Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2019-46-EC1, 2019 © Author(s) 2019. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



**AMTD** 

Interactive comment

Interactive comment on "Validation, comparison, and integration of GOCI, AHI, MODIS, MISR, and VIIRS aerosol optical depth over East Asia during the 2016 KORUS-AQ campaign" by Myungje Choi et al.

## Cheng Liu (Editor)

chliu81@ustc.edu.cn

Received and published: 21 May 2019

Review of the manuscript number AMT-2019-46 submitted to Atmospheric Measurement Techniques and entitled "Validation, comparison, and integration of GOCI, AHI, MODIS, MISR, and VIIRS aerosol optical depth over East Asia during the 2016 KORUS-AQ campaign" by Myungje Choi et al.

The paper describes the aerosol results and analysis from several different polarorbiting and geostationary satellites. The author give a meaningful topic and we could Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



get a positive comparison response. It will be better that the authors could give more detailed outside validation using several ground-based instruments. Moreover, there should be a detailed description of data filter and validation method. I recommend publication after minor corrections.

Major comments: 1, The authors should have a detailed description for data filter of all the polar-orbiting and geostationary satellites. It will be meaningful if the authors could give the validation results of all the satellite analyzed in the manuscript calculated using a same algorithm. 2, In the manuscript, the authors also used AERONET data to validate the satellite results. It will be better that the authors could use other more ground-based instrument in different stations to validate and have a comparison with the satellites results. 3, From Figure2, we could find there are difference for the amount of data of different satellite. The authors should give detailed reasons (Due to errors or cloud?) 4, Why the authors only use the GOCI measurements in the case analysis (Section 4.2) Minor comments: Figure2 need to be improved. The font is too small that the readers can't see it clearly.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2019-46, 2019.

## **AMTD**

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

