

Interactive comment on “New estimates of Arctic and Antarctic sea ice extent during September 1964 from recovered Nimbus I satellite imagery” by W. N. Meier et al.

W. N. Meier et al.

walt@nsidc.org

Received and published: 27 March 2013

We thank the reviewer the very useful comments. Our responses are below:

Details of the imaging and geolocation processes are added to the 3rd paragraph of Section 2.

Page 37, Line 22: reference added

Page 39, Lines 3-5: Details are added to the 3rd paragraph of Section 2.

Page 40, Line 6: “resolution” rephrased to “spectral range” or “sampling range”

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive
Comment

Page 40, Line 12: same as the previous comment

Page 40 Line 18: Details have been added to address composition process

Page 40, Line 23: added “visual”

Page 41, Line 1: rephrased without “basin”

Page 42, Line 3: reference added and text rephrased to clarify subtraction of Antarctic land/ice sheet area from the contour area. Also the numbers in the text have been corrected to match the whisker range in Figure 4, which is what the text is referring to (the range between the most northern and most southern estimates), not the red box (which is the standard deviation of ice edge location)

Page 42, Lines 28-29: a land contour is not used – the ice contour is drawn to the coast, but with glaciers the boundary is difficult to discern. Thus the rationale for filling these areas with passive microwave estimates – the region is mostly ice-covered, so the error is relatively small.

Page 43, Line 21: standard deviation added (and “median” changed to “average”, as discussed above).

Interactive comment on The Cryosphere Discuss., 7, 35, 2013.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)