

Interactive comment on “Physical and optical aerosol properties at the Dutch North Sea coast” by J. Kusmierczyk-Michulec et al.

J. Kusmierczyk-Michulec

jolanta.kusmierczyk@tno.nl

Received and published: 27 March 2007

First of all I would like to thank the Reviewer#2 for the comments and suggestions. I would like to comment on the statement by the Reviewer#2 that “using instantaneous values will bias the result because of more measurements usually are made in clear days”.

It is true that our data are biased because we work only with clear days. It is related to the whole procedure of getting information about the aerosol optical thickness (see <http://aeronet.gsfc.nasa.gov>). Therefore, I think, we have to accept it. In the paper we use the hourly mean values of the aerosol optical thickness. In that way the values become “less instantaneous” because they represent the period of one hour. On the other hand the hourly mean values give a possibility to analyze the daily variations.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

Regarding the reviewer's suggestion to remove Figure 6, I would like to mention that Figure 6 is included only to illustrate how the amplitude function should be interpreted. One can say that this Figure is not needed but for another reader it will be very useful. Therefore, personally, I would prefer to keep this Figure.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 7, 1557, 2007.

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper