

Interactive comment on “The Smithsonian solar constant data revisited: no evidence for cosmic-ray induced aerosol formation in terrestrial insolation data” by G. Feulner

K.S. Carslaw (Editor)

k.s.carslaw@leeds.ac.uk

Received and published: 1 April 2011

I would like to make a few suggestions for changes to the choice of wording in several parts of this paper.

p2302, last line. The word majority should be replaced with a term that is more accurate. The fraction of summer and winter observations can be expressed as a number.

2303 line 4. Please consider whether "very likely" is correct here. Regrettably the IPCC has adopted such terms and given them an apparent formal statistical meaning, so they are now best avoided.

C1399

2303 line 21. Remove obvious.

2303 line 28. This what? It follows a lengthy paragraph that makes several points, so it is not clear what is being referred to.

2304 line 5. Consider revising "in all likelihood". Line 10, remove obvious.

2305 Line 1 and elsewhere. Change we to I.

2307 line 4. Remove surprising. Line 6, remove careful.

There are other examples where the use of such words adds very little to the scientific quality to the work, and may be misleading.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 11, 2297, 2011.

C1400