

***Interactive comment on “Comparisons between
SCIAMACHY atmospheric CO₂ retrieved using
(FSI) WFM-DOAS to ground based FTIR data and
the TM3 chemistry transport model” by
M. P. Barkley et al.***

A. Richter (Editor)

andreas.richter@iup.physik.uni-bremen.de

Received and published: 1 September 2006

Two of the reviewers comment on the fact that a review in ACPD differs from a classical review in that one often has access to the comments of another referee.

In my opinion, this can have several impacts:

1) An uncertain (or lazy) reviewer might be biased by what has already been posted. That of course is not desirable and can be avoided by just not reading the comments before writing the review

2) On the other hand, reading a comment can also be helpful to better understand a critical point in a paper which should lead to a better review. At the same time, reviewers are not always correct, and a second reviewer might disagree with an already published statement which would then start a discussion. As pointed out by Christian, this is still not happening enough on the ACPD web pages.

3) Reading previous reviews can also help to avoid unnecessary duplication of more technical comments.

On balance, I think that the current situation has more advantages than disadvantages, in particular if those reviewers who don't want to be biased by earlier comments just don't open them.

Waiting for the last review to come in would further slow down the whole process of review and discussion, and in my opinion should be avoided.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 6, 5387, 2006.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)