

## ***Interactive comment on “Chemical ozone loss in the Arctic winter 2002/2003 determined with Match” by M. Streibel et al.***

**M. Streibel et al.**

Received and published: 7 April 2006

Answers to the Comments

We agree with most of the comments and have amended the paper accordingly.

We do not agree with the following comment:

Reviewer Major Comment: Figures: It is important to have the information from various sensitivity studies that the Match results are robust to details of the assumptions inherent in Match. However, in terms of presentation, I suggest that several of these sensitivity studies are better represented in difference (of ozone loss) plots rather than in plots showing several points lying (more or less) on top of each other.

We think that is important to show both, the absolute and relative difference if the

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

approach is changed. For that reason we would like to stick to the figures shown here as it enables both.

Moreover Reviewer Minor comment to section 4.3: P. 4320, l. 17: Why 5 K resolution?

The resolution was chosen to minimize computational costs. We do not think that it is important to the science so we would rather leave it out as it provides no real important information to the reader.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 5, 4311, 2005.

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper