

Responses to Editor Comments

Thank you very much for your comments. Responses to each are given below.

Prior to publication, to the extent possible, the figures need to be improved. General recommendations are: (i) use scalable fonts, (ii) avoid lossy compression (e.g., jpeg), (iii) select "high-quality print" for pdf output, (iv) magnify to 400% to check results.

Figs. 1,3,4,5,6,8,9,10,11,14,15,16: arrows & annotation font appear blocky (this is a minor problem)

Figs. 2,7,12,13: ditto, and lossy compression degrades all pixels considerably (this is a major problem)

Following the advice of (i) – (iv), we have changed the format of all figures to encapsulated postscript, and used scalable image rendering for the raster-type plots (Figs. 1,2,12, and 13). These changes have removed the blockiness of the fonts and arrows, and eliminated the pixel degradation noted above.

MINOR FIXES & IMPROVEMENTS

8.135: data were

Corrected.

18.367: "The DMS concentrations vary widely across models but are generally higher than the aircraft observed values for some models, [and vary strongly between models]."

The last clause [...] is now redundant and may be deleted.

Clause deleted.