

## ***Interactive comment on “Validation of MIPAS-ENVISAT NO<sub>2</sub> operational data” by G. Wetzel et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 22 April 2007

This paper compares the MIPAS operational NO<sub>2</sub> with a number of correlative measurements. The paper is generally well written and scientifically sound. I recommend publication after some minor corrections (pg. and line numbers refer to the print version) 1. pg. 3340, l.2, “statistical”. 2. pg. 3340, near top. Please add a few words about how the systematic errors were determined (e.g., were errors in the line parameters included?). 3. Table 1 and Figure 2 captions, “2-day”. 4. Table 2 caption, “as a function of the solar zenith angle”. 5. pg. 3341, l. 7, “adopted”? 6. pg. 3342, l. 15, “graph”. 7. pg. 3346, l. 18, use “as a function of” rather than “in dependence on”. 8. pg. 3347, l. 24, “NO<sub>2</sub>”. 9. pg. 3348, l.2, “was” POAM III has also failed. 10. pg. 3349, l. 5, fix this sentence. 11. pg. 3349, l. 12, “not very” 12. pg. 3361, l. 16, “Bernath”

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 7, 3333, 2007.

S1318

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

EGU