

Interactive comment on “Atmospheric drag effects on modelled LEO satellites during the July 2000 Bastille Day event in contrast to an interval of geomagnetically quiet conditions” by Victor U. J. Nwankwo et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 17 September 2020

I am satisfied with the response from the author. I reckon that the authors could include the response, i.e. "this work also doubled as a strong review paper because it presented extensive details/review on atmospheric drag (and its relevance) in relation to solar activity, against properly referenced background of existing work. The significant number of readers who have interacted with this manuscript on this platform (and others) certainly did because of its relevance to them. I am also aware of authors have cited this paper in their new manuscript" on the introduction. This will guide readers and clearly underpin the objectives of the present communication. It will be good for

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



[Interactive
comment](#)

the authors to spotlight the comparison of the Bastille day event to existing result right from the abstract. I advise that the part of the abstract that sort of infer that there are no new results in the paper should be taken off as it is grossly misleading if the authors claim that "this analysis motivated the development of new method and indices for description and estimation of drag effects on satellite ephemeris

How do you justify the below within in he current paper. You are supposed to convincingly show the strength in this paper for reviewing purposes. " We are now in the process of combining satellite drag model high-fidelity atmospheric specification to produce such realistic estimation model (beginning with the results of this work".

Interactive comment on Ann. Geophys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/angeo-2020-33>, 2020.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

