

Response to interactive comment of anonymous Referee #2 on “Comparison of continuous atmospheric CH₄, CO₂ and N₂O measurements – results of InGOS travelling instrument campaign at Mace Head”

We wish to thank this referee for his/her effort to review our manuscript and give our reply below.

This paper describes results from a measurement campaign to evaluate the compatibility of station measurements of CH₄, CO₂, and N₂O. The transfer standard instrument used was a FTIR that was also compared with standard samples and GC measurements comparable to those used in the station network. The work is high quality and the paper is well written and organized. The paper is a technical paper and it is borderline whether the paper is appropriate for publication in ACP. A better journal choice would probably have been AMT (many of the previous papers from this group and on this subject have been published in AMT). I recommend that the paper be accepted in ACP, but that for further articles on this subject that the authors submit to another more appropriate journal.

Response

As noted in our reply to referee 3, we agree that our paper is essentially a technical one, but we nevertheless felt that submitting it to ACPD would help to increase its visibility to data users and modelers, i.e. making them aware of the potential problems in compatibility of CH₄, CO₂ and N₂O records from different stations or networks (such as AGAGE and NOAA).