

Response to the reviewers: Synoptic and regional-scale meteorological controls of stratus altitude in the Namib Desert

Viola Hipler¹, Hendrik Andersen^{1,2}, Robert Spirig³, Roland Vogt³, Stuart Piketh⁴, Bianca Adler^{5,6}, and Jan Cermak^{1,2}

¹Institute of Meteorology and Climate Research, Atmospheric Trace Gases and Remote Sensing, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT), Karlsruhe, Germany

²Institute of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT), Karlsruhe, Germany

³Department of Environmental Sciences, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland

⁴North-West University, School for Geo- and Spatial Sciences, Potchefstroom, South Africa

⁵Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences (CIRES), University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, Colorado, USA

⁶NOAA Physical Sciences Laboratory, Boulder, Colorado, USA

We thank the three anonymous reviewers and the editor for their careful reviews of the manuscript.

Editor

Dear authors,

Please address the technical comment of one of the reviewers regarding the correction of terminology.

5 Done, see below.

In addition please address the editor comments.

1. Please add statements regarding research equity involving international research.

We have included this section which states: "This work draws on a long-term research infrastructure at the Gobabeb Namib Research Institute, Namibia, which is a platform for interdisciplinary research on the Namib. Station access and on-site maintenance support was provided by Gobabeb staff. Regional dynamical expertise was contributed by a co-author from North-West University (South Africa). We aim to continue active collaborations with local partners in future work at this site."

2. With the next revision, kindly ensure that all materials belonging to the appendix are grouped within the respective "Appendix" section and are not separated or interrupted by other sections of the manuscript.

Done.

15 3. Please add the following attribution text to the Figures 1 and 6 captions: MODIS satellite data © NASA.

Done, thanks for the pointer.

Minghui Diao

Reviewer 3

Dear authors, I appreciate you taking my comments very seriously and responding to every one in detail. I think the paper is pretty much ready for publication. I have only one minor comment related to the 'fog precipitation' term. I really think that the word 'fog precipitation' seems to be more related to a natural process of fog being (naturally) precipitated, as drizzle or fog deposition. Because the word "precipitation" reminds us of rainfall, a natural process. The fog collectors, whatever their design is (raschel mesh standard, cylindrical, harps, etc), artificially precipitate fog into a measurement system. In that case, the most accurate term should be "artificial precipitated fog" or, like in most papers, "passive fog collection". My suggestion is to change the term "fog precipitation" to "passive fog collection" or simply "fog collection" to be clear that you are not describing a natural process but an artificial (passive) one.

We thank the reviewer for the constructive comment and agree that "fog collection" may be clearer. We have adapted the suggested terminology throughout the manuscript.