

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “An overview of the SCOUT-AMMA stratospheric aircraft, balloons and sondes campaign in West Africa, August 2006: rationale, roadmap and highlights” by F. Cairo et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 16 November 2009

This manuscript presents an overview of the SCOUT-AMMA campaign, including descriptions of the meteorological situation, payloads, flights, observations made, and research highlights. While this manuscript might be suitable for publication in a newsletter (of, for example, a meteorological or geoscience society) it is not suitable for publication in ACP as it does not present any new research results. There is mention of some new measurements and research but none of this is shown, and where references are given for more detail it is nearly always to papers still in preparation. So this gives the reader no opportunity to see the measurements or research to support statements made.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



An argument may be made for the need for a paper that gives an overview of the campaign, but even if this is the case the overview paper (i) cannot be written until papers that present the measurements and results have been accepted (otherwise references are being made to papers that might never appear), and (ii) needs to be a lot more concise than this manuscript, which contains a lot of material that is either not needed or will be repeated in papers that actually show measurements and scientific results.

Specific examples of point (ii) are below (this is not an exclusive list of areas that need to be more concise).

pg 19718, line 10-29: There is no need to describe why various decisions were made. You should just state where and when various measurements were made. This discussion, and that on following page, could be made more concise.

pg 19720. The discussion of West African monsoon is not that clear, and introduces numerous acronyms for various meteorological features that don't appear to be used. I think including a schematic diagram would really help, although I am not convinced this discussion is needed.

Payloads: The material in Section 3.1 to 3.3 could be summarized in tables. Any paper that shows results from these instruments will repeat, and likely expand, the material shown here, and so I do not see the need for all this information in text form. All that is needed are tables listing instrument acronym, key species measured, whether in-situ or remote, and reference for more details.

Flights: It is not clear to me that all the details given for each flight is needed. I find the description of changes in trace gas concentrations with no plots or references to papers that show these plots very frustrating, and would imagine most readers would give up reading these subsections.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 9, 19713, 2009.

C7144

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