

## ***Interactive comment on “Evaluation of CALIOP 532 nm AOD over opaque water clouds” by Z. Liu et al.***

**O. Torres**

omar.o.torres@nasa.gov

Received and published: 21 October 2014

Pg. 23585 line 23 The authors seem unaware of recent significant progress on the use of passive sensors for the quantification of aerosols above clouds. Jethva et al [2014] published a comparative analysis of the performance of passive [POLDER, OMI, MODIS] and active [CALIOP] sensors in the retrieval of AOD of aerosol above clouds.

Pg. 23609 lines 10-14 The failure of detecting the full extent of the aerosol layer is not limited to the case of aerosols above clouds. As shown by recent publications [Kacenelenbogen et al., 2011; Torres et al. 2013] CALIOP's 532 nm measurements miss a significant fraction of smoke layers under cloud free conditions. No under-detection is apparent for dust layers. Also as noted by Torres et al [2013], the CALIOP

C8328

under-detection problem of carbonaceous aerosols does not affect the 1064 nm measurements.

### References

Kacenelenbogen, M., Vaughan, M. A., Redemann, J., Hoff, R. M., Rogers, R. R., Ferrare, R. A., Russell, P. B., Hostetler, C. A., Hair, J. W., and Holben, B. N. (2011), An accuracy assessment of the CALIOP/CALIPSO version 2/version 3 daytime aerosol extinction product based on a detailed multi-sensor, multi-platform case study, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 11, 3981-4000, doi:10.5194/acp-11-3981-2011.

Torres, O., Ahn, C., and Chen, Z.: Improvements to the OMI near UV aerosol algorithm using A-train CALIOP and AIRS observations, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 6, 5621-5652, doi:10.5194/amtd-6-5621-2013, 2013.

Jethva, H., O. Torres, F. Waquet, D. Chand, and Y. Hu (2014), How do A- train sensors inter-compare in the retrieval of above-cloud aerosol optical depth? A case-study based assessment, Geophys. Res. Lett., 41, 186–192, doi:10.1002/2013GL058405.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 14, 23583, 2014.