

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Synchronous starphotometry and lidar measurements at Eureka in High Canadian Arctic” by K. Baibakov et al.

Anonymous Referee #5

Received and published: 6 April 2015

There are already 4 reviews..., so I do not want to add another detailed review because my basic criticism is already covered by the other reviews.

The contents of the paper are ok and appropriate for AMT. But as a lidar and photometer expert, I found the paper rather lengthy and thus very boring. It is not necessary to describe the methodological background in such large detail. The shorter the paper, the more readers will be attracted. I am sure, if the present version would be published, almost nobody out of the photometer community would read it. So, please think about this point, and try to shorten the paper to make it much more attractive.

When you state in the introduction that the photometer/lidar synergy has proven to be effective, you **MUST** give references!

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



The first statement on lidar is combined with a reference to Carswell (1983) and nothing else! This is frustrating for lidar scientists. There are so many innovations during the last one-two decades, and the authors give reference to a paper which more than 30 years old, ONLY!

The figures (especially the lidar-data color plots) are of very low quality (1980ies standard). Very low information content. I would not publish such low-quality plots.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 8, 2013, 2015.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

