

## ***Interactive comment on* “Evaluation of cloud fraction and its radiative effect simulated by IPCC AR4 global models against ARM surface observations” by Y. Qian et al.**

**Y. Qian et al.**

yun.qian@pnl.gov

Received and published: 22 October 2011

Y. Qian (Corresponding Author) Yun.qian@pnnl.gov

Dear Dr. Stevens,

Thank you for being the editor of this manuscript and for the comments above. We have seriously addressed all comments from the three referees, and accordingly we revised the manuscript substantially. Our detailed responses are documented in the supplement zip file we uploaded, in which four responses to three reviewers and editor are included. Here we would like to bring to your attention the major points we addressed and changes made in the manuscript.

C10736

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



(1) We have clarified how we map the cloud fraction from model and observation into same vertical grids (see the response to General Comment 1 of Referee # 1 and Specific Comment 5 of Referee # 3) and added a few paragraphs describing this in Section 2.2.d.

(2) We have added new analysis for inter-comparison of the three cloud fraction datasets at SGP and NSA. Three new figures are added (Figures 2, 4, and 5). See the response to General Comment 2 of Reviewer # 1.

(3) We have moved most of the scattered motivations to the introduction and observational data section (Sections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3). We have reorganized Section 2.2 into four subsections, two of which are new subsections introducing the TSI data (2.2.b) and explaining why only a certain measurement is used to evaluate the models and how the vertical profiles of cloud fraction are constructed (2.2.d).

(4) We have reorganized Section 3 into three subsections presenting the results for Manus, SGP and NSA, respectively. We have moved some discussions on the uncertainty of measurements into the ARM data section (2.2).

(5) We have revised the Abstract and Conclusion/Discussion to more clearly highlight the unique aspects and key findings of this study (See response to Specific Comment 1 of Referee # 1).

(6) We have added a few paragraphs in Section 6 discussing the future work plan as the referees suggested.

(7) We also removed many sentences/phrases that seemed repetitive or caused confusion in the original manuscript.

Please see the response to each referee for more details. For your convenience, we uploaded a pdf file for the revised manuscript in which all changes we made to the original version of manuscript are tracked where you may also see how much substantially we have revised it (Note this file is generated by Word by comparing the original and

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

revised versions of manuscript so may not accurately reflect all changes we made in some cases). We believe that those changes have made the manuscript more concise, much clearer and much improved. Please let us know if you have further questions or comments.

Thank you for the consideration, and we look forward to your decision.

Sincerely, Yun Qian (on behalf of all authors)

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/11/C10736/2011/acpd-11-C10736-2011-supplement.zip>

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 11, 14933, 2011.

ACPD

11, C10736–C10738,  
2011

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C10738

