Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 6, C4245–C4246, 2014
www.atmos-meas-tech-discuss.net/6/C4245/2014/

Atmospheric Measurement Techniques Discussions

Interactive comment on "Relationship between optical extinction and liquid water content in fogs" *by* C. Klein and A. Dabas

C. Klein and A. Dabas

alain.dabas@meteo.fr

Received and published: 3 February 2014

Reviewer #2 apparently used the pdf we generated ourselves instead of the one produced by AMT. Many comments he made about e.g. page numbering, references in alphabetical order, centering of captions... are not relevant for the AMT pdf (there, pages are numberd, references are in alphabetical order, captions are centered...).

Units will be introduced for all parameters in the revised article.

In part 2, we tried to minimize the description of the instrumental setup and referred to the publication Burnet et al. for details. We propose to indicate more clearly to the reader that details about the instrumental set-up are to be found in the reference.

Full Screen / Esc
Printer-friendly Version
Interactive Discussion
Discussion Paper

We will try to give better explanations for the figures in part 4.

The fog cases in tab 1 are presently listed from the weakest to the heaviest LWC. We chose this way because we then know that a case with a small index is a light fog, and a case with an index close to 20 is a thick fog. We propose to leave the order as it is know and write how the present list is actually sorted.

"Runaway" is a mistake. The word we had in mind is "runway". We thank the reviewer for signaling us this mistake.

p5 line 5-15: we understand reviewer #2 suggests to add more information in the part of the article that describes how PSDs were characterized. We agree that we should have indicated there which fog case is represented in figure 1. This will done in the revised article.

p6, line 12: we will add the max and min values of extinction and absorption.

p6, line 17: we will add a reference to the gray dots (equation 3).

p7, line 9: we think the range is good.

Fig 1: we do not understand reviewer #2 comment. The quality of the fifure shall be improved anyway for the final publication.

Fig 2-3, 4-5: We will modify "en" into "in" and add units where they are missing.

Fig 9-11: The order of these figures can be rearranged.

Fig 12: the four figures can be distinguished.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 6, 9623, 2013.