

***Interactive comment on* “New-particle formation events in a continental boundary layer: First results from the SATURN experiment” by F. Stratmann et al.**

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 6 May 2003

After reading the comments from Referee #2 I have the feeling to give my general meaning concerning scientific articles. Most of the single points Referee #2 mentioned in his statement are also included in my ones and I agree completely that the authors should reconsider some aspects of their conclusions.

However, a great problem in the scientific community is the long time periods results from different campaigns needs to be available for the rest of the scientists. In this way ACP already made in my opinion a big step into the future with time periods of less than two months between receiving and publishing in ACPD.

Concerning the discussed article we and I mean the whole scientific community have to decide, whether we want to get preliminary results from some campaigns after a

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

short period, although they are not in a so perfect way as they might be one year later. In the case of the MS the authors published first results from the SATURN experiment (summer 2002) already 7 months later and I am very happy to see the results of the experiments so early.

The general question is: To we need and accept papers with first results after short time scale or to we want to wait some years for better manuscripts?

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 3, 1693, 2003.

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper