Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 2, S182–S183, 2002
www.atmos-chem-phys.org/acpd/2/S182/

Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions

Interactive comment on "Observations of large stratospheric ozone variations over Mendoza, Argentina" *by* C. Puliafito et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 17 June 2002

This is a generally interesting paper but it is still rough in a few places and could be improved. Here are a few comments:

Pg. 510, last sentence: I do not understand this sentence. It sounds like the authors are saying that they can only retrieve ozone if the water vapor concentration is high enough. This doesnŠt make sense.

Pg. 511 line 19-20: What do the error bars represent (systematic error, standard deviation, or something else)? Is the height resolution FWHM?

Pg. 513: The authors talk about the wave increasing with height and then damping above 35 km. While this accurately represents the variation in the measured ozone, there are many other factors to consider before claiming that this represents the displacement caused by a gravity wave. Such factors include both the normal variation

of ozone with altitude and the change in sensitivity of the measurement to ozone at different altitudes.

Pg. 514: The calculation of a phase velocity is not meaningful since the authors are subtracting two numbers both of which have uncertainties larger than the phase velocity.

Pg. 517: The Conclusion is a strange place to suddenly make a comment about lack of observed trends. It would be best just to delete this first sentence.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 2, 507, 2002.