

1 Reaching new heights: Profiling Upper altitudes For Ice Nucleation 2 (PUFIN) on the Atmospheric Radiation Measurement (ARM) 3 tethered balloon systems

4 Jessie M. Creamean¹, Darielle Dexheimer², Carson C. Hume¹, Maria Vazquez¹, Benjamin T. M. Hess²,
5 Casey M. Longbottom², Carlos A. Ruiz², Adam K. Theisen³

6 ¹Department of Atmospheric Science, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, 80523, USA

7 ²Sandia National Laboratory, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 87123, USA

8 ³Argonne National Laboratory, Lemont, Illinois, 60439, USA

9 *Correspondence to:* Jessie M. Creamean (jcream07@rams.colostate.edu)

10 Abstract

11 Ice nucleating particles (INPs) are a rare yet climatically relevant subset of aerosols that initiate ice formation in mixed-phase
12 clouds, strongly influencing cloud microphysics, precipitation, and Earth's radiative balance. Despite their significance,
13 ground-based measurements of INPs may not always be representative of those at cloud level, yet vertically-resolved INP
14 measurements remain limited. Here, we introduce PUFIN (Profiling Upper altitudes For Ice Nucleation), a robust,
15 lightweight INP sampler designed for routine deployment on the U.S. Department of Energy Atmospheric Radiation
16 Measurement (ARM) user facility's tethered balloon system (TBS). PUFIN collects multiple filter samples per flight at up
17 to three altitudes, integrating real-time monitoring of flow, power consumption, and atmospheric conditions, while remaining
18 fully operable from the ground. Multiple deployments at two ARM observatories in Maryland and Alabama demonstrate
19 that PUFIN achieves sufficient aerosol loading to detect INPs down to $\sim 10^{-3} \text{ L}^{-1}$ within as little as 28 minutes of sampling,
20 but typically within an hour. Data from recent deployments reveal altitude-dependent variability in INP concentrations,
21 indicative of boundary layer stratification and contributions from both local and transported aerosol sources. All resulting
22 TBSINP data are publicly available via the ARM Data Center, and researchers may request PUFIN for future TBS campaigns
23 or access archived filters for additional analyses. Looking forward, routine PUFIN deployments can be used to enhance
24 understanding of the vertical distribution and seasonal variability of INPs, enabling improved representation of aerosol-cloud
25 interactions in Earth system models and advancing predictive capabilities for weather and climate.

26 Short summary

27 PUFIN (Profiling Upper altitudes For Ice Nucleation) is a lightweight sampler flown on the U.S. Department of Energy's
28 Atmospheric Radiation Measurement user facility's tethered balloons to measure ice nucleating particles at multiple
29 altitudes. Deployments in Maryland and Alabama show it can detect low concentrations in under an hour and capture changes

30 with height. All data are publicly available, and future flights will help track seasonal and vertical patterns of these unique
31 particles.

32 **1 Introduction**

33 Ice nucleating particles (INPs) are a rare, but critical subset of atmospheric aerosols that catalyze the formation of cloud ice
34 through heterogeneous nucleation, i.e., freezing supercooled liquid water at temperatures above the homogenous threshold
35 at roughly -38°C (Pruppacher and Klett, 2010). Despite existing at concentrations orders of magnitude lower than cloud
36 condensation nuclei (CCN) that facilitate the formation of cloud droplets, INPs exert an outsized influence on cloud
37 microphysics, lifetime, and radiative properties (Kanji et al., 2017), especially in mixed-phase clouds, which are arguably
38 the most prominent type of cloud globally (Mülmenstädt et al., 2015). By initiating the glaciation of such clouds, INPs can
39 accelerate precipitation processes, alter cloud reflectivity, and modulate the hydrological cycle. Their role in determining
40 cloud phase is especially consequential for Earth’s energy balance, as ice-containing clouds differ strongly from liquid-only
41 clouds in albedo and longwave emissivity (Storelvmo, 2017). Therefore, understanding INP abundance, composition, and
42 variability is essential for improving the representation of aerosol-cloud interactions in weather and Earth system models
43 (Burrows et al., 2022).

44 INPs connect boundary layer processes to terrestrial, oceanic, and cryospheric sources, linking biogeochemical systems to
45 climate feedbacks on regional to global scales (Creamean et al., 2025b; Murray et al., 2021; Schnell and Vali, 1976; Steiner,
46 2020). However, INP measurements are often made at ground level, which may not accurately represent the concentrations
47 or composition of INP populations at cloud level where ice nucleation processes occur (Burrows et al., 2022), and are only
48 directly relevant when clouds are coupled to the surface (e.g., Griesche et al., 2021). Furthermore, the types of INPs often
49 vary with altitude. A recent modeling study suggests that, on a global average, biological and marine organic INPs are more
50 prevalent at lower altitudes depending on hemisphere and freezing temperature, whereas dust INPs dominate at higher
51 altitudes (Chatziparaschos et al., 2025). While crewed aircraft have a long history of conducting airborne INP measurements,
52 they typically provide only brief snapshots and often cannot sample close enough to the surface to capture the full vertical
53 structure from the ground to cloud base.

54 Smaller platforms such as uncrewed aerial and tethered balloon systems (UASs and TBSs, respectively) help fill this gap.
55 Although these systems cannot accommodate the larger payloads of crewed aircraft, advances in lightweight instrumentation
56 now enable vertically-resolved comprehensive measurements of meteorology and aerosol properties (Dexheimer et al., 2024;
57 Mei et al., 2025; Pohorsky et al., 2024; Pilz et al., 2022). TBSs are particularly valuable because they can provide routine
58 profiling or sustained sampling of aerosols at targeted altitudes up to several hours, reaching up to 1–2 km above ground
59 level, below, into, and above clouds (e.g., Creamean et al., 2021). These capabilities offer certain advantages over UASs,
60 which are frequently limited by line-of-sight or altitude regulations, payload weight restrictions depending on aircraft design,

61 and relatively short flight times at often an hour or less. Recent studies such as Pilz et al. (2023, 2024) and Londardi et al.
62 (2022) reported aerosol observations from TBS platforms during summer of the 2019–2020 Multidisciplinary drifting
63 Observatory for the Study of Arctic Climate (MOSAiC) expedition. Their results revealed substantial complexity in aerosol
64 vertical structure, which varied by day and air mass origin, though most profiles indicated new particle formation above low-
65 level clouds. Similarly, Guy et al. (2024) measured aerosol size distributions from the surface to cloud base over the central
66 Greenland Ice Sheet using TBS and found distinct stratification, concluding that surface measurements alone failed to
67 represent cloud-relevant aerosol conditions roughly half of the time. Pohorsky et al. (2025) also observed distinct aerosol
68 layering using TBS in a high-latitude urban environment, where heavy pollution was trapped beneath a strong temperature
69 inversion and overlain by typical Arctic haze aerosols. In another study, Zinke et al. (2021) developed a cloud water sampler
70 they deployed on a TBS, enabling measurements of bulk cloud residual chemical composition and INP concentrations in the
71 high Arctic from an icebreaker, although these were not vertically-resolved.

72 Only a limited number of studies have reported on vertically-resolved INP measurements from balloon or UAS platforms.
73 Creamean et al. (2018) quantified INPs in both immersion and deposition modes across six altitude ranges during three test
74 flights in Colorado, using launched balloons rather than a TBS. This approach was challenging, as launched balloons can be
75 entrained in low-level jets carrying them long distances, and physical retrieval is required to collect filters for offline INP
76 analysis. Bieber et al. (2020) and Seifried et al. (2021) describe a developed system, the DAPSI (Drone-based Aerosol
77 Particle Sampling Impinger/Impactor), for collecting INP samples using UAS. To date, results have been limited to test
78 flights and a short (3-day) campaign conducted near a lake in Austria during summer. Porter et al. (2020) developed a size-
79 resolved sampling payload for offline INP analysis, the SHARK (Selective Height Aerosol Research Kit), for deployment
80 on a TBS. This system has been tested at several locations, including in the high Arctic (Porter et al., 2022); however, it
81 collects samples at only one altitude above ground level per flight. More recently, Böhmländer et al. (2025) developed an
82 INP sampler capable of collecting filters at multiple altitudes for offline analysis. The system was initially tested on a UAS
83 in Finland, with plans to test it for TBS applications. While these previous studies mark important progress toward resolving
84 the vertical distribution of INPs, substantial effort is still needed to establish reliable, routine measurements. Such
85 advancements are essential for improving the representation of INPs in models and, consequently, the simulation of aerosol-
86 cloud interactions across vertical scales.

87 Here, we present a robust INP sampling system designed to address this gap, called PUFIN: Profiling Upper altitudes For
88 Ice Nucleation. The instrument collects filters at up to three distinct altitudes plus a blank during each TBS flight and can be
89 fully controlled from the ground. Developed collaboratively by the INP and TBS instrument teams under the U.S. Department
90 of Energy’s Atmospheric Radiation Measurement (DOE ARM) user facility, the system is intended for routine deployment
91 at ARM sites in response to user requests. Resulting data products are publicly released on the ARM Data Center
92 (<https://www.arm.gov/data>) within six months of each TBS campaign. In this paper, we describe the system design and flight

93 operations, outline the offline sample processing and data production, summarize the data that are currently available and
94 how to access them, and guide users how to request deployment of PUFIN for their own research needs.

95 **2 Instrument description**

96 **2.1 DOE ARM TBS and INP initiatives**


97 The ARM TBS program has evolved into a critical observational capability for capturing high-resolution, vertically-stratified
98 atmospheric data, operating at ARM observatories using helium-filled Skydoc balloons capable of ascending to
99 approximately 1.5 km above ground level. Typically, ARM conducts six to eight two-week TBS missions each year, with
100 flights deploying baseline instrumentation suites, including aerosol, thermodynamic, and turbulence sensors, tailored to
101 research objectives across clear-air and, occasionally, in-cloud conditions. More details on the TBS system and standard
102 instrument payload can be found in Dexheimer et al. (2024) and up-to-date information on the ARM TBS website
103 (<https://www.arm.gov/capabilities/instruments/tbs>).

104 Since 2020, ARM has provided routine, publicly-available INP measurements at select sites. Prior to that, INP sampling was
105 considered a guest instrument activity and required proposals by researchers for targeted campaigns and locations. Demand
106 for such measurements has since grown, and as of 2025 INP data are available from seven ARM sites. These data are
107 generated by collecting filters at ARM fixed observatories and mobile facilities, followed by offline processing with the Ice
108 Nucleation Spectrometer (INS) at Colorado State University (CSU), as described briefly below and in detail in Creamean et
109 al. (2024, 2025a). Data products can be accessed through the ARM Data Center by searching for “INP.” Up-to-date
110 information, including deployment details and data availability from TBS operations, is provided on the ARM INS website
111 (<https://www.arm.gov/capabilities/instruments/ins>), where a routinely updated field log is also available for community
112 reference.

113 **2.2 Design and integration of PUFIN with the TBS**

114 PUFIN operates similarly to the standard ARM INP sampling system, but on a smaller scale and with multiple filters attached.
115 A detailed parts list and design schematic are publicly available on GitHub at [https://github.com/ARM-Development/TBS-](https://github.com/ARM-Development/TBS-INP-Design)
116 [INP-Design](https://github.com/ARM-Development/TBS-INP-Design) to enable researchers to build and deploy their own PUFIN replicas for their independent or collaborative studies.
117 [Figure 1](#) illustrates PUFIN’s flow diagram, which includes a dry floating scroll pump (SVF-E0-50P, ScrollLabs®), a multi-
118 gas flow sensor (SFM4300, Sensirion AG), four stainless steel solenoid valves (PL-220101, Plum Garden), and four ports
119 for reusable 47-mm in-line polycarbonate filter holders (Pall Life Sciences). The pump features a brushless motor powered
120 by 24 VDC, achieves an ultimate vacuum of <1 mbar, and provides flow rates up to 50 sL min⁻¹ (liters per minute at standard
121 temperature and pressure (STP): 0°C and 101.32 kPa) without a filter attached. The flow sensor operates over a 0–50 sL min⁻¹
122 range. Each solenoid valve, with ¼-inch threaded inlet connections, requires 12 VDC and is controlled via a motor driver

123 controller board (L298N, HiLetGo). The filter holders, with an effective filtration area of 9.6 cm², are prepared as outlined
124 in Section 2.4.1. With prepared filter holders attached, the pump can pull a maximum of roughly 11 sL min⁻¹ through the
125 standard 0.2-μm pore size filters used for the ARM INP measurements. Connections at both ends consist of ¼-inch hose
126 barb adapters, linking to ¼-inch tubing inside PUFIN and opening directly to the air on the exterior ([Figure 2](#)). PUFIN's
127 components are protected by a 3D-printed enclosure, which is equipped with a ventilation fan for in-flight cooling and backed
128 with a 0.32 cm thick aluminum electrical ground distribution board that also provides structural integrity for the mounting
129 point to the tether. The enclosure and all other 3D-printed parts are fabricated from white ASA (acrylonitrile styrene acrylate)
130 polymer (Bambu Lab) due to its exceptional UV and temperature resistance, high impact strength, durability, and suitability
131 for long-term outdoor use. The total flight-ready weight of the instrument is 6.1 kg.



132
133 **Figure 1:** Schematic of PUFIN airflow. Main components are labeled. Valves are sequentially triggered to direct airflow through one filter
134 at a time, while the fourth filter serves as a field blank and remains closed to airflow. Arrows indicate direction of airflow. The schematic
135 was generated with SmartDraw.com.





Figure 2: Exterior views of PUFIN mounted on the ARM TBS tether during a field deployment, shown in flight alongside other instrument payloads. The inset on the right displays a frontal view of PUFIN with filter holders attached. This flight required collection of INPs at two designated altitudes plus one field blank.

[Figure 3](#) illustrates the primary components and features of both the interior and immediate exterior of PUFIN. It is powered by a 28.8-V, 14,000-mAh lithium ion battery pack (8S4P, MaxAmps), housed within a 3D-printed enclosure for protection and secure mounting. The battery pack typically powers PUFIN for approximately 3.5 hours depending on the target flow rate, ambient temperature, and air density. A 30-W DC/DC converter (PYB30-U, Bel Power Solutions) steps down the battery voltage to 12 V to supply the pump, valves, and sensors. System power consumption is monitored using a current, voltage, and power monitor (INA260, Adafruit Industries LLC), providing measurements of electrical load and enabling safe operation during flight. PUFIN's control system is built around a TEENSY 4.1 microcontroller (iMXRT1062, SparkFun Electronics), which serves as the central processing unit for all sensor operations. Onboard sensors communicate digitally with the microcontroller, and analog pump command signals are generated using a digital-to-analog converter (MCP4725, SparkFun Electronics), enabling the microcontroller and other computational components to interpret and respond to sensor inputs accurately. This configuration allows precise regulation of flow rates, valve actuation, and system monitoring during flight. PUFIN's communications system integrates atmospheric sensing, data transmission, and user interface components to enable real-time monitoring during flight. An iMet-XQ2 sensor measures atmospheric pressure, temperature, and humidity, and includes a GPS receiver, rechargeable battery, and onboard data logger. However, these measurements are only accurate to approximately ± 20 m; therefore, data from the TBS iMet payload are currently more reliable, available as the "TBSIMET" datastream from the ARM Data Center (Dexheimer et al., 2024). The sensor is mounted in a custom 3D-printed holder bracket. Wireless data transmission is achieved via a 2.4-GHz radio frequency transceiver module with antenna (NRF24L01P+PA+LNA, HiLetgo), allowing real-time communication between PUFIN and the ground station. A

158 9-dBi omni-directional antenna is used with the transceiver to increase range (ANT-WS-A-NF-09-150, ATOP
 159 Technologies). System status and measurements are displayed locally on a 2.8-inch LCD touch panel (ILI9341, HiLetgo)
 160 and a digital LED tube clock module. All remote electronics, including the transceiver, display, and sensor assemblies, are
 161 housed in a series of 3D-printed enclosures to protect components while maintaining accessibility and visibility during
 162 deployment.



163 **Figure 3:** Photos of the interior (left) and immediate exterior (right) of PUFIN. The main components and features are labeled. The exterior
 164 housing shown in the right image is 3D printed.
 165

166 2.4 INP sample collection during deployments

167 2.4.1 Filter material and holder preparation

168 In preparation for aerosol collection, 0.2- μ m polycarbonate filters (47-mm diameter Whatman® Nuclepore™ Track-Etched
 169 Membranes) are loaded into the reusable 47-mm polycarbonate in-line filter holder, pre-cleaned with cycles of methanol and
 170 deionized water. These filters are identical in preparation to those used at ARM fixed and mobile sites (Creamean et al.,
 171 2025a). All components, including filters, forceps, and workspaces are pre-cleaned following the procedure described in
 172 Barry et al. (2021). Filter holders are disassembled and reassembled under ultraclean conditions inside a laminar flow cabinet
 173 with near-zero ambient particle concentrations, wrapped in foil, then sealed and stored individually in clean airtight bags
 174 until deployment. Filter holders are thoroughly cleaned following each use and before reuse by immersion in 5% hydrogen
 175 peroxide for 1 hour, followed by 10 minutes of ultra sonication in deionized water and Windex® Original Glass Cleaner to
 176 remove any remaining particles.

177 The 0.2- μ m filters used in PUFIN provide a simple, robust, and widely adopted approach for INP sampling, enabling bulk-
 178 integrated collection across particle sizes and facilitating intercomparability across studies. Compared to impingers, filters
 179 do not require liquid handling, are less sensitive to environmental conditions, and allow for more stable storage of INPs when


180 frozen (e.g., Beall et al., 2020). Compared to impactors, they provide a bulk-integrated sample rather than size-segregated
181 fractions, simplifying analysis and reducing uncertainties associated with particle bounce and stage-specific collection
182 efficiencies. Based on calculations from Spurny and Lodge (1972), these filters exhibit relatively high collection efficiencies
183 across PUFIN's operating flow rate range ($4\text{--}11\text{ L min}^{-1}$), with a decrease near 150 nm but still maintaining efficiencies on
184 the order of 78–91%. In principle, the filters sample total suspended particulates. However, inlet-related biases, particularly
185 for coarse particles, may arise due to wind speed-dependent inertial and gravitational losses (e.g., governed by Stokes number
186 and settling velocity), such that the largest particles may be underrepresented, although this has not yet been empirically
187 quantified for this system.

188 **2.4.2 Operation of PUFIN during flight**

189 PUFIN is typically operated manually unless used in environments with elevated electromagnetic interference. During setup,
190 the blank filter remains installed as the instrument is mounted onto the tether. It is then removed using latex gloves, wrapped
191 in aluminum foil, labeled, and stored in a $-80\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ ultracold freezer. The pump is activated, and the first solenoid valve is
192 manually opened to begin sampling ([Figure 4](#)). The instrument makes multiple passes through the first target altitude over a
193 30–60 minute interval. Before transitioning to the next altitude range, the valve is closed, and the next solenoid valve is
194 opened. This process is repeated for the third valve at the highest altitude.

195 PUFIN sampling is often conducted in coordination with concurrent airborne measurements, including aerosol size
196 distributions and multimodal micro-spectroscopy, to enable complementary characterization of aerosol properties across
197 altitudes. Sampling is performed within predefined altitude ranges to facilitate comparison across flights, seasons, and
198 locations, targeting roughly 0–250 m, 250–500 m, and $>500\text{ m AGL}$. These altitude bins are adjusted as needed based on
199 flight duration and atmospheric conditions. They can be modified in real time to target layers of interest identified from on-
200 site aerosol and meteorological measurements.

201 After the flight, the instrument is removed from the tether and placed on a workspace lined with clean aluminum foil. Filters
202 are removed using latex gloves, wrapped in foil, labeled, and stored in the same plastic bag as the blank filter in the $-80\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$
203 freezer. The operation log is retrieved from the onboard SD card. Once all flights are completed, the collected filters are
204 shipped overnight to CSU for analysis in a hard-sided 7 kg-capacity cooler with 2.2 kg of dry ice.



205

206 **Figure 4:** Photo of the PUFIN ground station undergoing manual operation. The image depicts the pump motor in an inactive state
 207 ('DISABLED') with all four valves closed and 0 sL min⁻¹ of flow. The target flow upon activation is 5.00 sL min⁻¹.

208 3 Filter processing for INP data

209 3.1 INS sample processing

210 The INS, similar to the CSU Ice Spectrometer, simulates immersion freezing of cloud droplets by measuring heterogeneous
 211 ice nucleation initiated by ambient aerosol particles acting INPs (Creamean et al., 2024, 2025a). This technique provides
 212 quantitative insight into the population of ambient aerosols capable of initiating cloud ice formation across a broad range of
 213 subzero temperatures, thereby determining INP concentrations spanning up to six orders of magnitude. The INS is supported
 214 by robust experimental protocols and has been widely applied across diverse atmospheric contexts (e.g., Barry et al., 2023;
 215 Beall et al., 2017; DeMott et al., 2017; Hill et al., 2016; Hiranuma et al., 2015; Lacher et al., 2024; McCluskey et al., 2017;
 216 Suski et al., 2018).

217 The INS contains two units that operate simultaneously to increase processing throughput. Each unit consists of two 96-well
 218 aluminum incubation blocks designed for polymerase chain reaction (PCR) plates, arranged end-to-end and thermally
 219 regulated via cold plates on the sides and base. The instrument measures freezing across a temperature range of 0 °C to
 220 approximately -27 to -30 °C. For analysis, filters are carefully removed from the in-line holders under ultraclean conditions
 221 inside a laminar flow cabinet. Each filter is placed in a sterile 50 mL polypropylene tube with 7–10 mL of 0.1 µm-filtered
 222 deionized (DI) water, with the volume adjusted based on expected aerosol loading; lower volumes are used for cleaner
 223 environments to enhance sensitivity. Samples are re-suspended by end-over-end rotation for 20 minutes. Serial dilutions are
 224 prepared using the suspensions and 0.1 µm-filtered DI water, typically including 11-fold dilution steps. Each suspension and
 225 its dilutions are aliquoted into sets of 32 wells (50 µL per well) of single-use 96-well PCR trays (Optimum Ultra), along with
 226 a 32-well negative control containing only filtered DI water. Trays are placed into the INS blocks and cooled at a controlled

rate of 0.33 °C min⁻¹. Uncertainty of the thermocouple is ±0.2 °C. Freezing is monitored optically using a CCD camera with a 1-second resolution. A continuous flow of HEPA-filtered N₂, precooled just above block temperature, purges the headspace to minimize condensation and prevent warming of the samples. Field blanks are processed in an identical manner as sampled filters.

3.2 INP concentration and uncertainty calculations

INP concentrations, blank corrections, and uncertainties were generated using the Open-source Library for Automating Freezing Data acQuisition from Ice Nucleation Spectrometer (OLAF DaQ INS; <https://github.com/SiGran/OLAF>). Details are described in Creamean et al. (2025a). The program calculates INP concentrations at each temperature interval using the fraction of frozen droplets and the known total volume of air that passed through each filter, following Equation (1) (Vali, 1971):

$$K(\theta) (L^{-1}) = -\frac{\ln(1-f)}{V_{drop}} \times \frac{V_{suspension}}{V_{air}} \quad (1)$$

where f is the fraction of frozen droplets, V_{drop} is the volume of each droplet, $V_{suspension}$ is the volume of the suspension, and V_{air} is the volume of air sampled (liters at STP of 0 °C and 101.32 kPa). The primary variable of the INS is the freezing temperature spectrum of cumulative immersion mode INP number concentration, $K(\theta)$, from aerosols re-suspended from individual filters. INP spectra are corrected using DI negative controls and subsequently blank-subtracted. Specifically, each run includes a 32-well DI negative control. For each 0.5 °C temperature bin, the number of frozen wells in the DI control is subtracted from the number of frozen wells in each dilution. The corrected freezing counts are then converted to frozen fraction for each dilution and subsequently to INP concentration as a combined spectrum. Sample blanks are processed in a similar manner as filter samples, with INP concentrations calculated per blank filter for each 0.5 °C temperature bin. All blanks from a given campaign are averaged to generate a representative blank spectrum (expressed as INP per blank filter). For each sample, concentrations are first converted to INP per filter, the average blank spectrum is subtracted, and the corrected values are then converted back to INP L⁻¹. Binomial 95% confidence intervals are calculated following Agresti and Coull (1998), varying with the proportion of wells frozen. For example, freezing in 1 of 32 wells yields a confidence interval range of approximately 0.2–5.0 times the estimated concentration, while 16 of 32 yields approximately 0.7–1.3 times the estimated concentration. $K(\theta)$ and upper and lower confidence intervals are derived per every 0.5 °C interval.

4 Accessibility of PUFIN and resulting TBSINP data

4.1 Availability of TBSINP data and filters

INP data collected with PUFIN on the ARM TBS and processed using the INS are available through the ARM Data Center by searching for “TBSINP”. Not all TBS deployments included PUFIN and resulted in TBSINP data, but this section summarizes those that have. [Table 1](#) provides an overview of TBS campaign details through the end of 2025, which occurred

at four main ARM sites: 1) Southern Great Plains (314 m AMSL, 36.607° N, 97.488° E), 2) Gunnison, Colorado (2886 m AMSL, 38.956° N, 106.988° W) during the SAIL (Surface Atmosphere Integrated field Laboratory) campaign, 3) Bankhead National Forest, Alabama (293 m AMSL, 34.342° N, 87.338° W), and 4) Baltimore, Maryland (158 m AMSL, 39.422° N, 77.21° W) during the CouRAGE (Coastal-urban-Rural Atmospheric Gradient Experiment) campaign. While not all datasets are available, those pending release as of the publication date of this paper are indicated in the table. Campaigns that used an earlier INP collection method predating PUFIN (called the IcePuck), as described in Creamean et al. (2024), are also identified. Limitations of the IcePuck in collecting sufficient air volumes to capture the higher freezing temperature range of the cumulative INP spectrum, along with challenges in ease of use, prompted the development of PUFIN. Exact start and end dates and times, altitude range, sample duration, and volume of air sampled for each sample and each flight can be found in the field log link on the INS website (<https://www.arm.gov/capabilities/instruments/ins>). For deployments in which data are not or only partially available, researchers interested in accessing or analyzing these samples may submit a request to ARM (<https://www.arm.gov/guidance/campaign-guidelines/small-campaigns>). User-requested data from additional INP processing will also be made accessible to the broader research community through the ARM Data Center.

Table 1. Details on ARM TBS deployments with INP sampling. Information includes ARM sampling site, flight dates during each deployment, altitude range of the flights (meters above mean sea level), the range of sample duration (minutes), value or range of flow rates during sample collection (L min^{-1}), range of volume of air collected per sample (liters), if the data are available on the ARM Data Center (ADC), and the sampling method used. For the site, SGP = Southern Great Plains, GUC = Gunnison, Colorado, BNF = Bankhead National Forest, Alabama, and CRG = Baltimore, Maryland. Sampling method indicates whether the older INP sampler (IcePuck) or PUFIN were used. For data availability, yes = all data are posted, partial = some data are available within the dates indicated, queued = samples will be processed / data will be available in the future, and no = samples are archived for possible future processing / no data are available.

ARM site	Flight dates	Altitude range (m AGL)	Sample duration (min)	Flow rate (L min^{-1})	Vol air sampled (L)	Data on ADC	Sampling method
SGP	10 – 26 Apr 2022	0 – 1000	30 – 150	0.3 – 0.9	34 – 133	Yes	IcePuck
GUC	6 – 16 May 2022	0 – 500	74 – 149	0.6	40 – 90	Yes	IcePuck
GUC	23 – 28 Jul 2022	0 – 750	21 – 119	0.6	27 – 71	Partial	IcePuck
GUC	21 – 24 Jan 2023	0 – 560	33 – 74	0.4 – 0.5	30 – 37	No	IcePuck
GUC	6 – 11 Apr 2023	0 – 1150	70 – 120	0.1 – 0.5	34 – 133	Partial	IcePuck
GUC	9 – 13 May 2023	0 – 500	119 – 120	0.3 – 0.5	30 – 41	No	IcePuck
GUC	9 – 15 Jun 2023	0 – 1000	60 – 120	0.3 – 0.5	16 – 47	No	IcePuck
CRG	14 – 23 Feb 2025	0 – 900	59 – 119	7.1 – 11.0	447 – 1456	Yes	PUFIN
CRG	15 – 28 Jul 2025	0 – 1050	4 – 30	4.6 – 8.2	31 – 245	Yes	PUFIN

BNF	21 – 27 Mar 2025	0 – 1100	60 – 91	6.9 – 7.2	416 – 1157	Yes	PUFIN
BNF	17 – 27 Apr 2025	0 – 850	46 – 62	6.9 – 7.3	350 – 438	Yes	PUFIN
BNF	29 May – 6 Jun 2025	0 – 700	28 – 44	7.3 – 8.9	204 – 394	Yes	PUFIN
BNF	9 – 24 Aug 2025	0 – 850	30 – 89	7.7 – 8.9	254 – 713	Yes	PUFIN

The SGP site is located in the midst of agricultural fields in north-central Oklahoma, United States, which often produce high concentrations of INPs from soil dust lofted during farming activities such as harvesting and plowing (Knopf et al., 2021). The TBS deployment at SGP was part of an intensive observational period (IOP) aimed at investigating the drivers of variability in INP concentrations from regional emissions of fertile, organic-rich agricultural soils, as well as intermittent contributions from other sources, including aerosols from controlled burns or wildfires, long-range transported desert dust, cellulose-containing plant matter, fungal spores, and microbial particles. Cornwell et al. (2024) reported enrichments of phosphate, lead, and soil organics in dust particles acting as INPs from surface measurements, while non-ice-nucleating aerosols were primarily carbonaceous or secondary in origin. TBSINP data from this deployment are still under analysis for a forthcoming publication, but several noteworthy case days have already emerged, including instances with elevated particle concentration layers within the boundary layer. The GUC site, part of the SAIL campaign, is located high in the Colorado Rocky Mountains. SAIL aimed to develop a quantitative understanding of atmospheric and land–atmosphere interaction processes, across relevant scales, that influence mountain hydrology in the midlatitude continental interior of the United States (Feldman et al., 2023). TBS flights at GUC were conducted in all seasons except autumn and sampled both within the mountain valley and above ridgelines, capturing cases influenced by local valley sources as well as more regional aerosol below cloud level.

In this paper, we focus on the TBS deployments at CRG and BNF where PUFIN was included, and consequently, larger air volumes were collected ([Table 1](#)). These conditions produced relatively complete cumulative INP spectra over much shorter collection times (~30 to 60 minutes) compared with previous IcePuck deployments at SGP and GUC, which often required more than an hour to obtain sufficient sample loading for INP detection, given the low flow rate of IcePuck. The shorter collection time is advantageous because it allows sampling at more altitude ranges per flight given constraints on flight duration imposed by battery life and staffing limitations.

At CRG, TBS operations took place in both winter and summer as part of the CoURAGE campaign, which investigates how spatial gradients in land–atmosphere interactions across coastal, urban, and rural environments influence atmospheric processes such as aerosols, clouds, radiation, precipitation, and boundary-layer dynamics in the Baltimore region. A central objective of CoURAGE is to improve representation of coastal urban climates in Earth system models by leveraging observations from a four-node regional observatory network to test and refine model simulations of urban atmospheric

environments. The BNF observatory, a long-term ARM mobile facility (AMF) located in northwest Alabama, United States, is designed to advance understanding of the coupled interactions among aerosols, clouds, and land-atmosphere processes, particularly within forested environments, to strengthen their representation in Earth system models. In addition, BNF is envisioned to serve as a testbed for applying artificial intelligence and machine learning methods to enhance predictability in atmospheric science, while supporting detailed studies of land-atmosphere feedbacks and aerosol-cloud interactions. To date, four TBS deployments have been conducted at BNF during spring and summer, with additional campaigns anticipated in the future.

4.2 INP profile data from recent ARM TBS campaigns




Figure 5: Cumulative INP spectra from CRG TBS flights in a) February and b) July 2025. Two altitudes or altitude ranges were sampled per day. PUFIN loitered at a single altitude if the range is the same value; if a range with different values is listed, PUFIN profiled within that range to collect the sample. Date (mm/dd/yyyy) and time (hh:mm:ss) indicate the sampling (flight) start in UTC. Each day is a different color, with each altitude (range, in m AGL) a different shade of that color. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals.

The objective of this section is to provide an initial presentation of the temperature spectra, demonstrating the capabilities of the dataset and highlighting its potential for future scientific investigation. A more in-depth scientific interpretation of these data falls beyond the primary scope of this manuscript; however, we encourage the community to further explore these observations in combination with complementary meteorological and aerosol measurements. [Figure 5](#) shows cumulative INP spectra from CRG during February and July 2025, with darker shades of each color representing the lower altitude sampled each day. We also evaluated equivalent potential temperature (θ_e) during flight days using data collected from the TBS to assess whether the boundary layer in the PUFIN sampling region was well mixed, where INP concentrations would be expected to be similar across altitudes, or stratified, which can promote aerosol layering (Creamean et al., 2021; Griesche et al., 2021, 2025). Details of the θ_e calculations are provided in the Supporting Information.

327 In February, multiple flights were conducted, with two altitudes sampled per day, revealing substantial variability both in
328 overall INP concentrations and in the vertical structure. For example, on 14 and 22 February (red and green shades,
329 respectively), higher altitudes (loitering at 600 m and 300–575 m, respectively) consistently exhibited significant elevated
330 INP concentrations (i.e., spectra varied beyond the 95% confidence intervals) across all temperatures compared with lower
331 altitudes (200 m and 0–300 m, respectively). These days also corresponded to a fairly stratified part of the boundary layer
332 during the flights, since θ_e varied vertically by ~ 2 to 4 K ([Figure S3](#)). In contrast, on 19 and 23 February (orange and blue
333 shades, respectively), no significant differences were observed between upper and lower altitude levels (0–300 m versus
334 300–740 m and 0–300 m versus 250–900 m, respectively), as concentrations overlapped within the 95% confidence intervals.
335 The boundary layer during the flights appeared to be well mixed on 19 February (θ_e varied by only ~ 1 K vertically) but
336 stratified on 23 February ([Figure S3](#)); therefore, the observed differences in INP spectra were unlikely to be driven solely by
337 distinct aerosol layers. In July, INP concentrations averaged an order of magnitude lower (19 L^{-1}) than in February (145 L^{-1})
338 at -25°C , but were an order of magnitude higher at -15°C (3 versus 0.6 L^{-1}). Interestingly, even the sample collected over
339 just 4 minutes (31 L of air) yielded detectable INP concentrations and was among the higher values observed at CRG at all
340 temperatures. The spectral shapes also differed: February spectra were more log-linear, whereas July spectra exhibited a
341 sharp increase in concentration before -15°C followed by a plateau, consistent with the influence of biological INPs
342 (Creamean et al., 2019). This is notable given that Baltimore is an urban environment, yet it may still be influenced by
343 biological activity linked to ice nucleation activity, which has been observed in other urban environments (Cabrera-
344 Segoviano et al., 2022; Tobo et al., 2020; Yadav et al., 2019). However, the Baltimore region is bordered by farmland to the
345 east where the dominant crops are grains, oilseeds, dry beans, and dry peas (USDA, 2022), which may have influenced the
346 sampled INP population. Higher freezing temperatures were reached in February due to larger sampling volumes ([Table 1](#)),
347 with detection up to -7°C compared to -11°C in July. In July, the flights on 22 Jul, 26 Jul, and the lowest (53–423 m) and
348 highest (618–1062 m) altitude ranges on 28 Jul had significant differences. During all three cases, higher INP concentrations
349 were observed at the lower altitude ranges than the upper ranges, which was the opposite of the February observations. These
350 dates also coincided with a stratified vertical structure based on θ_e profiles ([Figure S3](#)).

351 [Figure 6](#), similar to [Figure 5](#), presents results from BNF flights across four months in 2025. In March, INPs were limited to
352 relatively colder temperatures ($\leq -14^\circ\text{C}$), despite the highest sampled air volumes at BNF compared to other months ([Table](#)
353 [1](#)), and no significant differences were observed between altitude levels on any day. The boundary layer during the 27 March
354 flight was highly stratified, but was well mixed on the 21 and 22 March flights ([Figure S4](#)). In April, only one day included
355 two altitude levels, which again showed no significant difference. Generally, April exhibited average concentrations
356 comparable to those observed in March (13 and 10 L^{-1} at -25°C , respectively). By the end of April, a single sample was
357 collected over the full flight from ground level to 850 m, and concentrations began to increase toward the warmer end of the
358 spectrum. May involved one flight towards the end of the month at two altitude levels with no difference in INP
359 concentration, likely due to the well-mixed boundary layer ([Figure S4](#)), and were similar in concentration to March and April

on average (12 L^{-1} at -25°C). Although the 1 June samples did not show a significant difference, likely due to the generally well-mixed boundary layer aside from a near-surface inversion, the higher altitude range exhibited an order of magnitude higher INP concentration than the lower range (42 versus 4 L^{-1} at -25°C). Later in June, concentrations increased at higher freezing temperatures, and a significant difference was observed during the 15 June flight, with the lower altitude range showing higher INP concentrations (41 versus 5 L^{-1} at -25°C), opposite to the pattern observed earlier in the month. Again, this is consistent with the boundary layer structure, which was well mixed on 6 June and stratified on 15 June ([Figure S4](#)). The increase towards the end of June suggests that as summer approaches, biological activity in the forest likely intensifies, producing biological INPs active at higher freezing temperatures as evidenced by the spectral shape (Creamean et al., 2019). This is also consistent with observations of increased INPs and bioaerosols during summer in other forested regions (Petersson Sjögren et al., 2023; Schneider et al., 2021; Schumacher et al., 2013). Combined with CRG, these results highlight highly variable vertical and seasonal trends in INP concentrations at a single location, as captured by PUFIN and processed offline with the INS, yielding publicly available data for further exploration by the research community.

At -20°C , the INP concentrations observed at CRG ($0.01\text{--}1 \text{ L}^{-1}$ in winter; $0.01\text{--}12 \text{ L}^{-1}$ in summer) and BNF ($0.01\text{--}1 \text{ L}^{-1}$ in spring; $0.02\text{--}11 \text{ L}^{-1}$ in summer) fall within the broad range reported in recent studies. For example, Creamean et al. (2018) reported $1\text{--}11 \text{ L}^{-1}$ in springtime agricultural regions in Colorado from vertically-resolved filters via a launched and retrieved balloon system, while similar concentrations ($\sim 0.02\text{--}12 \text{ L}^{-1}$) were observed by Bieber et al. (2020) and Seifried et al. (2021) near a lake in Austria in summer via UAS. Böhmländer et al. (2025) reported lower values of $\sim 0.2\text{--}0.5 \text{ L}^{-1}$ during spring and autumn UAS test flights in a boreal environment in Finland. In April in Cyprus, Marinou et al. (2019) reported $\sim 3 \text{ L}^{-1}$ from UAS measurements. Values ranging from $\sim 0.2\text{--}10 \text{ L}^{-1}$ from size-resolved measurements have been reported by Porter et al. (2020) across multiple sites in Europe and the Arctic using balloon-based sampling. Overall, the concentrations reported here are consistent with the range of environments sampled in the literature, spanning relatively clean to more biologically or terrestrially influenced regions.

Overall, the flights conducted to date demonstrate that PUFIN can collect sufficient aerosol loadings to capture concentrations as low as $10^{-2} \text{ INP L}^{-1}$ in as little as 28 minutes (equivalent to $\sim 250 \text{ L}$ of air; 4 minutes at 31 L of air is achievable but at a higher detection limit of $10^{-1} \text{ INP L}^{-1}$). For comparison, INP spectra from SGP and GUC TBS flights are shown in [Figures S1](#) and [S2](#), respectively, in which the same detection limit is achieved but from a longer sampling duration as discussed in Section 4.1. By comparison, ground-based ARM INP measurements are typically collected over 24 hours (~ 10000 to 30000 L of air), enabling lower detection limits of $10^{-4} \text{ INP L}^{-1}$ (Creamean et al., 2025a). Although PUFIN cannot yet achieve such low concentrations, it provides valuable vertically-resolved INP measurements detectable at temperatures as high as -7°C from measurements thus far. Longer collection durations may further extend detection toward higher temperatures, potentially above -7°C . However, further testing in environments with known warm-temperature INPs, such as *Pseudomonas syringae*, is needed to determine whether PUFIN can adequately capture them.




Figure 6: Same as [Figure 5](#), but for BNF in a) March, b) April, c) May, and d) June 2025.

4.3 Requesting PUFIN for future ARM TBS campaigns and beyond

Researchers interested in deploying PUFIN on an ARM TBS mission should first consider contacting the INP and TBS mentors (co-authors of this manuscript, Jessie Creamean and Darielle Dexheimer) to discuss the feasibility, timing, and logistical considerations of potential campaigns. Two identical PUFIN units are currently available, including the original system and a newly constructed duplicate. An intercomparison test was conducted using standard ARM ground-based INP filters (Creamean et al., 2025), in which ambient samples were collected outside CSU for 30 minutes, using the first sample valves on both PUFIN systems. The resulting INP spectra show good agreement between the two units, and the ground-

402 based INP filters deployed routinely at ARM sites, demonstrating reproducibility and consistency in sampling and analysis
403 ([Figure S5](#)).

404 Formal requests for PUFIN deployment are submitted through the ARM TBS proposal process, following the guidelines
405 provided on the TBS campaign website (<https://www.arm.gov/guidance/campaign-guidelines/tbs>). PUFIN is currently
406 configured for deployment on the ARM user facility TBS system, but the design is flexible and could be adapted for use on
407 other balloon platforms or UASs, contingent on community interest. Users may also request sample collection for total INP
408 concentrations, as well as the application of thermal and peroxide treatments to infer INP types, including heat-labile (likely
409 biological), heat-stable (likely organic), and inorganic (likely mineral) INPs (Barry et al., 2023, 2025; DeMott et al., 2025;
410 Hill et al., 2016; McCluskey et al., 2018; Schiebel et al., 2016; Suski et al., 2018; Testa et al., 2021; Tobo et al., 2019).
411 Proposals must target existing ARM observatories, adhere to specific submission deadlines, and include sufficient detail on
412 desired sampling locations, altitudes, and measurement objectives. Both ARM-only and collaborative campaigns are
413 supported. For example, researchers may propose joint ARM–Emsl FICUS (Facilities Integrating Collaborations for User
414 Science) missions to deploy guest instruments, leverage specialized laboratory capabilities, and access additional resources
415 to enhance the scientific output of the campaign (<https://www.emsl.pnnl.gov/proposals/type/ficus-program>). Detailed
416 information on proposal requirements, timelines, and eligible instruments is provided on the ARM TBS guidance webpage.

417 **5 Summary**

418 This paper introduces PUFIN (Profiling Upper altitudes For Ice Nucleation), a robust INP sampling system developed for
419 routine deployment on the DOE ARM TBS platform. INPs, though present at concentrations orders of magnitude lower than
420 CCN, exert a strong influence on cloud microphysics, lifetime, and radiative properties, particularly in mixed-phase clouds.
421 Accurate representation of INPs in weather and climate models requires knowledge of their vertical distribution, which is
422 often not captured by surface-based measurements or short-duration crewed aircraft observations. Small, flexible platforms
423 such as TBS allow multi-hour, vertically-resolved sampling at targeted altitudes below, within, and above clouds.

424 PUFIN collects filters at up to three altitudes plus a field blank per flight, and all operations are fully ground-controlled. The
425 collected samples are processed offline using the INS at Colorado State University, producing cumulative INP spectra across
426 subzero temperatures. Recent deployments in Baltimore, Maryland (CRG) and Bankhead National Forest, Alabama (BNF)
427 demonstrate that PUFIN can detect INP concentrations as low as $\sim 10^{-3} \text{ L}^{-1}$ in as little as 28 minutes, a substantial improvement
428 over the older ARM TBS INP sampling system and enabling multiple altitude profiles per flight. CRG data revealed notable
429 vertical variability in INP concentrations likely linked to boundary layer stratification and aerosol transport, while BNF
430 exhibited generally lower INP concentrations with limited vertical dependence. All PUFIN-generated INP data are publicly
431 available via the ARM Data Center, and researchers can request PUFIN deployment for future TBS campaigns, including
432 collaborative missions at existing and future proposed ARM observatories.

As PUFIN has only been deployed a limited number of times to date, we are still actively identifying best practices. While we have not yet fully evaluated performance under extreme environmental conditions, future deployments will require careful consideration of such factors. Initial experience highlights the importance of maximizing sampling volume for robust INP detection and the value of sending test samples from new or unfamiliar environments for immediate analysis to inform subsequent sampling strategies. We also note that inlet components (e.g., hose barbs) may introduce minor collection efficiency losses, though further testing is needed to assess potential trade-offs with background contamination during ascent and descent. Maintaining consistent altitude ranges where possible improves comparability, and future dedicated flights are planned to include longer-duration sampling at fixed “loitering” altitudes to better resolve vertical structure and potentially achieve even lower detection limits.

Future improvements to PUFIN will focus on enhancing altitude accuracy, overall system robustness, and evaluating particle removal methodologies to ensure the most effective approach is used. Planned upgrades include the incorporation of pressure-based altitude measurements and higher-accuracy GPS sensors, as well as standardized reporting of altitude relative to surface elevation (AGL) to facilitate inter-site comparisons. In addition, improvements to power management, particularly more reliable charging and distribution for onboard sensors, are anticipated to ensure stable operation during extended deployments. For particle removal from the filters, this approach has been intercompared with other techniques employing different extraction methods and showed good agreement (DeMott et al., 2017, 2025; Lasher et al., 2024). Future work will evaluate a range of rotation times to ensure that the current 20-minute extraction is sufficient across filters with varying particle loadings.

Looking forward, expanding the use of PUFIN and similar systems as TBS operations become more routine would not only provide more comprehensive assessments of vertical INP distributions but also capture seasonal variability in these profiles. By providing high-resolution, vertically-stratified INP measurements, PUFIN enhances understanding of aerosol-cloud interactions, informs representation of INPs in models, and supports studies of regional to global climate processes.

Data availability

TBSINP data are available from the DOE ARM Data Center (<https://www.arm.gov/data>) or Data Discovery portal (<https://adc.arm.gov/discovery/>) under DOI <https://doi.org/10.5439/2001041> (Creamean et al., 2024). PUFIN design drawing and parts list are available at <https://github.com/ARM-Development/TBS-INP-Design>.

Author contributions

JMC and AT conceptualised the INP mentor program. JMC, CCH, DD, and BTMH designed the TBSINP sampler, while BTMH built it. DD, CL, and CR were responsible for TBS deployments at ARM sites. CCH and MV conducted the sample

462 and data analysis for the TBSINP data that are publicly-available for download from the DOE ARM Data Center. All authors
463 contributed to the writing of this manuscript.

464 **Competing interests**

465 None of the authors has any competing interests.

466 **Disclaimer**

467 Publisher's note: Copernicus Publications remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims made in the text, published
468 maps, institutional affiliations, or any other geographical representation in this paper. While Copernicus Publications makes
469 every effort to include appropriate place names, the final responsibility lies with the authors.

470 **Acknowledgements**

471 This work was supported by the Office of Biological and Environmental Research within the U.S. Department of Energy
472 (DOE) through the Atmospheric Radiation Measurement (ARM) user facility. JMC, CCH, and MV received support under
473 DOE contract no. DE-0F-60173. We gratefully acknowledge James Mather for his invaluable support in the development
474 and implementation of the INP program. We also extend our sincere thanks to the ARM site staff for their significant
475 assistance with instrument installation, sample collection, and logistics. We gratefully acknowledge Thomas C. J. Hill for
476 his foundational role as co-mentor alongside JMC during the inception of this program, and for his enduring guidance and
477 expertise. He is now enjoying a well-earned retirement in Australia. ChatGPT was used to assist in editing and improving
478 the wording of this manuscript.

479 **Financial support**

480 This research has been supported by Argonne National Laboratory for the DOE under contract DE-0F-60173.

481 **References**

482 Agresti, A. and Coull, B. A.: Approximate Is Better than “Exact” for Interval Estimation of Binomial Proportions, *Am. Stat.*,
483 52, 119, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2685469>, 1998.

484 Barry, K. R., Hill, T. C. J., Jentsch, C., Moffett, B. F., Stratmann, F., and DeMott, P. J.: Pragmatic protocols for working
485 cleanly when measuring ice nucleating particles, *Atmospheric Res.*, 250, 105419,
486 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2020.105419>, 2021.

Barry, K. R., Hill, T. C. J., Nieto-Caballero, M., Douglas, T. A., Kreidenweis, S. M., DeMott, P. J., and Creamean, J. M.: Active thermokarst regions contain rich sources of ice nucleating particles, *EGUsphere*, 1–19, <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2023-1208>, 2023.

Barry, K. R., Hill, T. C. J., Kreidenweis, S. M., DeMott, P. J., Tobo, Y., and Creamean, J. M.: Bioaerosols as indicators of central Arctic ice nucleating particle sources, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 25, 11919–11933, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-25-11919-2025>, 2025.

Beall, C. M., Stokes, M. D., Hill, T. C., DeMott, P. J., DeWald, J. T., and Prather, K. A.: Automation and heat transfer characterization of immersion mode spectroscopy for analysis of ice nucleating particles, *Atmospheric Meas. Tech.*, 10, 2613–2626, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-10-2613-2017>, 2017.

Beall, C. M., Lucero, D., Hill, T. C., DeMott, P. J., Stokes, M. D., and Prather, K. A.: Best practices for precipitation sample storage for offline studies of ice nucleation in marine and coastal environments, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 13, 6473–6486, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-13-6473-2020>, 2020.

Bieber, P., Seifried, T. M., Burkart, J., Gratzl, J., Kasper-Giebl, A., Schmale, D. G., and Grothe, H.: A Drone-Based Bioaerosol Sampling System to Monitor Ice Nucleation Particles in the Lower Atmosphere, *Remote Sensing*, 12, 552, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs12030552>, 2020.

Böhmländer, A., Lacher, L., Brus, D., Doulgeris, K.-M., Brasseur, Z., Boyer, M., Kuula, J., Leisner, T., and Möhler, O.: A novel aerosol filter sampler for measuring the vertical distribution of ice-nucleating particles via fixed-wing uncrewed aerial vehicles, *Atmospheric Meas. Tech.*, 18, 3959–3971, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-18-3959-2025>, 2025.

Burrows, S. M., McCluskey, C. S., Cornwell, G., Steinke, I., Zhang, K., Zhao, B., Zawadowicz, M., Raman, A., Kulkarni, G., China, S., Zelenyuk, A., and DeMott, P. J.: Ice-Nucleating Particles That Impact Clouds and Climate: Observational and Modeling Research Needs, *Rev. Geophys.*, 60, e2021RG000745, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021RG000745>, 2022.

Cabrera-Segoviano, D., Pereira, D. L., Rodriguez, C., Raga, G. B., Miranda, J., Alvarez-Ospina, H., and Ladino, L. A.: Inter-annual variability of ice nucleating particles in Mexico city, *Atmos. Environ.*, 273, 118964, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2022.118964>, 2022.

Chatziparaschos, M., Myriokefalitakis, S., Kalivitis, N., Daskalakis, N., Nenes, A., Gonçalves Ageitos, M., Costa-Surós, M., Pérez García-Pando, C., Vrekoussis, M., and Kanakidou, M.: Assessing the global contribution of marine aerosols, terrestrial bioaerosols, and desert dust to ice-nucleating particle concentrations, *Atmospheric Chem. Phys.*, 25, 9085–9111, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-25-9085-2025>, 2025.

Cornwell, G. C., Steinke, I., Lata, N. N., Zelenyuk, A., Kulkarni, G., Pekour, M., Perkins, R., Levin, E. J. T., China, S., DeMott, P. J., and Burrows, S. M.: Enrichment of Phosphates, Lead, and Mixed Soil-Organic Particles in INPs at the Southern Great Plains Site, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmospheres*, 129, e2024JD040826, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2024JD040826>, 2024.

Creamean, J., Hill, T., Hume, C., and Devadoss, T.: Ice Nucleation Spectrometer (INS) Instrument Handbook, U.S. Department of Energy, Atmospheric Radiation Measurement user facility, Richland, Washington, 2024.

Creamean, J. M., Primm, K. M., Tolbert, M. A., Hall, E. G., Wendell, J., Jordan, A., Sheridan, P. J., Smith, J., and Schnell, R. C.: HOVERCAT: a novel aerial system for evaluation of aerosol–cloud interactions, *Atmospheric Meas. Tech.*, 11, 3969–3985, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-11-3969-2018>, 2018.

524 Creamean, J. M., Mignani, C., Bukowiecki, N., and Conen, F.: Using freezing spectra characteristics to identify ice-
525 nucleating particle populations during the winter in the Alps, *Atmospheric Chem. Phys.*, 19, 8123–8140,
526 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-19-8123-2019>, 2019.

527 Creamean, J. M., de Boer, G., Telg, H., Mei, F., Dexheimer, D., Shupe, M. D., Solomon, A., and McComiskey, A.: Assessing
528 the vertical structure of Arctic aerosols using balloon-borne measurements, *Atmospheric Chem. Phys.*, 21, 1737–1757,
529 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-1737-2021>, 2021.

530 Creamean, J. M., Hume, C. C., Vazquez, M., and Theisen, A.: Long-term measurements of ice nucleating particles at
531 Atmospheric Radiation Measurement (ARM) sites worldwide, *Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss.*, 1–31,
532 <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2025-352>, 2025a.

533 Creamean, J. M., L. A. Miller, M. van Pinxteren, O. Crabeck, N. S. Steiner, L. Marelle, I. Deschepper, R. Lapere, A. Leon-
534 Marcos, K. A. Pratt, J. L. Thomas, A. Da Silva, M. M. Frey, I. Peeken, H. Horowitz, M. D. Willis, and R. Price: Polar primary
535 aerosols across the ocean-sea ice-snow-atmosphere interface: from sources to impacts, *Elem. Sci. Anthr.*, in revision, 2025b.

536 DeMott, P. J., Hill, T. C. J., Petters, M. D., Bertram, A. K., Tobo, Y., Mason, R. H., Suski, K. J., McCluskey, C. S., Levin,
537 E. J. T., Schill, G. P., Boose, Y., Rauker, A. M., Miller, A. J., Zaragoza, J., Rocci, K., Rothfuss, N. E., Taylor, H. P., Hader,
538 J. D., Chou, C., Huffman, J. A., Pöschl, U., Prenni, A. J., and Kreidenweis, S. M.: Comparative measurements of ambient
539 atmospheric concentrations of ice nucleating particles using multiple immersion freezing methods and a continuous flow
540 diffusion chamber, *Atmospheric Chem. Phys.*, 17, 11227–11245, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-11227-2017>, 2017.

541 DeMott, P. J., Mirrieles, J. A., Petters, S. S., Cziczo, D. J., Petters, M. D., Bingemer, H. G., Hill, T. C. J., Froyd, K.,
542 Garimella, S., Hallar, A. G., Levin, E. J. T., McCubbin, I. B., Perring, A. E., Rapp, C. N., Schiebel, T., Schrod, J., Suski, K.
543 J., Weber, D., Wolf, M. J., Zawadowicz, M., Zenker, J., Möhler, O., and Brooks, S. D.: Field intercomparison of ice
544 nucleation measurements: the Fifth International Workshop on Ice Nucleation Phase 3 (FIN-03), *Atmospheric Measurement
545 Techniques*, 18, 639–672, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-18-639-2025>, 2025.

546 Dexheimer, D., Whitson, G., Cheng, Z., Sammon, J., Gaustad, K., Mei, F., and Longbottom, C.: Tethered Balloon System
547 (TBS) Instrument Handbook, <https://doi.org/10.2172/1415858>, 2024.

548 Feldman, D. R., Aiken, A. C., Boos, W. R., Carroll, R. W. H., Chandrasekar, V., Collis, S., Creamean, J. M., Boer, G. de,
549 Deems, J., DeMott, P. J., Fan, J., Flores, A. N., Gochis, D., Grover, M., Hill, T. C. J., Hodshire, A., Hulm, E., Hume, C. C.,
550 Jackson, R., Junyent, F., Kennedy, A., Kumjian, M., Levin, E. J. T., Lundquist, J. D., O'Brien, J., Raleigh, M. S., Reithel, J.,
551 Rhoades, A., Rittger, K., Rudisill, W., Sherman, Z., Siirila-Woodburn, E., Skiles, S. M., Smith, J. N., Sullivan, R. C., Theisen,
552 A., Tuftedal, M., Varble, A. C., Wiedlea, A., Wielandt, S., Williams, K., and Xu, Z.: The Surface Atmosphere Integrated
553 Field Laboratory (SAIL) Campaign, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-22-0049.1>, 2023.

554 Griesche, H. J., Ohneiser, K., Seifert, P., Radenz, M., Engelmann, R., and Ansmann, A.: Contrasting ice formation in Arctic
555 clouds: surface-coupled vs. surface-decoupled clouds, *Atmospheric Chem. Phys.*, 21, 10357–10374,
556 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-10357-2021>, 2021.

557 Griesche, H. J., Engelmann, R., Radenz, M., Hofer, J., Althausen, D., Ansmann, A., Barry, K., Creamean, J., Jimenez, C.,
558 and Seifert, P.: Annual cycle of surface-coupling effects on Arctic mixed-phase clouds during MOSAiC, *EGUsphere*, 1–33,
559 <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-5708>, 2025.

560 Guy, H., Martin, A. S., Olson, E., Brooks, I. M., and Neely III, R. R.: Measurement report: In situ vertical profiles of below-
561 cloud aerosol over the central Greenland Ice Sheet, *Atmospheric Chem. Phys.*, 24, 11103–11114,
562 <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-24-11103-2024>, 2024.

563 Hill, T. C. J., DeMott, P. J., Tobo, Y., Fröhlich-Nowoisky, J., Moffett, B. F., Franc, G. D., and Kreidenweis, S. M.: Sources
564 of organic ice nucleating particles in soils, *Atmospheric Chem. Phys.*, 16, 7195–7211, [https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-7195-](https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-7195-2016)
565 2016, 2016.

566 Hiranuma, N., Augustin-Bauditz, S., Bingemer, H., Budke, C., Curtius, J., Danielczok, A., Diehl, K., Dreischmeier, K.,
567 Ebert, M., Frank, F., Hoffmann, N., Kandler, K., Kiselev, A., Koop, T., Leisner, T., Möhler, O., Nillius, B., Peckhaus, A.,
568 Rose, D., Weinbruch, S., Wex, H., Boose, Y., DeMott, P. J., Hader, J. D., Hill, T. C. J., Kanji, Z. A., Kulkarni, G., Levin, E.
569 J. T., McCluskey, C. S., Murakami, M., Murray, B. J., Niedermeier, D., Petters, M. D., O’Sullivan, D., Saito, A., Schill, G.
570 P., Tajiri, T., Tolbert, M. A., Welti, A., Whale, T. F., Wright, T. P., and Yamashita, K.: A comprehensive laboratory study
571 on the immersion freezing behavior of illite NX particles: a comparison of 17 ice nucleation measurement techniques,
572 *Atmospheric Chem. Phys.*, 15, 2489–2518, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-15-2489-2015>, 2015.

573 Kanji, Z. A., Ladino, L. A., Wex, H., Boose, Y., Burkert-Kohn, M., Cziczo, D. J., and Krämer, M.: Overview of ice nucleating
574 particles, *Meteor Monogr*, 58, 1.1-1.33, <https://doi.org/10.1175/AMSMONOGRAPHS-D-16-0006.1>, 2017.

575 Knopf, D. A., Barry, K. R., Brubaker, T. A., Jahl, L. G., Jankowski, K. A., Li, J., Lu, Y., Monroe, L. W., Moore, K. A.,
576 Rivera-Adorno, F. A., Saucedo, K. A., Shi, Y., Tomlin, J. M., Vepuri, H. S. K., Wang, P., Lata, N. N., Levin, E. J. T.,
577 Creamean, J. M., Hill, T. C. J., China, S., Alpert, P. A., Moffet, R. C., Hiranuma, N., Sullivan, R. C., Fridlind, A. M., West,
578 M., Riemer, N., Laskin, A., DeMott, P. J., and Liu, X.: Aerosol–Ice Formation Closure: A Southern Great Plains Field
579 Campaign, *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 102, E1952–E1971, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-20-0151.1>, 2021.

580 Lacher, L., Adams, M. P., Barry, K., Bertozzi, B., Bingemer, H., Boffo, C., Bras, Y., Büttner, N., Castarede, D., Cziczo, D.
581 J., DeMott, P. J., Fösig, R., Goodell, M., Höhler, K., Hill, T. C. J., Jentzsch, C., Ladino, L. A., Levin, E. J. T., Mertes, S.,
582 Möhler, O., Moore, K. A., Murray, B. J., Nadolny, J., Pfeuffer, T., Picard, D., Ramírez-Romero, C., Ribeiro, M., Richter, S.,
583 Schrod, J., Sellegri, K., Stratmann, F., Swanson, B. E., Thomson, E. S., Wex, H., Wolf, M. J., and Freney, E.: The Puy de
584 Dôme ICe Nucleation Intercomparison Campaign (PICNIC): comparison between online and offline methods in ambient air,
585 *Atmospheric Chem. Phys.*, 24, 2651–2678, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-24-2651-2024>, 2024.

586 Marinou, E., Tesche, M., Nenes, A., Ansmann, A., Schrod, J., Mamali, D., Tsekeri, A., Pikridas, M., Baars, H., Engelmann,
587 R., Voudouri, K.-A., Solomos, S., Sciare, J., Groß, S., Ewald, F., and Amiridis, V.: Retrieval of ice-nucleating particle
588 concentrations from lidar observations and comparison with UAV in situ measurements, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 19, 11315–
589 11342, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-19-11315-2019>, 2019.

590 Lonardi, M., Pilz, C., Akansu, E. F., Dahlke, S., Egerer, U., Ehrlich, A., Griesche, H., Heymsfield, A. J., Kirbus, B., Schmitt,
591 C. G., Shupe, M. D., Siebert, H., Wehner, B., and Wendisch, M.: Tethered balloon-borne profile measurements of
592 atmospheric properties in the cloudy atmospheric boundary layer over the Arctic sea ice during MOSAiC: Overview and
593 first results, *Elem. Sci. Anthr.*, 10, 000120, <https://doi.org/10.1525/elementa.2021.000120>, 2022.

594 McCluskey, C. S., Hill, T. C. J., Malfatti, F., Sultana, C. M., Lee, C., Santander, M. V., Beall, C. M., Moore, K. A., Cornwell,
595 G. C., Collins, D. B., Prather, K. A., Jayarathne, T., Stone, E. A., Azam, F., Kreidenweis, S. M., and DeMott, P. J.: A
596 Dynamic Link between Ice Nucleating Particles Released in Nascent Sea Spray Aerosol and Oceanic Biological Activity
597 during Two Mesocosm Experiments, *J. Atmospheric Sci.*, 74, 151–166, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-16-0087.1>, 2017.

598 McCluskey, C. S., Hill, T. C. J., Humphries, R. S., Rauker, A. M., Moreau, S., Stratton, P. G., Chambers, S. D., Williams,
599 A. G., McRobert, I., Ward, J., Keywood, M. D., Harnwell, J., Ponsonby, W., Loh, Z. M., Krummel, P. B., Protat, A.,
600 Kreidenweis, S. M., and DeMott, P. J.: Observations of ice nucleating particles over Southern Ocean waters, *Geophysical*
601 *Research Letters*, 45, 11,989–11,997, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL079981>, 2018.

602 Mei, F., Zhang, Q., Zhang, D., Fast, J. D., Kulkarni, G., Pekour, M. S., Niedeck, C. R., Glienke, S., Silber, I., Schmid, B.,
603 Tomlinson, J. M., Mehta, H. S., Mansoura, X., Cheng, Z., Vandergrift, G. W., Lata, N. N., China, S., and Zhu, Z.:

604 Measurement report: Vertically resolved atmospheric properties observed over the Southern Great Plains with the
605 ArcticShark uncrewed aerial system, *Atmospheric Chem. Phys.*, 25, 3425–3444, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-25-3425-2025>,
606 2025.

607 Mülmenstädt, J., Sourdeval, O., Delanoë, J., and Quaas, J.: Frequency of occurrence of rain from liquid-, mixed-, and ice-
608 phase clouds derived from A-Train satellite retrievals: RAIN FROM LIQUID- AND ICE-PHASE CLOUDS, *Geophys. Res.*
609 *Lett.*, 42, 6502–6509, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL064604>, 2015.

610 Murray, B. J., Carslaw, K. S., and Field, P. R.: Opinion: Cloud-phase climate feedback and the importance of ice-nucleating
611 particles, *Atmospheric Chem. Phys.*, 21, 665–679, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-665-2021>, 2021.

612 Petersson Sjögren, M., Alsved, M., Šantl-Temkiv, T., Bjerring Kristensen, T., and Löndahl, J.: Measurement report:
613 Atmospheric fluorescent bioaerosol concentrations measured during 18 months in a coniferous forest in the south of Sweden,
614 *Atmospheric Chem. Phys.*, 23, 4977–4992, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-23-4977-2023>, 2023.

615 Pilz, C., Düsing, S., Wehner, B., Müller, T., Siebert, H., Voigtländer, J., and Lonardi, M.: CAMP: an instrumented platform
616 for balloon-borne aerosol particle studies in the lower atmosphere, *Atmospheric Meas. Tech.*, 15, 6889–6905,
617 <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-15-6889-2022>, 2022.

618 Pilz, C., Lonardi, M., Egerer, U., Siebert, H., Ehrlich, A., Heymsfield, A. J., Schmitt, C. G., Shupe, M. D., Wehner, B., and
619 Wendisch, M.: Profile observations of the Arctic atmospheric boundary layer with the BELUGA tethered balloon during
620 MOSAiC, *Sci. Data*, 10, 534, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-023-02423-5>, 2023.

621 Pilz, C., Cassano, J. J., de Boer, G., Kirbus, B., Lonardi, M., Pöhlker, M., Shupe, M. D., Siebert, H., Wendisch, M., and
622 Wehner, B.: Tethered balloon measurements reveal enhanced aerosol occurrence aloft interacting with Arctic low-level
623 clouds, *Elem. Sci. Anthr.*, 12, 00120, <https://doi.org/10.1525/elementa.2023.00120>, 2024.

624 Pohorsky, R., Baccarini, A., Tolu, J., Winkel, L. H. E., and Schmale, J.: Modular Multiplatform Compatible Air
625 Measurement System (MoMuCAMs): a new modular platform for boundary layer aerosol and trace gas vertical
626 measurements in extreme environments, *Atmospheric Meas. Tech.*, 17, 731–754, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-17-731-2024>,
627 2024.

628 Pohorsky, R., Baccarini, A., Brett, N., Barret, B., Bekki, S., Pappaccogli, G., Dieudonné, E., Temime-Roussel, B., D’Anna,
629 B., Cesler-Maloney, M., Donato, A., Decesari, S., Law, K. S., Simpson, W. R., Fochesatto, J., Arnold, S. R., and Schmale,
630 J.: In situ vertical observations of the layered structure of air pollution in a continental high-latitude urban boundary layer
631 during winter, *Atmospheric Chem. Phys.*, 25, 3687–3715, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-25-3687-2025>, 2025.

632 Porter, G. C. E., Sikora, S. N. F., Adams, M. P., Proske, U., Harrison, A. D., Tarn, M. D., Brooks, I. M., and Murray, B. J.:
633 Resolving the size of ice-nucleating particles with a balloon deployable aerosol sampler: the SHARK, *Atmospheric Meas.*
634 *Tech.*, 13, 2905–2921, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-13-2905-2020>, 2020.

635 Porter, G. C. E., Adams, M. P., Brooks, I. M., Ickes, L., Karlsson, L., Leck, C., Salter, M. E., Schmale, J., Siegel, K., Sikora,
636 S. N. F., Tarn, M. D., Vüllers, J., Wernli, H., Zieger, P., Zinke, J., and Murray, B. J.: Highly active ice-nucleating particles
637 at the summer North Pole, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmospheres*, 127, e2021JD036059, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021JD036059>,
638 2022.

639 Pruppacher, H. R. and Klett, J. D.: *Microphysics of Clouds and Precipitation*, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht,
640 <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-306-48100-0>, 2010.

641 Schiebel, T., Höhler, K., Funk, R., Hill, T. C. J., Levin, E. J. T., Nadolny, J., Steinke, I., Suski, K. J., Ullrich, R., Wagner,
642 R., Weber, I., DeMott, P. J., and Möhler, O.: Ice nucleation activity of various agricultural soil dust aerosol particles,
643 European Geosciences Union General Assembly, Wien, A, April 17-22, 2016. Geophysical Research Abstracts, 18(2016)
644 EGU2016-13422, 2016.

645 Seifried, T. M., Bieber, P., Kunert, A. T., Iii, D. G. S., Whitmore, K., Fröhlich-Nowoisky, J., and Grothe, H.: Ice Nucleation
646 Activity of Alpine Bioaerosol Emitted in Vicinity of a Birch Forest, *Atmosphere*, 12,
647 <https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos12060779>, 2021.

648 Schneider, J., Höhler, K., Heikkilä, P., Keskinen, J., Bertozzi, B., Bogert, P., Schorr, T., Umo, N. S., Vogel, F., Brasseur, Z.,
649 Wu, Y., Hakala, S., Duplissy, J., Moiseev, D., Kulmala, M., Adams, M. P., Murray, B. J., Korhonen, K., Hao, L., Thomson,
650 E. S., Castarède, D., Leisner, T., Petäjä, T., and Möhler, O.: The seasonal cycle of ice-nucleating particles linked to the
651 abundance of biogenic aerosol in boreal forests, *Atmospheric Chem. Phys.*, 21, 3899–3918, [https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-](https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-3899-2021)
652 3899-2021, 2021.

653 Schnell, R. C. and Vali, G.: Biogenic Ice Nuclei: Part I. Terrestrial and Marine Sources, *J. Atmospheric Sci.*, 33, 1554–1564,
654 [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469\(1976\)033%253C1554:BINPIT%253E2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1976)033%253C1554:BINPIT%253E2.0.CO;2), 1976.

655 Schumacher, C. J., Pöhlker, C., Aalto, P., Hiltunen, V., Petäjä, T., Kulmala, M., Pöschl, U., and Huffman, J. A.: Seasonal
656 cycles of fluorescent biological aerosol particles in boreal and semi-arid forests of Finland and Colorado, *Atmospheric Chem.*
657 *Phys.*, 13, 11987–12001, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-13-11987-2013>, 2013.

658 Spurny, K. R. and Lodge, J. P.: Collection Efficiency Tables for Membrane Filters Used in the Sampling and Analysis of
659 Aerosols and Hydrosols, Laboratory of Atmospheric Science, National Center for Atmospheric Research, 56 pp., 1972.

660 Steiner, A. L.: Role of the Terrestrial Biosphere in Atmospheric Chemistry and Climate, *Acc. Chem. Res.*, 53, 1260–1268,
661 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.accounts.0c00116>, 2020.

662 Storelvmo, T.: Aerosol Effects on Climate via Mixed-Phase and Ice Clouds, *Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.*, 45, 199–222,
663 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-earth-060115-012240>, 2017.

664 Suski, K. J., Hill, T. C. J., Levin, E. J. T., Miller, A., DeMott, P. J., and Kreidenweis, S. M.: Agricultural harvesting emissions
665 of ice-nucleating particles, *Atmospheric Chem. Phys.*, 18, 13755–13771, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-13755-2018>, 2018.

666 Testa, B., Hill, T. C. J., Marsden, N. A., Barry, K. R., Hume, C. C., Bian, Q., Uetake, J., Hare, H., Perkins, R. J., Möhler, O.,
667 Kreidenweis, S. M., and DeMott, P. J.: Ice Nucleating Particle Connections to Regional Argentinian Land Surface Emissions
668 and Weather During the Cloud, Aerosol, and Complex Terrain Interactions Experiment, *JGR Atmospheres*, 126,
669 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021JD035186>, 2021.

670 Tobo, Y., Adachi, K., DeMott, P. J., Hill, T. C. J., Hamilton, D. S., Mahowald, N. M., Nagatsuka, N., Ohata, S., Uetake, J.,
671 Kondo, Y., and Koike, M.: Glacially sourced dust as a potentially significant source of ice nucleating particles, *Nat. Geosci.*,
672 12, 253–258, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-019-0314-x>, 2019.

673 Tobo, Y., Uetake, J., Matsui, H., Moteki, N., Uji, Y., Iwamoto, Y., Miura, K., and Misumi, R.: Seasonal Trends of
674 Atmospheric Ice Nucleating Particles Over Tokyo, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmospheres*, 125, e2020JD033658,
675 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020JD033658>, 2020.

676 Vali, G.: Quantitative Evaluation of Experimental Results an the Heterogeneous Freezing Nucleation of Supercooled
677 Liquids, *J. Atmospheric Sci.*, 28, 402–409, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1971)028%253C0402:QEOERA%253E2.0.CO;2)
678 0469(1971)028%253C0402:QEOERA%253E2.0.CO;2, 1971.

- 679 Yadav, S., Venezia, R. E., Paerl, R. W., and Petters, M. D.: Characterization of Ice-Nucleating Particles Over Northern India,
680 J. Geophys. Res. Atmospheres, 124, 10467–10482, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JD030702>, 2019.
- 681 Zinke, J., Salter, M. E., Leck, C., Lawler, M. J., Porter, G. C. E., Adams, M. P., Brooks, I. M., Murray, B. J., and Zieger, P.:
682 The development of a miniaturised balloon-borne cloud water sampler and its first deployment in the high Arctic, Tellus B
683 Chem. Phys. Meteorol., 73, 1915614, <https://doi.org/10.1080/16000889.2021.1915614>, 2021.