

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Estimated UV doses to psoriasis patients during climate therapy at Gran Canaria in March 2006” by L. T. N. Nilsen et al.

j. groebner (Editor)

julian.groebner@pmodwrc.ch

Received and published: 3 March 2008

This is an editor comment published due to the unavailability of one of the reviewers.

The manuscript describes measurements and model results of solar UV radiation at Gran Canaria for one month in 2006. The aim of the study was to estimate the UV dose received by psoriasis patients during climate therapy at Gran Canaria.

The manuscript is evaluated according to the criteria outlined on the ACP web-site:

- 1) Aims and Scope of ACP at <http://www.atmospheric-chemistry-and-physics.net/index.html>
- 2) Manuscript evaluation criteria: <http://www.atmospheric-chemistry-and->



Interactive
Comment

After discussion with one of the executive editors of ACP, and studying carefully the comments made by one reviewer and two reader comments, I believe that this manuscript does not fulfill the aims and scope of ACP for the following reasons:

- 1) The manuscript does not address relevant scientific questions within the scope of ACP, which is to focus on the Earth's atmosphere and its underlying chemical and physical processes. On the contrary its focus is on the medical treatment of psoriasis patients, using UV radiation exposure of these patients. This argument is binding for all manuscripts published in ACP, even though this manuscript was published within a special issue dedicated to a UV Conference with a topic related to UV radiation effects on humans and the biosphere. While it would be possible to rewrite the manuscript to focus on the measurements and modeling aspects of this study, I believe that this manuscript does not meet the strict quality standards of ACP, see points 2, 3, and 4 below.
- 2) While the UV measurements and modeling results would by themselves fulfill the basic requirement of ACP, its scientific quality is not rigorous enough to warrant publication in a high quality journal such as ACP. As mentioned by reviewer #2, and acknowledged by two additional reader comments, the measurements and model results are presented without uncertainty budgets; therefore no judgment can be given as to the significance of the presented results. Secondly, the methodology used does not follow accepted standards which recommend the use of personal UV dosimeters.
- 3) The study is of very local character, i.e. 15 days within one month of 2006. To reach significant conclusions related to the use of Gran Canaria as climate therapy location, a UV Climatology of this region would be needed, which necessitates a study over several years. This could be obtained by either modeling studies using satellite estimates of surface UV Radiation, or by long-term measurements. The dose estimates shown in Figure 5 tend to follow this argument by trying to extend the 15 day measurement

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



Interactive
Comment

period to a full year, however the quality cannot be judged without an extensive description of the method used to generate this data, which does not seem possible by a simple revision of the present manuscript.

4) No substantial conclusions are reached. The aim of correlating the UV Dose with an improvement in the condition of the psoriasis patients was not conclusive.

Interactive comment on *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 8, 1, 2008.

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