

**Response to Interactive comment on “A comparison of ship and satellite measurements of cloud properties in the southeast Pacific stratus deck” by A. A. Kokhanovsky**

**M. A. Brunke<sup>1</sup>, S. P. de Szoeké<sup>2</sup>, P. Zuidema<sup>3</sup>, and X. Zeng<sup>1</sup>**

[1]{The University of Arizona, Department of Atmospheric Sciences, Tucson, Arizona, USA}

[2]{Oregon State University, College of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences, Corvallis, Oregon, USA}

[3]{University of Miami, Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science, Miami, Florida, USA}

Correspondence to: M. A. Brunke (brunke@atmo.arizona.edu)

1. We won't rank the satellite products per se, but we are adding AMSR-E and SSM/I to Figures 2 and 4 to show that the LWPs from these two are very consistent with the ship observations. We are also adding the ship LWPs to the histogram in Figure 1b.
2. A better description of the averaging of the CloudSat profiles to get the  $0.25^\circ \times 0.25^\circ$  values will be added to the manuscript. Also, further screening of the CloudSat profiles is being implemented into this averaging process (see #1 in Response to Z. Wang).
3. This will be added to the manuscript.
4. The aircraft data listed in Table 1 was only used in Figure 3a. Here, we are just comparing the relationship between cloud thickness and LWP that were presented in those papers to the ship observations, CloudSat/CALIPSO measurements, and model results presented here. These are presented because they were used to get  $\alpha$  and  $A$  in Eq. (1) (i.e., the solid line in Fig. 3a). Since these aircraft data are older than the satellite data that we are using here (October-December 2006-2008) and mostly outside the southeast Pacific, it is impossible collocate the satellite data with these observations. Besides, we are just exploring whether this relationship holds in the satellite measurements and the model

1 results, so there is really no need to match up the aircraft data to the satellite  
2 measurements.