

Interactive comment on “OMI total column ozone: extending the long term data record” by R. D. McPeters et al.

R. D. McPeters et al.

richard.d.mcpeters@nasa.gov

Received and published: 13 October 2015

p2 L29-33 - introduction has been expanded a bit to emphasize the need for continued ozone monitoring.

p3 L75 - rephrased to note that the comparisons shown in this paper show that the row anomaly has little effect .

p4 L88-89 - at the suggestion of the reviewer the actual linear fit has been added to Fig. 2 and the actual drift is noted in the text.

p4 L90-92 - the released OMI data all used the Bass and Paur cross section data. Using the new BDM cross sections entails a full reprocessing and this will be done as

C3275

part of the version 9 release in 2016.

p5 L110-111 - done.

p5 L114-115 - text added noting that the relative trend is from a simple linear fit to the percent difference plot.

p5 L123-124 - We don't really know why there is always a residual annual cycle in the difference. But similar residuals are almost always seen in instrument to instrument comparisons (MLS vs lidar for example).

p5 L133-135 - such comparisons are discussed at length in the Firth et al. paper on the validation of the vsn 8.6 SBUV data record. This reference has been added to this section.

p6 L152 - at this point we don't have further evidence but we will be looking into this further as part of the vsn 9 reprocessing.

p7 L172 - it is our best effort to merge the data, wording changed.

p7 L178 - the comment about the limitations of this work is indeed based on experience. Error analysis is the most difficult part of any analysis such as this and there is a bit of black art involved since all the systematic error cannot be known. Random errors are easy.

Figure 2 - details of exactly which stations are included in the northern hemisphere average are given in the Labow et al. reference.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 8, 7491, 2015.