

Interactive comment on “Aerosol climatology: on the discrimination of aerosol types over four AERONET sites” by D. G. Kaskaoutis et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 6 June 2007

The paper “Aerosol climatology: On the discrimination of aerosol types over four AERONET sites” by D. G. Kaskaoutis et al. should not be published.

There are two reasons for that. AERONET data are available at <http://aeronet.gsfc.nasa.gov> and the first 20 pages just retell publicly available material.

The rest is an attempt of data division into various aerosol classes based on certain thresholds established a priori by the authors without any justification. I am not going to discuss here why those thresholds are flaws but would like just to indicate that their division would be different if we change boundaries slightly. I wonder if there is any use of such a division, and what we will gain from reading a 49 page paper.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

Overall I believe that scientific paper should be something more than just presenting tables of aerosol climatology from the AERONET site in the form of graphs.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 7, 6357, 2007.

ACPD

7, S2300–S2301, 2007

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

S2301

EGU