

Interactive comment on “MAX-DOAS observations of aerosols, formaldehyde and nitrogen dioxide in the Beijing area: comparison of two profile retrieval approaches” by T. Vlemmix et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 17 October 2014

This is a nice and honest manuscript that I enjoyed reading. The manuscript is well written and the overall quality is good. Scientifically there are no problems and I see no reason why the manuscript should not be accepted.

On the other hand I must say that in some technical matters the manuscript is still a bit clumsy. Nevertheless, the quality improved a lot after the first technical review. The clumsiness in technical matters makes the reading fatigue, which is a pity, since the manuscript is otherwise so well written. I suggest that the authors go through the manuscript once more and try to correct these little details. For example all the reported times should be double-checked. The authors should be systematic and follow the

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



journal guidelines.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 7, 9673, 2014.

AMTD

7, C3216–C3217, 2014

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C3217

