

Interactive comment on “Halogens and the chemistry of the free troposphere” by D. J. Lary

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 5 November 2004

Thanks for clarifying my questions. I did read the detailed description of the analysis procedure in your previous papers (otherwise I wouldn't have been able to understand the paper), however I think that at least a few paragraphs should be spent repeating the main points of the methods because otherwise it is impossible to assess the results which might appear to come "out of the blue" which is clearly not the case. In my opinion the reader should be able to get at least an idea of the methods from the current paper and should only have to go back to previous papers for the details but not the basic principle of the analysis. I don't think it's acceptable to refer to unreviewed webpages for the main parts of the methods description, this - certainly very powerful medium - should be used only for supplemental material, not for "core" material.

Sources of Cl and Br: the referenced web pages only show results of CYCLING between the different species, I couldn't find a discussion of the actual sources. What was the model initialized with, short-lived organic halogens, CFC-breakdown products,

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

Interactive
Comment

seasalt, ...? Again: crucial explanations of the technique cannot be "outsourced" to web pages.

Months other than those presented in the paper: apparently a lot more data is available than presented in the paper - I would have preferred to read about that in the paper and have comments on the variability in the paper and not on a webpage. In my opinion a paper is meant to summarize the work done and present conclusions that are valid for all the data analyzed, not simply to show the "tip of the iceberg" and then refer to webpages for the bulk of the data. Why didn't you include more general conclusions in the paper (ie not only referring to 2 months) - especially when you have the data to draw these conclusions?

Please also include (if you haven't done already) the main points of your replies into the revised version, esp your explanations of p. 2338 and 2339.

Again: all this doesn't diminish the overall value of the paper, which I think is definitely good work.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 4, 5367, 2004.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Print Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)