

Interactive comment on “The EISCAT meteor-head method - a review and recent observations” by A. Pellinen-Wannberg

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 25 February 2004

This manuscript presents a good synopsis of the EISCAT contributions to meteor head echo research. EISCAT researchers, and the author in particular, have been leaders in renewing interest in this field of study and this review of their work is most welcome.

I do, however, have a comment about the last paragraph of section 4. That paragraph presents the author's view of the meteor head echo scattering mechanism as if it were completely accepted by the scientific community. In actuality, this is still an area of research and several groups are making progress on quantitative scattering models to explain the available measurements. This uncertainty is alluded to in section 7, but it would help the readers if the author would point out that the area is still active.

I also question the utility of figure 3 in the context of this paper. The measurements shown there are very raw and, though undoubtedly containing information about the

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

meteor being observed, this information is far from evident. The figure would be much more useful if actual meteor parameters such as vector velocity, altitude, and deceleration were presented in place of returned power from each pulse.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 4, 21, 2004.

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper