

Reply to 'Comment on "Clausius–Clapeyron equation and saturation vapour pressure: simple theory reconciled with practice"'

This content has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text.

2012 Eur. J. Phys. 33 L13

(<http://iopscience.iop.org/0143-0807/33/3/L13>)

View [the table of contents for this issue](#), or go to the [journal homepage](#) for more

Download details:

IP Address: 137.82.23.217

This content was downloaded on 25/09/2015 at 03:08

Please note that [terms and conditions apply](#).

LETTERS AND COMMENTS

Reply to ‘Comment on “Clausius–Clapeyron equation and saturation vapour pressure: simple theory reconciled with practice”’

Demetris Koutsoyiannis

Department of Water Resources and Environmental Engineering, School of Civil Engineering,
National Technical University of Athens, Greece

E-mail: dk@itia.ntua.gr

Received 25 January 2012

Published 12 March 2012

Online at stacks.iop.org/EJP/33/L13

Abstract

In agreement with the comment on my paper it is clarified that the atmosphere does not involve a mechanism to ‘hold’ water vapour but rather it ‘contains’ it.

In her comment, López-Arias [1] discusses my statement in [2] which reads ‘... *the saturation vapour pressure, also known as equilibrium vapour pressure, is an upper limit of the quantity of vapour that the atmosphere can hold*’ and asserts that it may contribute to a ‘*very common misconception regarding the behaviour of water vapour and the role of air (which is none) in the process of reaching saturation*’.

I wish to thank her for her attentiveness, for her kind comment with good clarifications, and for being ‘*absolutely sure [that] the author does not have this image [i.e. the misconception] in his mind*’. I agree that the choice of the word ‘hold’ in my formulation was infelicitous. It should be replaced by ‘contain’. I also agree with her explanations that the presence or absence of air should be irrelevant to reaching saturation. Actually, nowhere in my detailed calculations do I involve the presence or absence of air, or imply that the air could be considered as a sort of ‘*sponge*’ holding water vapour—to repeat López-Arias’s metaphor. Rather, I used the expression ‘*the atmosphere [and not the air or the dry air] can hold*’ because of the much smaller quantity of water vapour in the atmosphere, in comparison to the bulk of other constituents (which, in addition, do not involve phase transitions). It is like we say that the dog waggles its tail, although indeed the tail is part of the dog. Nevertheless, reformulating it and saying that the atmosphere *contains* the water vapour makes it more accurate.

I also agree when she modifies her initial assertion that the air has no role, subsequently assigning it the role of ‘*being the means by which water vapour cools or warms up*’. Perhaps, it is even more than this, as several researchers and practitioners distinguish the saturation of pure water vapour from that of moist air and to estimate the saturation pressure of the latter,

they involve the air pressure (with a minor weight, though) in addition to temperature (e.g. [3]). However, this is beyond the scope of my paper and I mention it here just as an indication of the complexity of the phenomena.

Overall, I think there is no essential disagreement and I regard this discussion as very useful.

References

- [1] López-Arias T 2012 Comment on ‘Clausius–Clapeyron equation and saturation vapour pressure: simple theory reconciled with practice’ *Eur. J. Phys.* **33** L11
- [2] Koutsoyiannis D 2012 Clausius–Clapeyron equation and saturation vapour pressure: simple theory reconciled with practice *Eur. J. Phys.* **33** 295–305
- [3] Buck A L 1981 New equations for computing vapor pressure and enhancement factor *J. Appl. Meteorol.* **20** 1527–32