

Interactive comment on “Model Sensitivity Studies of the Decrease in Atmospheric Carbon Tetrachloride” by Martyn P. Chipperfield et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 22 August 2016

General remarks: I am in favor of publishing the paper after following points have been carefully considered.

other issues: L 48 . . . and large uncertainty range (157 to . . . Better mention that this is the lifetime as before you speak of losses . . . and large lifetime uncertainty range (157 to . . .

L 87 it was 2014.

L 115/223/441 numbers for Butler et al. are not identical. However, I just read that they have actually revised their number between the ACPD and the now accepted revision to ACP by 15%. See: response to referee 2: <http://www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/acp-2016-311/> L 48/448 range. . . see just above I am also a little bit unsure what to propose here. Either authors stay with the old number from Butler et al (ACPD)

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



which is also part of the SPARC report or they redo their analysis by asking Butler et al. what their “final-final” number and uncertainty will be in the ACP paper (which will be published soon).

Line 403 . . . show more variability than the AGAGE. . . should be. . . show more variability than the AGAGE. . .

Line 664, Figure 6: x-axis should be ppt, not ppb.

Line 676, Figure 7, header: more accurate? CCl₄ partial photolysis lifetime

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., doi:10.5194/acp-2016-603, 2016.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

