

Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., author comment AC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2021-796-AC2>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Reply on RC2

Abdulaziz Tunde Yakubu and Naven Chetty

Author comment on "A decadal assessment of the climatology of aerosol and cloud properties over South Africa" by Abdulaziz Tunde Yakubu and Naven Chetty, Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2021-796-AC2>, 2022

I think Reviewer #3 meant that the structure (not necessarily the grammar) needs to be revised. Your sentence and paragraph structures make it hard to read the article and review it. For example, I find that paragraphs tend to excessively long and likewise sentences. It would be good to try to split paragraphs into smaller ones to convey one main idea per paragraph.

The poor paragraphing result from errors in the Latex document. Errors are now corrected, and paragraphs appear in a well-structured manner. Please see the latest version of the manuscript.

- For example, the introduction appears to be one single paragraph running from Line 15 to Line 75. In fact, each section and subsection has only one paragraph. Please feel free to split them all.

Paragraph errors are now corrected.

- Another aspect of this paper that may need revising is the naming of keywords --- could you please make sure to use the correct terminology throughout? For example, is "climatology of aerosol properties" correct? I also think we often refer to aerosol--cloud interactions (in the plural). I could be wrong, so just double check and make a call on these phrases.

The terminology "climatology of aerosol properties" is consistent since the word climatology refers to the pattern over a long time. Besides, the terminology is well used in several other scientific write-ups.

- Can you make the figures clearer and bigger?

Figure improvements have been implemented in the latest version of the manuscript.

Also, since you responded to only one reviewer, could you upload the revised manuscript in your response? I still think this is a sound manuscript, almost ready for publication. My main concerns are related to the presentation and readability at this point.

The revised version of the manuscript is now uploaded.

I would like to review this again focusing on the scientific quality, which I think is good, but obscured by the busy presentation and long paragraphs. You could make the reviewers' lives easier by making it easier to read and follow your manuscript. Looking forward to reading this again :)

Thank you for your contributions to the improvement of this manuscript.