Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 6, S2113–S2114, 2006
www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/6/S2113/2006/

Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions

Interactive comment on "MIPAS level 2 operational analysis" *by* P. Raspollini et al.

M. Koukouli (Referee)

mariliza@auth.gr

Received and published: 31 July 2006

The paper is highly technical in its content and assumes quite a wide range of "insider's" knowledge, not only of the analysis of satellite spectroscopic measurements, but also of the actual spectra themselves. The audience of this paper will tend to be quite a specialised audience, for e.g. scientists with new spectral measurements seeking past experience in how to analyse them in detail rather than scientists seeking to understand the concepts of "level 1 processing" and "gain calibration", to name a couple in random.

However, to the initiated eye, this paper is very detailed and clear in the computational and physical choices made by the authors and researchers of this study who convince of their logic and solidness.

I recommend publication of this paper in the chosen journal after a number of clarifica-

tions/changes have been made to the text and figures as discussed in the annotated pdf document send by private e-mail to the first author, Dr Raspollini.

Apart from those significant and extended comments on the annotated pdf document, a couple of general issues follow:

1. The title is rather short and not as informative as it could be about the content of the paper. The main focus of the paper is neither the analysis of the MIPAS measurements nor is the Forward Model per se, but the specific choices made by the authors in both Forward Model and Retrieval Code in order to obtain the best results. Maybe the authors can come up with a more suitable title? 2. Were there any testing/validation/comparison campaigns post-launch? Maybe they can be explicitly mentioned as part of the validation of the code. I understand that the authors have mentioned an example in their Section 8, but it does not convince as well as it could. Maybe they have another "sister" paper in preparation and they do not want to repeat?

My congratulations to the authors for their efforts in completing the work behind this study and for writing such a full and comprehensive paper.

Looking forward to reading the revised manuscript,

MariLiza Koukouli

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 6, 6525, 2006.