

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.

F. Cairo et al.

f.cairo@isac.cnr.it

Received and published: 17 November 2009

We thank reviewer 2 for his/her remarks and suggestions, that gives us the opportunity to come back to what is probably the main criticism our work has attracted: namely if such an overview paper, which is of descriptive nature and does not focus on any new result, is admissible for publication in ACP. This is a formal remark that has to be confronted before approaching any other of more substantial nature. The ACP guidelines generally discourage the submission of articles with no substantial new result. However, they state that "...special issues may include an introduction article or an

C7197

overview article or both. Introduction articles outline the motivation and background, and overview articles synthesize and summarize the findings of the special issue papers. The manuscript title must clearly reflect the relation to the special issue and should start with "Introduction:" or "Overview:". (http://www.atmospheric-chemistry-and-physics.net/submission/manuscript_types.html)

Our manuscript tried to go along these suggested guidelines, providing both a background, a description of meteorology and activities and their logistic and scientific rationale. Moreover, it tried to summarize the main outcomes.

If such an approach is suitable and accepted by the reviewers, then we are ready to try to meet all the reviewer's recommendations which surely will greatly improve the readability of the manuscript.

We agree that there are a lot of areas that could be made clearer and more concise and all the reviewer's suggestions to improve the manuscript under this respect are greatly welcomed. The reviewer 2 suggestion to split the manuscript into two distinct papers might be also feasible, although there might be a risk to come out with two too weak manuscripts, while we feel that the meteorology description would still have validity within a campaign review paper. On this topic, we would welcome the editor's suggestion.

We agree that Section 5 is inappropriate in the present status, and should either quote only published results or be discarded.

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

C7198