

## ***Interactive comment on “Ice Crystal Characterization in Cirrus Clouds: A Sun-tracking Camera System and Automated Detection Algorithm for Halo Displays” by Linda Forster et al.***

**B. van Diedenhoven (Referee)**

bastiaan.vandiedenhoven@nasa.gov

Received and published: 5 April 2017

This is in reply to the preface included in the review by reviewer #3. I feel the remarks are largely inspired by my open review of this paper and I would therefore like to take the time to respond.

I regularly review papers for the Copernicus journals as an official reviewer (as in this case). I agree with the reviewer that the system is a bit odd at times and at least different from the usual review process. I also agree that one's review could be biased by previous reviews that are posted online and I try to refrain from reading previous

C1

reviews before writing my own. Actually, I think the idea proposed by the reviewer to have the open discussion as a second step after a more traditional review process is one to be considered by Copernicus.

Whenever I am asked by a Copernicus editor to review a paper, I usually do so anonymously. In this case, I chose not to stay anonymous in order to show my appreciation for a young scientist who delivered an excellent paper in my opinion. In my own experience as an author publishing in Copernicus journals, I appreciated reviewers adding their names to constructive reviews of my papers. I do not think there are many 'rewards' to be gained by adding your name to a review. On the other hand, in cases such as this, I do not think it can do any harm either.

Sincerely,

Bastiaan van Diedenhoven (Reviewer #2)

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2017-17, 2017.

C2