Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions

Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., author comment AC1
https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2021-620-AC1, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on acp-2021-620

Paul Joe et al.

Author comment on "Measurement Report: Challenges of Nowcasting the Women's Slope Style Finals at the PyeongChang 2018 OlympicWinter Games" by Paul Joe et al., Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2021-620-AC1, 2022

The comments by reviewers were substantial and I respond by providing a pdf file. The response is composed of general comments and point by point comments. I duplicate the general comments here.

General Response

Given the comments and the classification as a measurement report, I have decided to significantly reduce the scope of the objectives and the contents of the paper. I will focus on the nowcasting and process aspects.

As Reviewer 1 suggested, a new title to help focus the paper. I will focus on the Nowcasting Challenge of the Women's Slope Style Event (not final title), new analysis tools/forecast techniques and their limitations. I will not focus on reference examples (null or thermal case or with constricted terrain).

The most important points can be done by focusing on one event (Event 1) and one venue (BOKSS) and not three events and three venues. Then I can spend more space to provide more context/explanation. This will eliminate the figures with too many sub-plots. The number of figures may not change.

I will also drop the eigenanalysis. I may have not articulated my problems with the limited resolving capability of wavelet analysis clearly enough (i.e. poor resolving capability) but the eigenanalysis indicated that there were no closely spaced peaks and my concern was unfounded. While I felt that this was significant and answers a nagging question for me, it seems not important to the reviewers and so I will drop it as it is not needed to "tell the story". Publishing elsewhere will give the innovation that I found proper attention.

With the descoping, I will be able to focus on providing much more context which is the major message that I am receiving from the reviews. This will also limit the conclusions but also keep them simple and therefore understood easier.

Therefore, the suggestion by RC1 to change the title and the scope of the paper is accepted.

I actually do not see many disagreements but the comments help focus where I need to

improve the manuscript.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:
https://acp.copernicus.org/preprints/acp-2021-620/acp-2021-620-AC1-supplement.pdf