

[Interactive
Comment](#)

Interactive comment on “Aerosol airmass type mapping over the urban Mexico City region from space-based multi-angle imaging” by F. Patadia et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 10 May 2013

General remark: The paper contains a huge amount of aerosol information from airborne, lidar and satellite observations, and is appropriate for ACPD after minor revisions. But it is rather lengthy. The style is often like (sorry...!) a boring technical report.

A paper should summarize (and in this way condense) the essential findings of a scientific work or project. The opposite is the case here, is my feeling.

A few detailed remarks:

Too many tables are presented. Table 1 a,b,c is a typical example for technical report tables (which certainly make sense to have them for internal project workshops). But

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



in a paper? Why do you not show just a map with the locations of observational sites? Table 2 is a technical report table, too. Table 3, the same. Table 4 may contain some interesting comparison, but that should then be shown in a plot, at the moment this is again a lengthy technical report table, and so on. . . with tables 5 and 6.

The figures must be improved regarding the axis information. Numbers and axis text are too small, must be significantly be enlarged. Figs.3-6 present excellent results, by the way!

In conclusion, the paper is certainly of high quality, the author list clearly indicates that high-level scientific work is presented. But the style of presentation does not 'suit my taste'

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 13, 7931, 2013.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

