

Interactive comment on “Contrail study with ground-based cameras” by U. Schumann et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 10 November 2013

The article is well-written, and describes an interesting and novel approach to analyse contrails including an evaluation of the required ambient conditions for their formation. Besides addressing the points made by the first reviewer (which I also support), I do ask the authors to also consider the list of minor points given below, and otherwise recommend publication of the article

p7441, l9, p7441, l10: please state more clearly that a height/speed determination is only possible due to the use of at least two cameras in the determination (which I guess limits the applicability to contrails living long enough). p7445, l1: as far as I know, aircraft not carrying ADS-B transponders are not really relevant for contrail formation (Wikipedia gives a weight/speed limit, suggesting that only small aircraft flying at lower levels are not equipped with ADS-B). p7447, l24: "motions" => "motions" p7448,l6-7: "likely because of" => sentence seems logically flawed, maybe "possibly indicating a

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



higher ambient...“ Conclusions: could the observations be automated/extended to single camera obeservations. by use of ADS-B data? I think this would be an interesting point for discussion. Fig.13: while this might be matter of preference, I'd suggest to express RH in percent.

Interactive comment on *Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss.*, 6, 7425, 2013.

AMTD

6, C3271–C3272, 2013

Interactive
Comment

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)

