

Interactive comment on “Comparison of Aircraft Measurements during GoAmazon2014/5 and ACRIDICON-CHUVA” by Fan Mei et al.

Fan Mei et al.

fan.mei@pnnl.gov

Received and published: 15 July 2019

We appreciate the referee efforts in reviewing our manuscript. However, we regret that the referee does not consider the manuscript worthy of publication. For reasons that we explain in the following, we do not share this opinion. 1. Many of the authors of this manuscript have participated in twenty plus aircraft measurement campaigns. Based on their experiences, a merely technical document comparing instruments to each other for each campaign is not a common practice. 2. Thus, we feel that such comparison studies should appear in the referenced literature to educate the community on how to examine the measurements obtained from more than one aircraft, including pointing out potential issues. This valuable information, is very important to share with a broader audience. 3. Also, publications of instrument intercomparisons

C1

from field or laboratory campaigns are common in the refereed literature, in AMT and other journals. Here are a few examples:

- Brock et al. (2019): “Aerosol size distributions during the Atmospheric Tomography Mission (ATom): methods, uncertainties, and data products”, <https://www.atmos-meas-tech.net/12/3081/2019/amt-12-3081-2019-discussion.html>
- Meyer et al. (2015): Two decades of water vapo measurements with the FISH fluorescence hygrometer: A review., ACP, 15, 8521–8538, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-15-8521-2015>, 2015.
- Fahey et al (2014): The AquaVIT-1 intercomparison of atmospheric water vapor measurement techniques, AMT, 7, 3177–3213, <https://doi.org/doi:10.5194/amtd-7-3177-2014>.
- Rollins et al. (2014): Evaluation of UT/LS hygrometer accuracy by intercomparison during the NASA MACPEX mission, JGR, 119, 1915–1935, <https://doi.org/doi:10.1002/2013JD020817>, 2014.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2019-17, 2019.

C2