

Interactive comment on “*Exploring accumulation-mode-H₂SO₄ versus SO₂ stratospheric sulfate geoengineering in a sectional aerosol-chemistry-climate model*” by Sandro Vattioni et al.

Comments by A. Robock are in bold. Author responses are in blue.

I find this sentence in the abstract very confusing: "The modelled all-sky (clear-sky) shortwave radiative forcing for AM-H₂SO₄ injection scenarios is up to 17-70 % (44-57 %) larger than is the case for SO₂." Since you use parentheses the normal way in the rest of the abstract, this usage makes the reader take a long time to figure out what you mean. Please just write this out as, "The modelled all-sky shortwave radiative forcing for AM-H₂SO₄ injection scenarios is up to 17-70% larger than is the case for SO₂, and up to 44-57% larger for the clear-sky case." This takes little more space and is easy to understand. I also have a question about the sentence. How can a value be up to a range of values? Shouldn't it be, "The modelled all-sky shortwave radiative forcing for AM-H₂SO₄ injection scenarios is up to 70% larger than is the case for SO₂, and up to 57% larger for the clear-sky case."? I have not read the rest of the paper yet, but if you use parentheses like this in it, please change the text.

See my article:

Robock, Alan, 2010: Parentheses are (are not) for references and clarification (saving space). *Eos*, 91(45), 419, doi:10.1029/2010EO450004.

<http://climate.envsci.rutgers.edu/robock/Parentheses2010EO450004.pdf>

Dear Dr. Robock,

thank you for your short comment on the abstract. The use of the parentheses was changed in the revised version of the paper and the whole abstract was shortened as well. Furthermore, the expression “up to a range of values” was changed. Instead we refer to average values now.

Yours sincerely,
Sandro Vattioni