

Interactive comment on “The 1-way on-line coupled atmospheric chemistry model system MECO(n) – Part 3: Meteorological evaluation of the on-line coupled system” by C. Hofmann et al.

C. Hofmann et al.

hofmach@uni-mainz.de

Received and published: 30 September 2011

We thank referee #1 for his/her helpful comments. Replies to his/her suggestions are embedded below.

- *Still, it is complicated to understand the detailed differences in the different model runs. I would like to recommend that the authors make an attempt to create a more clear structure in the paper. My suggestion is that the use of more sub-paragraphs, with clear titles/headings might help.*

We are not quite sure to which section this comment belongs to exactly and where we should introduce further sub-paragraphs.

C803

We structured the main part of this article (case studies in Sect. 4) as follows: Every case study is presented in the same way, starting with a description of the synoptic situation, followed by the setup of the different simulations, a general analysis of meteorological parameters and a detailed analysis of typical structures of the events, closing with a short summary.

To highlight the mentioned differences between the different model runs, we introduce a new figure in Sect. 2 to illustrate the different start times of the simulations exemplary for the first case study.

To give the first part of the article a better structure, we rename Sect. 2 and introduce a new section named: “Differences between COSMO and MECO(n): Provision of boundary data”.

- *Technical comment: The only comment I have is on page 1542, line 27, 28, 29 are not clear to me. What is meant by “an usual COSMO”. Should it be “as a usual COSMO”?*

Yes, that is right. We correct this typo.