

Interactive comment on “Influence of atmospheric dynamics during events Secondary Effect of the Antarctic Ozone Hole on southern Brazil” by Gabriela Dornelles Bittencourt et al.

Igo Paulino (Editor)

igo.paulino@df.ufcg.edu.br

Received and published: 6 October 2019

Dear Dr. Bittencourt et al.,

Thank you for revise the manuscript according to the reviewers' suggestions. Before sending you manuscript to the production, I would recommend you to revise few points listed below (I have used as reference the file [angeo-2019-104-AC2-supplement.pdf](#)):

In the introduction, it is not clear the objectives of the present work and what is the new findings from the authors to the knowledge on the dynamics of the ozone holes.

Line 35: In my opinion, this statement must be re-written. I agree with authors about

C1

the importance of the ozone to the stratosphere and atmosphere, but I would not write it as “the most important constituent” because It depends on the objective of study.

Line 54: delete “in and”.

Line 60: mid- and low-latitudes

Lines 65-66: Effects of this secondary event on middle latitude regions such as the southern region of Brazil, where ozone content falls over the region from August to November have been published elsewhere (Peres et al., 2014,2015).

Please, write the meaning of all acronyms as soon as they appear in the manuscript, e.g., SSO, MKII, MKIV, SSO, WMO, UT-LS (described only in the abstract), etc.

Line 269: “. . .For the day of the event September 18, 2018, it was. . .”

Line 310: “November is the month..”

Line 345: Please, revise: “It was shown from PV and PV anomalies. . .” It is confuse.

Why did not you overplot the Jet stream and Omega on the map in Figure 6?

Best regards,

Igo

Interactive comment on Ann. Geophys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/angeo-2019-104>, 2019.

C2