

Interactive comment on “Overview of SCIAMACHY validation: 2002–2004” by A. J. M. Piters et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 23 September 2005

General Comments

This paper presents an overview of the SCIAMACHY validation activities, summarizing the current retrieval products and the correlative data that is available. While all of this information is certainly useful for those currently interested in using SCIAMACHY data, it reads more like a status report to ESA than a scientific paper. There are no new results (observations or validation comparisons or other analysis) presented in this paper. The only real results are given in Section 6, which are just a summary of results all presented in other papers.

I guess this is supposed to serve as an introduction to a special issue, but I think such a paper should be kept very brief and/or include a synthesis of all the papers in the issue that is not possible in any individual paper. If an overview paper is really needed,

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

I think it should be shortened to essentially Sections 4 and 6, with their associated Tables. The rest of the paper would be appropriate for posting on the SCIAMACHY website, without any need for scientific peer review.

Specific Comments

1. The Abstract seems more like an abstract, where I would expect a summary of the validation results.

Technical

1. Abstract, 1st sent.: 'is now in operation' -> 'has been in operation now'
2. Abstract, line 21: 'Untied to the constraints' -> 'Free from the constraints'
3. Section 2, line 13: SCIAVALIG is mentioned without definition.
4. p. 7783, line 11: change 'on-board...' to 'on-board, these flights were optimised for measuring the cloud...'

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 5, 7769, 2005.

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper