

128   functionality. The Clear Sky payload DAQ is an Arduino based system that uses Labview software to collect data

129   and control the sensors. The Cloudy Sky payload uses a Raspberry PI running Python software to do the same. Both

130   DAQ systems collect and save data locally (on the aircraft) and also send data back to a ground station via a Silvus

131   radio link in near real-time. This communication link allows for command and control of the sensors during flight as

132   well as the ability to save a second copy of the data on the ground.

133

134   **2.2.2. Clear Sky Payload**

135

136   The Clear Sky Payload was designed to measure aerosol properties required for quantification of aerosol direct

137   radiative effects. All of the initial instruments in the payload were built by Brechtel Manufacturing Inc. (BMI,

138   Haywood, CA; ACCESS Model 9400) under a NOAA SBIR. The payload was first flown on a MANTA C1 UAS

139   from Ny-Ålesund, Svalbard, Norway in 2011 (Bates et al., 2013). The instruments included a mixing condensation

140   particle counter (MCPC) for measuring total particle number, or condensation nuclei (CN) concentration; a three-

141   wavelength Single Channel Tricolor Absorption Photometer (STAP) for measuring the aerosol light absorption

142   coefficient; and a multi-channel filter sampler for the collection of aerosol samples for post-flight chemical analysis.

143   Two instruments were added to the payload in 2014 including a Printed Optical Particle Spectrometer (POPS) for

144   the measurement of particle number size distribution (0.14 to 3 μm) (Telg et al., 2017) and a Mini Scanning Aerosol

145   Solar Photometer (mini-SASP) for the measurement of sun and sky radiance (Murphy et al., 2016). The payload also

146   includes Rotronic HC2-S3 and Innovative Sensor Technology (IST) HYT271 temperature and humidity sensors.

147   The updated version of the Clear Sky Payload was flown during a second campaign from Ny-Ålesund in 2015 (Telg

148   et al., 2017). A perma pure drier is plumbed into the sample line to provide dried air to the MCPC, STAP, and

149   POPS. The RH of the sampled air downstream of the drier was $34 \pm 1.6\%$, or ~ 8% lower than ambient RH, for

150   results reported here from a high-altitude flight off the coast of Oregon in August 2022. The Clear Sky Payload plus

151   the FVR-55 nose cone weighs 6 kg. The mini-SASP mounted on top of the FVR-55 nose cone is shown in Figure

152   1a. Table 2 lists the instruments in the Clear Sky Payload that were integrated into the FVR-55 nose cone. Sampling

153 rates were 1 sec for all real time instruments while filter samples were collected over a period of minutes to hours.

154 Further details on each instrument are provided below. Comparisons between Clear Sky and bench top instruments

155 are presented in Sect. 3.

156

157 Table 2. Measured parameters and instrumentation in the Clear Sky Payload.

Clear Sky Payload Instrumentation			
Measured Parameter	**Derivable Parameter(s)**	**Instrument**	**Uncertainty**
Total particle number concentration, > 0.005 μm		Brechtel Mixing Condensation Particle Counter (MCPC)	± 8%[a]
Particle number size distribution, 0.14 to 3 μm	Scattering coefficient, asymmetry parameter, Ångstrom exponent[b]	Portable Optical Particle Spectrometer (POPS)	± 10% particle concentration accuracy
Aerosol light absorption coefficient (dry) (450, 525, and 624 nm)	Absorption aerosol optical depth (AOD_{abs}) Single scattering albedo when paired with scattering coefficient derived from the measured number size distribution	Brechtel Single Channel Tricolor Absorption Photometer (STAP)	± 33% at 1.0 $Mm^{-1, c}$
Sun and sky radiance (460.3, 550.4, 671.2, and 860.7 nm)	Aerosol optical depth (AOD)	Mini Scanning Aerosol Solar Photometer (mini-SASP)	0.01 detection limit (AOD)
Chemical composition (Na^+, NH_4^+, K^+, Mg^{2+}, Ca^{2+}, Cl^-, NO_3, Br^-, SO_4^{-2})		Brechtel Multi-Channel Chemical Sampler	± 5%[d] ± 8.5%[e]
T		Rotronic HC2-S3 IST HYT271	± 0.1°C (<15 s)[f] ± 0.2°C (<15 s)[f]
RH		Rotronic HC2-S3 IST HYT271	± 0.8% (<5 s)[f] ± 1.8% (< 4 s)[f]

158 [a]Coincidence corrected concentration uncertainty at 10,000 cm^{-3}
159 [b]Using Mie theory
160 [c]Bates et al. (2013)
161 [d]Sample flow accuracy (uncertainty due to Chemical Sampler only)
162 [e]Overall uncertainty for the measurement of inorganic ions
163 [f]Time response

164

165 The MCPC (modified BMI Model 1710) has a 0.18 s response time, grows particles in a butanol-saturated flow, and

166 counts particles larger than 5 nm in diameter. Modifications to the butanol handling components of the commercial

167 Model 1710 were implemented to address the high vibration environment of the UAS (Bates et al., 2013). The

168 MCPC has a ± 8% coincidence corrected uncertainty for a particle concentration of 10,000 cm^{-3}.

169

170 The STAP provides real-time measurement of the aerosol light absorption coefficient at 450, 525, and 624 nm. Light

171 is transmitted from an LED source through a sample and a reference filter. The filter transmission is the ratio of the

172 signals from the two filters. The light absorption coefficient is proportional to the rate of decrease of light

173 transmittance divided by the flow rate of air through the filter (Bond et al., 1999). The raw data are averaged into 60

174   sec values for the calculation of the rate of decrease of light transmittance. The minimum detectable level, MDL,

175   defined as the peak-to-peak noise with the instrument running particle free air, is 0.2 Mm^{-1}. Errors in the STAP

176   measurement include noise in the transmission value, uncertainty in the measured flow rate, and uncertainty in the

177   measured filter spot area (Anderson et al., 1999). A quadrature sum of these errors yields a relative uncertainty of $\pm$

178   33% at 1.0 Mm^{-1}. In addition, light scattering by particles collected on the sample filter can lead to an

179   overestimation of absorption values by ~2% of the observed scattering coefficient (Bond et al., 1999). A correction

180   for scattering was not performed on the data collected in August 2022. The temperature and relative humidity of the

181   sample air flow drawn into the STAP was $12 \pm 1.6°C$ and $34 \pm 1.6\%$, respectively, for conditions encountered off of

182   the coast of Oregon in August 2022.

183

184   The Brechtel Multi-Channel Chemical Sampler has eight filter holders (13 mm diameter) and a magnetically-driven

185   rotary valve manifold that distributes the vacuum from a central pump to each of the sampling channels. A remote

186   serial command is used to move the rotary valve to a new sampling channel in flight. The sample flow rate is 2.5 L

187   min^{-1} which is measured by the pressure drop through a laminar flow element. One of the eight channels can be used

188   to maintain flow when a filter sample is not being collected. 13 mm Millipore Fluoropore 1.0 μm PTFE membrane

189   filters were used for sample collection. For the measurements reported here, filters were extracted post-flight in a

190   17% methanol/water solution for analysis by ion chromatography (IC). The volume of liquid used to extract the

191   filters was minimized to 1 mL to increase the sensitivity of the method. Filters were sonicated for 30 min. The filter

192   extract was injected into a Metrohm 940 Professional IC Vario with 889 IC Sample Center autosamplers and

193   analyzed for inorganic cations (Na^+, NH_4^+, K^+, Ca^{2+}, Mg^{2+}) and anions (Cl^-, NO_3^-, SO_4^{2-}). A Metrosep C6 - 100/4.0

194   column, 2 mMol HNO_3 eluent, and a flow rate 0.9 ml min^{-1} were used for the cation analysis. Metrosep A Supp 5 -

195   250/4.0 and Phenomenex Star Ion A300- 100/4.6mm columns in serial, a 1 mMol $NaHCO_3$ and 5 mMol Na_2CO_3

196   eluant, and a flow rate of 0.7 ml min^{-1} were used for the anion analysis. Sources of uncertainty in the chemical

197   analysis include air volume sampled ($\pm$ 5%), the extract liquid volume ($\pm$ 3.5%), 2 times the standard deviation of

198   the blank, and precision/calibration of the method ($\pm$ 5%). Total average overall uncertainty was $\pm$ 8.5%. Only ion

199   concentrations above 2 times the standard deviation of the filter blank are reported here.

200

201   Particle number size distributions from 0.14 to 3.0 μm in diameter were measured with a POPS (Telg et al., 2017).

202   The POPS detects and sizes single particles based on the dependence of the scattering intensity on particle size. A

203   405 nm laser diode is used as a light source. The light scattering signal is collected at scattering angles between 38°

204   and 142° (Gao et al., 2016). As for the MCPC and the STAP, the temperature and RH of the sample air drawn into

205   the POPS was $12 \pm 1.6°C$ and $34 \pm 1.6\%$, respectively, for conditions encountered off of the coast of Oregon in

206   August 2022. Uncertainty for the POPs is ~10% of the total particle concentration.

207

208   Sun and sky radiance were measured with a miniSASP at wavelengths of 460.3, 550.4, 671.2, and 860.7 nm

209   (Murphy et al., 2016). Four independent telescopes, each with a unique interference filter, are housed in a single

210   aluminium block. A heater is integrated with a temperature controller to minimize condensation and keep the

211   photodiodes at an approximately constant temperature. The miniSASP scans the sky at the elevation angle of the

212   sun. A full azimuth revolution is made in about 30 s and measurements are made every 30 ms. Sun angle is

213   corrected for the tilt of the UAS. Each revolution of the miniSASP's telescopes results in a distinct peak

214   corresponding to the intensity of direct sun light. The aerosol optical depth of an atmospheric layer on the slant path

215   is the difference between the sun signal and Rayleigh scattering. Flight data from Svalbard in 2015 show a detection

216   limit better than 0.01 in AOD for a vertical profile through the bottom few kilometers of the atmosphere.

217

218   **2.2.3. Cloudy Sky Payload**

219

220   The Cloudy Sky payload was designed to characterize the relationship between cloud drop number concentration

221   and particle number concentration and size below, within, and above cloud. The Cloudy Sky payload has a Brechtel

222   miniature Scanning Electrical Mobility Sizer (mSEMS) for the measurement of particle number size distribution

223   (0.01 to 0.3 μm) and total particle number concentration. A perma pure drier is plumbed into the sample line to

224   provide dried air to the mSEMS. The RH of the sheath air was measured during operation. The RH of the dried

225   sample air depended on ambient conditions but ranged from 35 to 45% for the flights from Tillamook. Operating

226   conditions for the mSEMS included a sheath flow rate of 2.5 lpm, sample flow rate of 0.36 lpm, and a size scan of

227   30 bins at 1 sec per bin resulting in a sampling rate of 30 sec for each size distribution.

228

229   A miniature and light weight Cloud Drop Probe (DMT, CDP-2) is used to measure cloud droplet number

230   concentration and size distribution between 2 and 50 μm. The payload also has Rotronic HC2-S3 and IST HYT271

231   temperature and humidity sensors. Cloudy Sky instrumentation and specifications are listed in Table 3. The Cloudy

232   Sky payload was integrated into an FVR-55 nose cone in March 2021 at the L3Harris facility in Tucson, Arizona.

233   The payload then flew three flights onboard the FVR-55 at the Florence Military Range up to an altitude of 2.6 km.

234   The cloud droplet probe mounted on top of the FVR-55 nose cone is shown in Figure 1b. Further details on each

235   instrument are provided below. Comparisons between Cloudy Sky and bench top instruments are presented in Sect.

236   3.

237

238   The Brechtel mSEMS (Model 9404) provided particle number size distributions for diameters between 0.01 to 0.3

239   μm every 30 seconds. Total particle number concentration was obtained by integrating the number concentration

240   over the measured size distribution. The RH of sample air drawn into the mSEMS was $45 \pm 0.74\%$, which was ~

241   40% below ambient RH, for the conditions encountered during flights off the coast of Oregon in August 2022. As

242   for the Clear Sky payload, the MCPC has an $\pm 8\%$ coincidence corrected uncertainty for a particle concentration of

243   10,000 cm^{-3}.

244

245   A DMT CDP-2 was mounted on the top of a FVR-55 nose cone for measurement of cloud drop number

246   concentration for diameters from 2 to 50 μm and retrieval of liquid water content. Liquid water content was derived

247   from the cloud droplet size distribution provided by the DMT CDP-2. The CDP-2 measures cloud droplet counts

248 and sizes them into 30 bins from 2-30 um. The count in each bin is converted to a concentration using the cross-

249 sectional surface area of the sensing beam (0.24 um^2) and the speed of the aircraft to determine the volume of air

250 sampled per second. Once the concentration is known, the volume of cloud droplets per volume is calculated and

251 converted to mass per volume assuming density of 1.0.

252

253 Table 3. Measured parameters and instrumentation in the Cloudy Sky Payload

Cloudy Sky Payload Instrumentation			
Measured Parameter	**Derivable Parameter(s)**	**Instrument**	**Uncertainty**
Particle number size distribution and total number concentration (0.01 to 0.3 μm in diameter)	Scattering coefficient, asymmetry parameter, Ångstrom exponent[b]	Brechtel miniature Scanning Electrical Mobility Sizer (mSEMS) coupled with a MCPC detector	± 8%[a]
Cloud droplet number concentration and size (2 to 50 μm)	Cloud liquid water content Cloud droplet effective diameter	DMT miniature Cloud Drop Probe (CDP-2)	
T		Rotronic HC2-S3 IST HYT271	± 0.1°C[d] (<15 s)[b] ± 0.2°C (<15 s)[b]
RH		Rotronic HC2-S3 IST HYT271	± 0.8%[d] (<5 s)[b] ± 1.8% (< 4 s)[b]

254 [a]Coincidence corrected concentration uncertainty at 10,000 cm^{-3}
255 [b]Response time
256

257 **3. Comparison of UAS and bench top measurements**

258

259 The degree of agreement between the bench and payload measurements of particle number concentration and

260 absorption coefficient were evaluated by calculating the relative difference between the measurements as

261

262 $$relative\ difference\ = \left(\frac{x_{bench} - x_{uas}}{x_{bench}}\right) \qquad (1)$$

263

264 where x_{bench} and x_{uas} are the bench and UAS measured values, respectively. The overall experimental uncertainty was

265 calculated as

266

267 $$experimental\ uncertainty = [(\delta x_{bench})^2 + [(\delta x_{uas})^2]^{1/2} / x_{bench} \qquad (2)$$

268

269 where δx_{bench} and δx_{uas} are the uncertainties in the bench and UAS measurements, respectively, as reported in Tables

270 1 and 2 and taken from manufacturer specifications.

271

272

3.1. Particle number concentration

Particle number concentrations measured by the Clear and Cloudy Sky payloads and bench top instruments were compared during ATOMIC (The Atlantic Tradewind Ocean-Atmosphere Mesoscale Interaction Campaign), a cruise in the tropical North Atlantic (Quinn et al., 2021). The comparison took place on January 24, 2020 from 18:40 to 22:00 UTC. For both the payload and the bench top instruments, sample air was drawn through a 5 m mast 18 m.a.s.l. and forward of the ship's stack. The mast was automatically rotated into the wind to maintain nominally isokinetic flow. Air entered the inlet through a 5-cm diameter hole, passed through a 7° expansion cone, and then into the 20-cm inner diameter sampling mast. The flow through the mast was 1 m^3 min^{-1}. The transmission efficiency of the inlet for particles with aerodynamic diameters < 6.5 μm is greater than 95% (Bates et al., 2002). The bottom 1.5 m of the mast was heated so that the sample air was at an RH of 60 ± 5%. Stainless steel tubes extending into the heated portion of the mast were connected to bench top instrumentation and payload inlets with conductive silicone tubing.

A bench top MAGIC210 particle counter, which measures particles with diameters greater than 0.005 μm, was compared to the Clear Sky MCPC and the Cloudy Sky mSEMS (Figure 3, top of plot). Differential Mobility Particle Sizers (DMPS) and an Aerodynamic Particle Sizer (APS) were used for the comparison to the Clear Sky POPS for particles with diameters greater than 0.14 μm (Figure 3, bottom of plot). A combination of an Aitken DMPS and an Accumulation DMPS measures the size distribution between 0.002 and 0.8 μm in geometric diameter. The APS measures the size distribution between 0.85 and 10.37 μm in aerodynamic diameter. The DMPS and APS size distributions were merged by converting the APS data from aerodynamic to geometric values using calculated densities and associated water mass at 60% RH based on the range of measured chemical compositions reported by Quinn et al. (2002). The DMPSs and APS are housed in a temperature-controlled box at the base of the inlet to maintain a uniform RH across all instruments. Given that the payloads and bench instruments were measured from a common inlet and the residence time in the tubing to the payloads was short, it is likely that RH differences in the sample air delivered to the payload and bench instruments were negligible over the comparison period. The payload data were averaged into 5-minute time periods to match the DMPS/APS scan times.

The average difference between the bench MAGIC CPC and the Clear Sky payload MCPC number concentration was 22 ± 42 cm^{-3}, resulting in an average relative difference of 5.2 ± 0.9%. The relative difference is smaller than the overall experimental uncertainty of 9.5 ± 0.09% indicating good agreement. The coefficient of determination, r^2, for the comparison was 0.99. These results indicate that the trends in the two measures of number concentration agreed well. However, the bench instrument was consistently higher by about 5%. Differences could be due to particle losses in sampling lines. Particle losses will be quantified in future experiments.

The average difference between the bench MAGIC CPC and the Cloudy Sky integrated number concentration from the mSEMS was -1.9 ± 9.8 cm^{-3}, resulting in an average relative difference of -0.19 ± 0.67%. This difference is

310 smaller than the overall experimental uncertainty of 10.2 ±0.72% indicating good agreement. A correlation between

311 the two measurements resulted in an r^2 value of 0.86. The mSEMS was, in general lower than the MAGIC CPC for

312 the first half of the comparison and higher for the second half, most likely due to changes in the mSEMS inversion

313 routine during the experiment.

314

315 The average difference between the bench DMPS/APS and the Clear Sky POPS for diameters greater than 0.14 μm

316 was -11 ± 7.6 cm^{-3}, resulting in an average relative difference of -31 ± 6.7%. The overall experimental uncertainty

317 was 13 ± 0.67% indicating a systemic difference resulting in consistently lower values measured by the DMPS/APS

318 than the POPS, again likely associated with losses in sampling lines. The r^2 value for the correlation was 0.90.

319

320 *Figure 3. Comparison of particle number concentrations between bench and payload instruments for diameters*

321 *greater than 0.005 μm (top half of plot) and 0.14 μm (bottom half of plot) during ATOMIC on January 24, 2020.*

322 *Coefficients of determination, r^2, are for the regression between the payload CN concentration and the bench*

323 *instrument used for each size range.*

324

325

326 **3.2. Absorption coefficient**

327

328 The Clear Sky STAP (525 nm) was compared to a Radiance Research PSAP (530 nm) at PMEL on August 27, 2018

329 from 21:06 to 22:00 UTC. The 5 m mast described above was used to deliver sample air to the bench top PSAP and

330 to the Clear Sky payload. The bench PSAP was downstream of a Berner multi-jet cascade impactor with a 50%

331   aerodynamic cut-off diameter of 1.0 μm and a PermaPure nafion dryer (model PR-94). The Clear Sky STAP also

332   was downstream of a PermaPure nafion dryer so that both absorption signals were measured at < 25% RH. Data

333   were averaged to 30 s to minimize noise. A time series of the comparison and a correlation plot are shown in Figure

334   4a and b, respectively. The average absolute difference between the bench PSAP and the UAS STAP was $0.11 \pm$

335   0.34 Mm^{-1}. The average relative difference was $3.1 \pm 12\%$, which was smaller than the overall experimental

336   uncertainty of $32 \pm 3.9\%$. The r^2 value for the correlation was 0.81.

337

338   *Figure 4. Comparison of the Bench top PSAP and the Clear Sky UAS STAP as a) a time series and b) a*
339   *correlation plot. The comparison was done of ambient air at PMEL on 8/27/18.*
340

341
342

343   **3.3. Aerosol optical depth**

344

345   Aerosol optical depth (AOD) from the miniSASP was compared to a Solar Light Microtops during Flight 5 over the

346   Tillamook airport. The lowest altitude flown while the payload was still powered on before landing was 660 m. The

347   miniSASP measured at 550.4 nm and the Microtops at 500 nm. The miniSASP AODs were adjusted to 500 nm

348   using the Microtops-measured Ångstrom Exponent. Between 22:45 and 22:50 on August 11, 2022 the Microtops

349   AOD averaged 0.08 ± 0.01 while the miniSASP measured 0.07 ± 0.02 indicating agreement within overall

350   uncertainty. The lower average value for the miniSASP could be due to the higher altitude of the measurement. Due

351   to the limited period of comparison, further tests are warranted.

352
353

354   **4. Results**

355   **4.1. First shipboard flights**

356   The first shipboard flights of the FVR-55 with payloads onboard took place from March 9 to 11, 2022 from the

357   *TowBoatU.S. Richard L. Becker* off the coast of Key West, FL. A 6 m x 6 m launch pad was installed on the rear

358   deck to minimize interference with boat superstructure during take-off and landing (Figure 5). A total of 11 flights

359   were flown including 2 Functional Check Flights of the UAS, 4 with the Clear Sky payload, and 5 with the Cloudy

360   Sky payload. The first two flights were conducted 25 miles northwest of Key West with the remainder conducted 5

361   miles southeast of Key West. All flights were line-of-sight with a maximum altitude of 360 m due to the Certificate

362   of Authorization (COA) in place. Unfortunately, this low flight ceiling prevented clouds from being sampled. Table

363   4 provides a list of flights with duration, payload configuration, flight pattern, wind speed and ship heave. Wave

364   heights during all flights were observed to be between 0.3 and 0.6 m. Ship speed was 1 to 4 m s^{-1}.

365

366   Three flights occurred on March 10th and March 11th with both payloads being flown. With each payload in its own

367   nose cone, swapping of payloads between flights took 30 to 45 minutes. This time included readying the plane for

368   the next flight (installing fresh batteries and refueling).

369

370   *Figure 5. FVR-55 with the Clear Sky payload onboard on the 6 x 6 m launch pad on the rear deck of the*

371   *TowBoatU.S. Richard L. Becker.*

372

373

374

375 *Table 4. Shipboard flight information including duration, payload configuration, flight pattern, wind speed, and*

376 *ship heave.*

Flight Number	Date	Duration (min)	Payload	Flight Pattern	Wind Speed ($m\ s^{-1}$)	Ship heave (m)
1	3/9/23	21	FCF[a]		7	< 0.3
2[b]	3/9/23	60	Clear	Spirals between 60 and 335 m		
3	3/9/23	62	Clear	Spirals between 60 and 335 m	5.1	< 0.3
4[c]	3/10/23	5	Cloudy		4.1	0.3
5	3/10/23	17	FCF[a]		4.6	0.5
6	3/10/23	62	Cloudy	Circles at 335 m	4.9	0.5
7	3/10/23	60	Cloudy	Circles at 335 m	4.6	0.8
8	3/10/23	152	Clear	Circles at 120 and 335 m	2.6	0.3
9	3/11/23	183	Cloudy	Circles at 335 m	6.4	0.9
10	3/11/23	122	Cloudy	Circles at 90, 150, 210, 270, and 335 m	4.9	0.8
11	3/11/23	122	Clear	Racetracks at 150 m	5.6	0.5

377 [a]Functional Check Flight

378 [b]Telemetry file corrupted

379 [c]Generator failure, flight aborted

380

381 Examples of data collected during Clear and Cloudy Sky payload flights are shown in Figures 6 and 7, respectively.

382 The Clear Sky payload was flown on Flight 8. Initially four vertical profiles between 50 and 335 m were conducted

383 to identify the altitude of aerosol layers. Circles were then flown alternating between 335 and 120 m (Figure 6a).

384 Particle number concentrations decreased with height, ranging up to 5,000 cm^{-3} at 120 m and decreasing to 1000 cm^{-3}

385 at 335 m for diameters greater than 0.005 μm (Figure 6b). Concentrations for diameters greater than 0.14 μm were

386 more than a factor of two lower. This result is expected given the large number concentration at diameters less than

387 0.2 μm. The flight track colored by time and the ship track are shown in Figure 6c. The ship travelled 1.3 km during

388 the flight. The plane landed within ± 0.36 m of the programmed spot on the launch pad.

389

390

391 *Figure 6. Data from the Clear Sky payload during Flight 8 offshore of Key West including a) altitude, b) total*

392 *particle number concentration for two size ranges (D_p > 0.005 and 0.14 μm) and particle number size*

393 *distribution, and c) the flight track colored by time along with the ship track.*

394

395

396

397 The Cloudy Sky payload was flown on Flight 6. After the initial ascent, circles were conducted at 335 m, the highest

398 altitude allowed by the COA in place (Figure 7a). Unfortunately, this altitude was below cloud bottom but the flight

399 served as a test of the aerosol instrumentation onboard. Initially particle number concentrations were around 3,000

400 cm^{-3} but increased up to 8,000 cm^{-3} after about 30 minutes of flight time (Figure 7b). As the number concentration

401 increased, the mean size of the particles shifted from about 0.12 to 0.16 μm. The flight track colored by time and the

402 ship track during the flight are shown in Figure 7c. The ship travelled 1.3 km during the flight with the plane landing

403 within ± 0.76 m of the designated spot on the launch pad.

404

405

Figure 7. Data from the Cloudy Sky payload during Flight 6 offshore of Key West including a) altitude, b) total particle number concentration and particle number size distribution, and c) the flight track colored by time along with the ship track.

4.2. First flights in cloud

The FVR-55 with payloads onboard was flown from the Tillamook UAS Test Range (TUTR) in cooperation with the Near Space Corporation (NSC) between August 9th and 17th, 2022. TUTR is located at the Tillamook, OR airport about 10 km from the coast. Flights were conducted over the airport and in offshore warning areas up to 40 km from the airport under the NSC COA. Line of sight flights over the airport were conducted up to 1,370 m with the help of visual observers. For the offshore BVLOS flights, a chase plane escorted the FVR-55 through non-controlled airspace to the warning areas. NSC personnel communicated flights to the local FAA Air Traffic Control (Seattle Center) and managed airspace de-confliction. Mission Control was based out of the Tillamook airport control tower. The science team directed the Pilot-in-Control (PIC) to adjust flight tracks based on incoming, real-time data from the payloads. Five flights with the Clear Sky payload and 9 flights with the Cloudy Sky payload were conducted for a total of 38.5 flight hours (see Table 5).

Table 5. TUTR flight information including duration, payload configuration, and flight pattern. Time within

428 *cloud is based on a measured cloud drop number concentration above 5 cm^{-3}.*

Flight Number	Date	Duration (min)	Payload	Flight Pattern	Comments
1	8/9/12	120	Cloudy Sky	Tracks below (300 m) and within (470 m) cloud[a]	Over airport
2	8/9/12	123	Cloudy Sky	Tracks below (400 m) and within (530 m) cloud[a]	Over airport
3	8/10/12	118	Cloudy Sky	Tracks below (610 m) and within (760 to 910 m) cloud[a]	Over airport
4	8/10/12	119	Cloudy Sky	Tracks below (610 m) and within (910 to 980 m) cloud[a]	Over airport
5	8/11/22	213	Clear Sky	Chase plane escort to offshore warning area for BVLOS[b] flights. Orbit in aerosol layer at 2550 m.	Offshore up to ~24 NM from airport
6	8/12/22	169	Cloudy Sky	Chase plane escort to offshore warning area for BVLOS[b] flights. Tracks below (800 m), within (1500 m), and above (2000 m) cloud.	Offshore up to ~24 NM from airport
7	8/12/22	168	Cloudy Sky	Tracks below (910 m) and within (1000 m) cloud[a]	Over airport
8	8/13/22	78	Cloudy Sky	Tracks below (1300 m) and within (1370 m) cloud[a]	Over airport
9	8/14/22	151	Clear Sky	Orbit in aerosol layer at 2300 m.	Over airport
10	8/14/22	113	Cloudy Sky	Chase plane escort to offshore warning area for BVLOS[b] flights. Clouds too far away to sample.	Over airport[c]
11	8/15/22	223	Cloudy Sky	Chase plane escort to offshore warning area for BVLOS[b] flights. PIC[c] handoff at Netarts Beach. Tracks below (300 m), within (400 m), and above (490 m) cloud.	Offshore up to ~16 NM from airport
12	8/16/22	152	Clear Sky	Chase plane escort to offshore warning area for BVLOS[b] flights. PIC[c] handoff at Bayocean Beach. Orbit in aerosol layer at 1800 m.	Offshore up to ~16 NM from airport
13	8/16/22				Aborted. Chase plane issue.
14	8/17/22	264	Clear Sky	Orbit in aerosol layer at 1500 m.	Over airport

429 [a]Above cloud flights were prevented by the line of sight COA over the airport.
430 [b]Beyond visual line of sight
431 [c]PIC = Pilot-In-Control
432
433 The track from Flight 5 with the Clear Sky payload onboard is shown in Figure 8 along with vertical profiles of RH,

434 particle number concentration, and aerosol absorption coefficient. The presence of an aerosol layer at ~2550 m is

435 clear based on increased particle number concentration and aerosol absorption. The factor of 4 increase in absorption

436 relative to values above and below the layer indicate the aerosol was likely made up of smoke. Results from the

437 filter sample collected in the aerosol layer show that non-sea salt potassium, a tracer of biomass burning, was

438 elevated at 0.04 μg m^{-3}. HYSPLIT trajectory analysis indicates the sampled air mass was transported northward

439 along the Oregon coast where several fires were burning according to the NASA FIRMS (Fire Information for

440 Resource Management System) web site (https://firms.modaps.eosdis.nasa.gov/map/#t:adv;d:today;@-

441 117.1,41.0,6.0z).

442

443 ***Figure 8. Flight 5 track from the TUTR colored by altitude (a) and vertical profiles of RH, particle number***

444 ***concentration, and absorption coefficient (b).***

445
446
447 Vertical profiles of cloud drop number concentration for Flights 4, 6, and 11 are shown in Figure 9. All data points

448 are shown in grey and level leg averaged points are shown in red. Particle number concentrations for diameters

449 between 0.03 and 0.3 μm were derived from the integral of the mSEMS size distribution. A lognormal fit was

450 applied to the size distributions to extend the size range up to 2.0 μm to encompass the entirety of the accumulation

451 mode. The relationship between particle number concentration and cloud drop effective radius for the averaged level

452 leg data from the three flights is shown in Figure 10. Particle number concentration and cloud drop size were well

453 correlated (r^2 = 0.75 to 0.97) for all ranges of cloud liquid water contents sampled. An increase in particle number

454 concentration corresponded to a decrease in cloud drop size as expected for the first indirect or Twomey effect

455 (Twomey, 1977). Future data analysis will be done to explore relationships between aerosol number concentration

456 and size, cloud drop number concentration and size, and liquid water content for clouds at different altitudes.

457

458

459 *Figure 9. Vertical profiles of cloud drop number concentration for Flights a) 4, b) 6, and c) 11 from the TUTR.*
460 *All data points are shown in grey and level leg averaged points are shown in red.*

461
462
463
464

465 *Figure 10. Comparison of particle number concentration for diameters between 0.03 and 2.0 μm and cloud drop*

466 *effective radius averaged over the altitude level leg data shown in Figure 8. Data are binned by ranges of cloud*

467 *liquid water content.*

468

469
470
471

5.0. Conclusions

The initial results described here indicate that the FVR-55 UAS with Clear and Cloudy Sky payloads onboard offers a unique platform for observations relevant to aerosol direct and indirect radiative forcing. This observing platform is deployable at sea with less cost and greater flight frequency than a crewed air craft. Potential applications of this technology extend beyond aerosol – cloud observations to marine mammal assessments, harmful algal blooms, and radiative impacts from forest fires.

Next steps include upgrading to the larger L3Harris Fixed Wing VTOL Rotator, the FVR-90. The Clear and Cloudy Sky payloads will be integrated into FVR-90 nose cones which will allow for the addition of instruments and longer flight endurance. The planned added instruments include upward and downward looking pyranometers to assess direct connections between particle number and concentration, cloud drop concentration and size, and radiation. In addition, instrumentation will be added to both payloads for the measurement of particle number size distributions from 5 nm to 3 μm. Although larger, the FVR-90 is operable from a ship thereby fulfilling the need of aerosol, cloud, and radiation measurements in the marine atmosphere.

Data availability

Flight data are publicly available at https://saga.pmel.noaa.gov/Field/Tillamook2022/.

Author contributions

PKQ and TSB designed the experiments. DJC and JEJ built and operated the payloads. LMU analyzed the chemical data. PKQ prepared the manuscript with contributions from all co-authors.

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

We thank Aaron Farber and the entire L3Harris Latitude Engineering team for developing, fabricating, and flying the FVR-55. We thank the caption and crew of the TowBoatUS Richard L. Becker and Chuck Bagnato and Eric Waters from the Tillamook UAS Test Range for their contributions toward successful flights. We thank Alexander Smirnov of NASA GSFC for the microtops calibration, processing, and data quality assurance. We also thank NOAA OMAO and UxSRTO for logistical and financial support. This is PMEL contribution number 5537.

References

Anderson, T. L., Covert, D. S., Wheeler, J. D., Harris, J. M., Perry, K. D., Trost, B. E., Jaffe, D. J., and Ogren, J.: Aerosol backscatter fraction and single scattering albedo: Measured values and uncertainties at a coastal station in the Pacific Northwest, Journal of Geophysical Research - Atmospheres, 104, 26,793 - 726,807, 1999.

510 Aurell, J., Mitchell, W., Chirayath, V., Jonsson, J., Tabor, D., and Gullett, B.: Field determination of multipollutant,
511 open area combustion source emission factors with a hexacopter unmanned aerial vehicle, Atmospheric
512 Environment, 166, 433 - 440, 2017.

513 Bates, T. S., Coffman, D. J., Covert, D. S., and Quinn, P. K.: Regional marine boundary layer aerosol size
514 distributions in the Indian, Atlantic and Pacific Oceans: A comparison of INDOEX measurements with ACE-1 and
515 ACE-2, and Aerosols99, Journal of Geophysical Research - Atmospheres, 107, 8026, 2002.

516 Bates, T. S., Quinn, P. K., Johnson, J. E., Corless, A., Brechtel, F. J., Stalin, S. E., Meinig, C., and Burkhart, J. F.:
517 Measurements of atmospheric aerosol vertical distributions above Svalbard, Norway, using unmanned aerial systems
518 (UAS), Atmospheric Measurement Techniques, 6, 2115 - 2120, 2013.

519 Bond, T. C., Anderson, T. L., and Campbell, D.: Calibration and intercomparison of filter-based measurements of
520 visible light absorption by aerosols, Aerosol Science and Technology, 30, 582 - 600, 1999.

521 Brady, J. M., Stokes, M. D., Bonnardel, J., and Bertram, T. H.: Characterization of a Quadrotor Unmanned Aircraft
522 System for Aerosol-Particle-Concentration Measurements, Environmental Science and Technology, 50, 1376 - 1383,
523 2016.

524 Chilinski, M. T., Markowicz, K. M., and Markowicz, J.: Observation of vertical variability of black carbon
525 concentration in lower troposphere on campaigns in Poland, Atmospheric Environment, 137, 155 - 170, 2016.

526 Corrigan, C. E., Roberts, G. C., Ramana, M. V., Kim, D., and Ramanathan, V.: Capturing vertical profiles of aerosols
527 and black carbon over the Indian Ocean using autonomous unmanned aerial vehicles, Atmospheric Chemisty and
528 Physics, 8, 737 - 747, 2008.

529 Gao, R. S., Telg, H., McLaughlin, R., Ciciora, S. J., Watts, L., Richardson, M. S., Schwarz, J. P., Perring, A. E., T.D.,
530 T., Rollins, A. W., Markovic, M. Z., Bates, T. S., Johnson, J. E., and Fahey, D. W.: A Light-Weight, High-Sensitivity
531 Particle Spectrometer for PM2.5 Aerosol Measurements, Aerosol Science and Technology, 50, 88 - 99, 2016.

532 Haywood, J. and Ramaswamy, V.: Global sensitivity studies of the direct radiative forcing due to anthropogenic
533 sulfate and black carbon aerosols, Journal of Geophysical Research - Atmospheres, 103, 6043 - 6058, 1998.

534 IPCC: Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis Cambridge University Press2021.

535 Li, J., Carlson, B. E., Yung, Y. L., Lv, D., Hansen, J., Penner, J., Liao, H., Ramaswamy, V., Kahn, R., Zhang, P.,
536 Dubovik, O., Ding, A., Lacis, A. A., Zhang, L., and Dong, Y.: Scattering and absorbing aerosols in the climate
537 system, Nature Reviews Earth and Environment, 3, 363 - 379, 2022.

538 Lohmann, U. and Feichter, J.: Global indirect aerosol effects: a review, Atmospheric Chemisty and Physics, 5, 715 -
539 737, 2005.

540   Murphy, D. M., Telg, H., Eck, T. F., Rodriguez, J., Stalin, S. E., and Bates, T. S.: A miniature scanning sun

541   photometer for vertical profiles and mobile platforms, Aerosol Science and Technology, 50, DOI:

542   10/1080/027/86826.2015.1121200, 2016.

543   Quinn, P. K., Coffman, D. J., Bates, T. S., Miller, T. L., Johnson, J. E., Welton, E. J., Neusüß, C., Miller, M., and

544   Sheridan, P. J.: Aerosol optical properties during INDOEX 1999: Means, variability, and controlling factors, Journal

545   of Geophysical Research - Atmospheres, 10.1029/2000JD000037, 2002.

546   Quinn, P. K., Thompson, E. J., Coffman, D. J., Baidar, S., Bariteau, L., Bates, T. S., Bigorre, S., Brewer, A., de Boer,

547   G., de Szoeke, S. P., Drushka, K., Foltz, G. R., Intrieri, J., Iyer, S., Fairall, C. W., Gaston, C. J., Jansen, F., Johnson,

548   J. E., Kruger, O. O., Marchbanks, R. D., Moran, K. P., Noone, D., Pezoa, S., Pincus, R., Plueddemann, A. J.,

549   Pohlker, M. L., Poschl, U., Quinones Melendez, E., Royer, H. M., Szczodrak, M., Thomson, J., Upchurch, L. M.,

550   Zhang, C., Zhang, D., and Zuidema, P.: Measurements from the RV Ronald H. Brown and related platforms as part

551   of the Atlantic Tradewind Ocean-Atmosphere Mesoscale Interaction Campaign (ATOMIC), Earth System Science

552   Data, 13, 1759 - 1790, 2021.

553   Rosenfeld, D., Zhu, Y., Wang, M., Zheng, Y., Goren, T., and Yu, S.: Aerosol-driven droplet concentrations dominate

554   coverage and water of low-level clouds, Science, 363, 10.1126/science.aav0566, 2019.

555   Russell, P. B., Hobbs, P. V., and Stowe, L. L.: Aerosol properties and radiative effects in the United States East Coast

556   haze plume: An overview of the Tropospheric Aerosol Radiative Forcing Observational Experiment (TARFOX),

557   Journal of Geophysical Research - Atmosphere, 104, 2213 - 2222, 1999.

558   Takemura, T., Nakajima, T., Dubovik, O., Holben, B. N., and Kinne, S.: Single-scattering albedo and radiative

559   forcing of various aerosol species with a global three-dimensional model, Journal of Climate, 15, 333 - 352, 2002.

560   Telg, H., Murphy, D. M., Bates, T. S., Johnson, J. E., Quinn, P. K., Giardi, F., and Gao, R. S.: A practical set of

561   miniaturized instruments for vertical profiling of aerosol physical properties, Aerosol Science and Technology, 51,

562   715 - 723, 2017.

563   Twomey, S.: The influence of pollution on the shortwave albedo of clouds, Journal of Atmospheric Science, 34,

564   1149 - 1152, 1977.

565   Yoon, S.-C. and Kim, J.: Influences of relative humidity on aerosol optical properties and aerosol radiative forcing

566   during ACE-Asia, Atmospheric Environment, 40, 4328 - 4338, 2006.

567   Zhang, Y., Forrister, H., Liu, J., Dibb, J., Anderson, B., Schwarz, J., Perring, A. E., Jimenez, J., Campuzano-Jost, P.,

568   Wang, Y., Nenes, A., and Weber, R. J.: Top-of-atmosphere radiative forcing affected by brown carbon in the upper

569   troposphere, Nature Geoscience, 10, 486 - 489, 2017.

570