

# Review of “An advanced spatial co-registration of cloud properties for the atmospheric Sentinel missions: Application to TROPOMI”

Comments based on

[https://editor.copernicus.org/index.php?mdl=msover\\_md&jrl=400&lcm=oc73lcm74a&acm=get\\_manuscript\\_file&ms=118338&id=2395282&salt=1973031979915874526](https://editor.copernicus.org/index.php?mdl=msover_md&jrl=400&lcm=oc73lcm74a&acm=get_manuscript_file&ms=118338&id=2395282&salt=1973031979915874526), retrieved 1 August 2024

## General comments

Dear authors,

It is very clear that you have put a lot of effort in revising and shortening the paper. The manuscript is now much more concise and therefore it is easier for the reader to follow the main results. In your answers you have addressed all my previous comments in a satisfactory way. However, during your revision some small oversights occurred:

## Detailed comments

Please find detailed comments in the table below.

#	Page	Line	Section	Comment
C4	1, 4 23	16, 92, Fig 18	Abstract, 3, Fig 18	There are still two occasions where ground and detector pixels are mixed up

## Technical comments/typos

On the second reading I found a minor point (T1) which I did not notice in my first review:

#	Page	Line	Section	Comment
T1	1	18	Abs	“Across-track flight direction” should be “across-track” or “across-flight” but not both
T2	2	30	Intro	Here you still refer to UV-1 UV-2... , Is this an oversight? The table has been updated with the band numbering and spectrometer names.
T4	4,14,28	84, 275, 412	3, 4.1, 5	On top -> in addition to
T5	5	Fig 1		“described” → described, also here: VIS-1/NIR-2 spectrometer is still not correct