

Interactive comment on “Radar and optical leonids” by N. Brosch et al.

N. Brosch et al.

Received and published: 15 June 2004

We are very grateful for the detailed comments received from the referee; we feel they improved significantly the paper. Most of our responses are evident in the revised version of the paper. We present here only those responses that did not find their way into the paper.

There are two instances where the referee stipulated the quotation of specific papers. We do not think this should be done because (a) the remark in the text of the paper referred to some comments made by Oppenheimer at the Radar Meteor meeting, and (b) we did not reference the two papers mentioned by the referee because they do not bear directly onto the topic of our paper.

The referee objects to the criterion we used for "simultaneity", i.e., the use of a 10-second time window to search for the radar echo that could be the counterpart of an optical meteor, and requires separating head echoes from trail echoes. Unfortunately, due to the classified nature of the installation this separation is not possible. While the

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

duration of the window may be too long at 10 seconds, this is what we adopted. To be fair, we mentioned the time difference between the optical meteor and the radar echo in each of the four cases we presented.

The issue of meteor head echo lifetime vs. sweep is answered implicitly in line 14 page 1433.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 4, 1425, 2004.

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper