

Interactive comment on “Technical Note: New ground-based FTIR measurements at Ile de LaRéunion: observations, error analysis, and comparisons with independent data” by C. Senten et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 7 February 2008

I want to contradict two comments,

1) C. Senten, ACPD, 8, S47-S50, 2008

"The paper has been published in ACPD as a Technical Note, emphasizing the fact that the goal of the paper is not to report scientific findings, but to inform the scientific community about new FTIR observations at the NDACC complementary site Ile de La Reunion",

and

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



2) K. Hocke, ACPD, 8, S113-S114, 2008

"My first impression was that you provide a very well organized article which can be used as a tutorial for all who want to start in this field of research. ... Thus I think that many ACP readers will be interested in your study."

Comment 1) is rising the impression that no new science is needed for an ACP Technical Note, and Comment 2) gives the impression that a pure tutorial without new science is sufficient.

While I can accept both comments as a personal opinion of the authors, I have to emphasize as a reviewer that they are not in line with the ACP evaluation guidelines. The evaluation guidelines require "new science" for an Article or Technical Note to pass the peer review process: For your information I attach the evaluation guidelines for reviewers (which I received with email of 17 Jan 2008 from ACP for this evaluation) thereafter.

In your evaluation please take into account the following aspects:

- 1) Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of ACP?
- 2) Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data?
- 3) Are substantial conclusions reached?
- 4) Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined?
- 5) Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions?
- 6) Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)?
- 7) Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution?
- 8) Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper?

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



- 9) Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary?
- 10) Is the overall presentation well structured and clear?
- 11) Is the language fluent and precise?
- 12) Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used?
- 13) Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated?
- 14) Are the number and quality of references appropriate?
- 15) Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate?

While we ask you to take into account all of the above aspects, it is not necessary to explicitly address each of them in the Referee Comments.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 8, 827, 2008.

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