

Interactive comment on “In-flight control and communication architecture of the GLORIA imaging limb-sounder on atmospheric research aircraft” by E. Kretschmer et al.

E. Kretschmer et al.

erik.kretschmer@kit.edu

Received and published: 30 April 2015

We would like to thank both referees for taking the time to review and comment our paper on the control and communication architecture developed for the GLORIA instrument and for their recommendation for publication in AMT in the frame of this special issue.

Experience shows that controlling, monitoring and automating complex scientific experiments on research aircraft is a mandatory but complex task. We hope that the documentation of our solution is helpful for other scientists. We have carefully taken into

C931

account the specific comments of both referees and we agree on all proposed technical corrections. All of them will be implemented as suggested in a revised manuscript.

In addition, we have a few remarks on some specific comments from the referees:

From Referee #2

Page 1702, line 24: Context not clear in ‘Since it is too large’. It’s not fully clear what ‘it’ refers to here. I think it must be the science data, right?

As suspected, “it” refers here to the science data. This will be specified clearly in the new version of the manuscript.

From Referee #2

Page 1702, line 27: ‘To support a large number of sensors placed on different levels of the gimbal frame’ I don’t really understand this statement. What ‘sensors’ do you mean here? Is there a large number of sensors on the gimbal frame?

The sensors mentioned here are the housekeeping-related sensors such as temperature, vibration and position/attitude sensors. To clarify, the sentence will be modified as follows:

“To support a large number of environmental and attitude sensors placed on different levels of the gimbal frame, a modular approach has been chosen.”

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 8, 1697, 2015.

C932