

Authors response to editor comment (ESSD-2023-16)

Comments from the editor :

“Public justification (visible to the public if the article is accepted and published):

Small technical corrections should resolve during typesetting, proofreading. Easy access to data and video. On my video viewer, top title somewhat cut off (?) although time advances as expected through hours of early days of Feb 2021. Good parsing of data and figures between main text and supplement. Good recommendations for future sample collection by citizens (conclusion paragraph around line 395); authors might (at their discretion) mention basic advantages (accessible substrate [snow], stable elements [mineral dust], nearby knowledgeable labs and experts) that contributed to success in this case.”

Authors response (in blue, changes in the manuscript enlightened in bold):

Thanks a lot for your positive review of the manuscript and for your comments.

We checked the video with several viewers and could not reproduce the problem with the title.

As suggested, we added a sentence in the conclusion (line 398):

“However, the sampling protocol of future campaigns should be improved for optical property measurements and radionuclide analyses since more dust mass is needed for such measurements than what could be sampled. **Several advantages contributed to the success of the citizen campaign, notably snow is a relatively accessible substrate, mineral dust is almost stable once deposited in the snow and the main laboratories involved in the citizen campaign are located close to the sampling areas.**”