

Interactive comment on “Validation of meteorological analyses and trajectories in the Antarctic lower stratosphere using Concordiasi superpressure balloon observations” by Lars Hoffmann et al.

A. Stohl (Referee)

ast@nilu.no

Received and published: 20 March 2017

This comment is to support the suggestion of reviewer #3 that the manuscript needs to be rejected, unfortunately.

I already wrote in my original review: "Please confirm explicitly (both in your response and in the paper) that the Concordiasi balloon data was not assimilated in any of the data sets that you are using. I assume this is the case but if the data were assimilated, of course your study would not be very meaningful as the data could not be considered independent."

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



As reviewer #3 reports in his review, Concordiasi data were in fact assimilated by the ECMWF data assimilation system. Thus, unless the authors can prove the opposite, I think there is no other choice than to reject the paper. It is of course a pity as the study is otherwise well designed, but the authors should have checked this very critical point more carefully.

Interactive comment on *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, doi:10.5194/acp-2017-71, 2017.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

