

Interactive comment on “Continuous monitoring of surface water vapour isotopic compositions at Neumayer Station III, East Antarctica” by Saeid Bagheri Dastgerdi et al.

Jean-Louis Tison (Editor)

jtison@ulb.ac.be

Received and published: 28 January 2021

Dear Authors,

First of all, please accept my apologies for the relative length of the procedure for this manuscript. As you know (and as I acted previously) the two initial reviewers agreed on "great data set, poor discussion and interpretation". One of the reviewer suggested to request the opinion of a third reviewer with a specific expertise in Antarctic atmospheric processes. This is what I did, and you have seen the comments of this third reviewer recently posted.

As an editor, I was now left with three options: a) request a fourth reviewer's opinion, b) close the discussion and ask for authors final comments and c) reject the paper.

Because of the general opinion that you are providing a unique data set, I have decided for option 2.

I believe all reviewers have gone to very detailed and sound comments that would greatly improve the interpretation of the data, and should be fully taken into account in your final response.

Of course, you still have the option to withdraw your manuscript and submit it to another Journal. If you decide that you have enough arguments to answer all reviewers comments, I will ask you to provide us with:

- a) A "one to one" reply to all comments of the 3 reviewers, stating your response and how (and where in the manuscript) you have taken this into account in the new version of the manuscript...(citing the initial version of the paragraph and how you have changed it is of real help for the second round of reviews and the editor for his final assessment)
- b) A pristine version of the new version of the manuscript
- c) A new version of the manuscript with changes highlighted

On the basis of these documents, and most probably a second round of review(s), I will take my final decision.

Best regards,

Jean-Louis Tison

Interactive comment on The Cryosphere Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-2020-302>, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

