

Interactive comment on “Evaluation of ECMWF IFS-AER (CAM5) operational forecasts during cycle 41r1 - 46r1 with calibrated ceilometer profiles over Germany” by Harald Flentje et al.

Harald Flentje et al.

harald.flentje@dwd.de

Received and published: 27 January 2021

(You may also use the formatted version of answers to your comments in the attached pdf document)

Response to reviewer #1 of the manuscript

‘Evaluation of ECMWF IFS-AER (CAM5) operational forecasts during cycle 41r1 - 46r1 with calibrated ceilometer profiles over Germany‘

for publication in GMD (MS No.: gmd-2020-308):

We thank the reviewer for her/his efforts to carefully read our manuscript and for the

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



helpful and constructive comments!

General comments: Following the reviewer's recommendations, we shortened the manuscript main body quite a bit from ~43 to ~30 pages, removed redundancies and tried to keep close to the main points. We are confident, that this makes the article easier to read now.

In this we made more use of the appendix, which is now about 9 pages. It disburdens the main text while keeping the information we consider necessary, original and relevant. Particularly section 2.1.1 (description of the mass-to-backscatter calculation) is now in the appendix.

In order to tidy up and ease readability, we removed 4 figures: deleted 2 tiny-looking and dispensable figures from the main text, shifted two figures to the appendix and removed two other figures from the appendix.

We removed (former) Table 2 as it was redundant information with Figure 4, and removed part 2 of Table 3 as this information is provided as numbers in Figure 5.

We increased the font sizes and annotations of all figures and corrected erroneous axistitles.

Specific comments: As you will see in the text, we corrected and followed all issues you raised (properly introduce the acronyms, correct typos and annotations, and remove the tiny-appearing poststamp figures which we ourselves are familiar to use as overview but are admittedly hard to read and identify in detail and interpret for readers outside the lidar community)

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://gmd.copernicus.org/preprints/gmd-2020-308/gmd-2020-308-AC1-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2020-308>,
C2

GMDD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



2020.

GMDD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

