

***Interactive comment on “Comparison of  
AERONET and SKYRAD4.2 inversion products  
retrieved from a Cimel CE318 sunphotometer” by  
V. Estellés et al.***

**V. Estellés et al.**

vestelle@uv.es

Received and published: 8 February 2012

Comment: Just one comment on the science: It would have been nice if the intercomparison dataset was longer than just one month. The dataset used contains just one episode of high aerosol loading. A longer dataset would presumably have more cases of high pollution. But, while it would have been preferable to have more data, this paper is still useful with the month long dataset.

Response: In spite of being only one month dataset, the period was chosen in order to represent very different burden conditions within a short time (the background values at

C2762

February are very low and the pollution event recorded aerosol burdens seldom found at this site). Moreover, this period includes a clear instance of spherical particles. As the skyrad version 4.2 still did not include non-sphericity of aerosols, it was important to select an event of spherical aerosols. Therefore, the selected period allowed us to focus a detailed comparison of the algorithms in optimum conditions. However, we acknowledge that more research must be done. Our plans include extending the study for a variety of sites and events, and also for a several year database retrieved in one site.

Detailed comments: This is a list of typos. Although not important to the science in the paper, correcting these might make it easier to read.

Response: We thank the reviewer for all the typo corrections. All of them will be taken into account in the text

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 4, 6883, 2011.