Atmospheric
Chemistry
and Physics
Discussions

Open Access

ACPD

Interactive
comment

Interactive comment on "Characterisation of ozone deposition to a mixed oak-hornbeam forest. Flux measurements at 5 levels above and inside the canopy and their interactions with nitric oxide" *by* Angelo Finco et al.

G. A. Gerosa

giacomo.gerosa@unicatt.it

Received and published: 12 July 2018

Dear referee, we are finalizing the answers to your peer review and we would like to submit you a question about one of your request, you can find it in the attached file. best regards Giacomo Gerosa and co-authors

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2018-454, 2018.

[Printer-friendly version]

[Discussion paper]

Dear referees,

we are finalizing the answers to your peer review and we would like to submit you a question about one of your request.

We understand the importance of the confidence intervals/error bars but we think that the readers might be confused because of too overlapping lines of the error bars and might not appreciate well the course of the plotted parameters. For this reason we have presented the graphs without error bars but if the referees persist we could add them in a following step, for instance in the next days when we will submit the final reviewed paper.

This is an example of the same figure with and without error bars and, in our humble opinion, we think the clearer figure is the one without error bars.

Another possibility we would like to propose to reviewers is it to add in the caption an indication of the range of the error bars, so that the reader can have an idea about them.

What do you prefer?

Best regards

Giacomo Gerosa and the co-authors

Fig. 1.