Ann. Geophys. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/angeo-2020-74-RC1, 2020 @ Author(s) 2020. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



ANGEOD

Interactive comment

Interactive comment on "Contribution of Meteor Flux in the Occurrence of Sporadic-E over Arabian Peninsula" by Muhammad Mubasshir Shaikh et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 17 December 2020

This paper is very interesting, but it is necessary significant improvements before publication. Please, consider the suggestions following:

1. The main point is the lack of manuscript organization. The authors need to include more information and the discussion about the anti-correlation. 2. Abstract- Lines 13-15: The authors need to include more details about the results. 3. Introduction: I suggest that authors include 2 or 3 paragraphs about the previous study of the Es layer behavior over the Arabian Peninsula and the wind shear and meter relationship.

4. The last paragraph of the Introduction (lines 43-45) needs to be more specific with

4. The last paragraph of the Introduction (lines 43-45) needs to be more specific with the authors' results in this work. 5. The authors need to explain Figure 1 and Figure 2 in more detail and maybe include the examples of ionograms since the Es layer are different forms in each region. 6. Lines: 109-110: Haldoupis et al. (2007) only talk that

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



the Es layers and the meteoric influx follow a similar seasonal dependence marked by a strong summer maximum only. The phrase seems that the results of Haldoupis et al. (2007) are related with both solstices. 7. The authors mentions that the "There are also numerous studies whose results are inconclusive", but they do not perform a deeply discussion about to works.

8. Figure 5 should be in discussions instead of conclusions. 9. Lines 157-159: The authors could give more proposals because this behavior occurs over the analyzed region. 10. Do the authors only consider the nighttime values of foEs to perform the correlation in Figure 5? Does this anti-correlation in this Figure not occur because the Es layer is very dynamic? 11. There are many mistakes in the language (for example, relationship in Figure 5), and the English need to be improved. 12. Please, consider including the word layer after the Es.

Interactive comment on Ann. Geophys. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/angeo-2020-74, 2020.

ANGEOD

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

