

Interactive  
Comment

## ***Interactive comment on* “Observation of a mesospheric front in a dual duct over King George Island, Antarctica” by J. V. Bageston et al.**

**J. V. Bageston et al.**

bageston@gmail.com

Received and published: 12 September 2011

Specific comments

- Pg. C6789 (first paragraph):

REPLY: Yes, the authors are well aware about the situation emphasized by the referee in this paragraph, and thanks for comment.

- Pg. C6789 (second paragraph):

REPLY: Indeed, we do not have information on the vertical regarding to the phase fronts of the event because of the mentioned limitation in the airglow imager (have just one filter).

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

- Pg. C6790 (first paragraph):

REPLY: The paragraph related to the difficult in identify the wave structures (due to the presence of low-altitude haze and the location of the Milk Way) was removed, and the images in Figure 1 were improved by using the Time Difference (TD) image technique and filtering process. We believe that now the Figure 1 is adequate (see Figure 1 attached below). Also, a new animation was posted as supplement material.

- Pg. C6790 (second paragraph):

REPLY: The period of observation (40 min) was associated to the time on which the wave structures were seen very clearly in the images, that is less than the time for the event propagates completely through the field of view of the imager. Indeed, the imager has some limitations, and one of these limitations is exactly a smaller effective area (in km) when compared with regular all-sky imagers, since the used camera was adapted to the all-sky system (see explanations in Bageston et al. (2011)). Briefly, this imager system produces a useful image inside of 312x312 pixels on the CCD, given a projected image in the OH layer (with 1 km/pixel of resolution) with a maximum area of 312x312 km. So, the time of observation associated to the wave event (about 1 hour) is consistent with the observed velocity (92m/s or  $\sim 331$  km/h).

The text in the paper was changed to: “The original images (with 1024x1024 pixels) were not binned, but cropped to 512x512 pixels due to limitations of the optical (Bageston et al., 2009 and Bageston et al., 2011}, which produces a useful image inside of 312x312 pixels on the CCD.”

Improvements of the text were performed in order to give the reader a better idea of the evolution of the event. In synthesis, the event came from outside of the field of view of the imager, from aproximately west, and was maintaining its propagation to the northeast until exiting the field of view. Also, a new animation, with the processed images, will be added as additional material.

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

- Pg. C6790 (third and fourth paragraphs):

REPLY: The sentence “This was not done in several previous bore studies, including that by Nielsen et al. (2006) at Antarctic latitudes, because of the absence of temperature and/or wind data” was removed from the text, and a proper citation was added in the introduction.

- Pg. C6790 (Fifth paragraph):

REPLY: The imaging spectrometer is described in the paper: Bageston, J. V., Gobbi, D., Takahashi, H., and Wrasse, C. M.: Development of Airglow OH Temperature Imager for Mesospheric Study, <http://www.scielo.br/>, Braz. J. Geophys., 25(2), 27–34, 2007. In the revised version the above reference was included.

- The referee said: “...it is mentioned that the field-of-view is too large to yield any wave information”.

REPLY: Maybe we did not express properly the correct information. In the paper we find the following sentence (see the end of pg. 16191 of the manuscript):

“...the field-of-view over which the spectrometer temperatures were averaged was  $\sim 70$  km in diameter about the zenith, more than twice the wavelength of the bore...”. This sentence was changed to:

“...the field-of-view over which the spectrometer observes the sky as an integrated counting of the OH (6-2) emission is  $\sim 70$  km in diameter about the zenith (Bageston et al., 2007), more than twice the wavelength of the wave event... This means that the field-of-view from which we calculate the temperature is large compared with the horizontal wavelength of the wave event. Hence, the spectrometer showed no evidence of the 6-min wave period inferred from the all sky imager data...”

- Pg. C6790 (last paragraph): Referee comment: “The discussion of whether ducting is due to the temperature structure through the static stability or to the wind structure is not always stated well in the text.”

Interactive  
Comment

REPLY: The separation of the effects of temperature structure (static stability) and wind structure is hard to do, especially given possible vertical phase variations between the temperature and wind observations and those of the front event. The best we could do was the separation through the dispersion relation presented in the Eq 1.

The relative importance of the Doppler shift in comparison with the curvature of the wind field is just the comparison between the first and the second terms on the right side of the Equation 1. The second term of Eq 1 is in the Fig. 5 (d), as shown in black, and its scale is at the bottom. For comparison, the Doppler shift in the curvature term, i.e.,  $(u_0 - c)$ , for a wind of about 40 m/s (the maximum at  $\sim 82$  km high) gives  $(u_0 - c) = -52$  m/s, and the term  $u_0'' / (u_0 - c) \sim 1.5 \times 10^{-7}$ , then we can infer that  $u_0'' \sim 10^{-6}$ . A simple scale analysis shows that the Doppler shift is much higher than the wind curvature in the second term in the dispersion relation. The relative importance of the full curvature term is discussed with more details, for comparison with the N2 term, in the last paragraph before the conclusions.

- Pg. C6791 (second paragraph): Referee comment: "The caption claims they result from the tidal winds alone, while the text claims they are from tidal winds plus the mean winds. I would guess that the latter may be correct."

REPLY: The referee is right, and the figure caption has been changed as in the text.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 11, 16185, 2011.

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