

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

A. J. M. Piters et al.

Received and published: 15 December 2005

We would like to thank referee #2 for critically reading the manuscript, and his positive words, with which we obviously agree.

Specific comments:

"The abstract reads more like a summary, the information about the results are missing in the abstract."

The whole section 6 is already a summary of the results from many individual validation papers, and in Table 6 this section is again summarised as quantitatively as possible. We argue in this paper that only giving an average bias and rms difference is not enough. Looking at Table 6 it is probably more important to note that for many products we do not have information on data quality. The quality of the products for which we filled in actual numbers in Table 6 and their usefulness for specific scientific

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

applications cannot be given in such a Table. Therefore we feel that summarising Table 6 even more for the abstract is not appropriate. Nevertheless, we added lists with the scientific products already giving acceptable results in the abstract.

"Although the information given about the processor versions is essential, the added value of figures 7 and 8 is not clear."

Table 5 lists the software versions and the periods for which they are valid. The information that is missing in this Table is the fraction of the data that is actually available. Figures 7 and 8 give this information. It shows that any selected period might contain multiple software versions, and the validation results can be affected by this. Furthermore, every software version will have large data gaps, also potentially affecting the validation results. This information has been included in the revised version of the manuscript.

"Most of the validation results presented are based on the two latest processor versions (NRT 5.04 and OL 2.5) or on 'scientific'. For the 'scientific' processors the used version is not always indicated, which makes its traceability more difficult. If possible an indication for those processors should be added (including institute and version)"

Indeed, scientific processors still too often have no processor version number. We have added in the revised version of Table 6 the information on available processor numbers and on scientific institutes.

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

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