

## ***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.***

**D. Feist**

dfeist@bgc-jena.mpg.de

Received and published: 5 March 2008

In my opinion, reviewer #2 uses a very strange argument in his review:

"3) A CO enhancement found in the campaign data is attributed to biomass burning source regions using FLEXPART (Section 4). Hundreds of earlier studies have demonstrated this kind of analysis (enter `stohl & long-range`; to Google). After more than 10 years the research `eld` of atmospheric (long-range) transport has reached a late and mature phase. Therefore, any new research should discuss

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive  
Comment

what the still open science questions are and how to address which of them. This is not the case in this paper."

Let me get this straight: a scientist uses an established analysis method to interpret her experimental data and this is held against her?

Or does this mean that only studies that contradict FLEXPART results should merit publication today? In that case at least half of the quoted hundreds of atmospheric transport studies should probably never have been published. I would say that for most of them the major conclusion was that FLEXPART was doing its job well while it is only a minor issue in the article by C. Senten et al.

Within this context there is also a link to the discussion about what should and what should not be published in ACP (according to reviewer #2). Stohl et al. published "Technical note: The Lagrangian particle dispersion model FLEXPART version 6.2", *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 5, 2461-2474, 2005. This is basically a manual for the latest FLEXPART version and was also cited by C. Senten et al. None of the reviewers had any trouble accepting this technical note for publication in ACP. So publishing a description for a new version of an existing model as a technical note in ACP is fine but doing the same thing for a new experimental data set is not? As an experimentalist, I find this logic unacceptable.

---

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

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