



Corrigendum to “Global cloud property models for real-time triage on board visible–shortwave infrared spectrometers” published in *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 13, 7047–7057, 2020

**Macey W. Sandford¹, David R. Thompson², Robert O. Green², Brian H. Kahn², Raffaele Vitulli³, Steve Chien²,
Amruta Yelamanchili², and Winston Olson-Duvall²**

¹Institute of Geophysics and Planetology, Department of Earth Sciences, University of Hawai'i at Manoa,
Hawai'i, Honolulu, HI, USA

²Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA

³European Space Research and Technology Center, European Space Agency, Noordwijk, the Netherlands

Correspondence: Macey W. Sandford (macey.sandford@gmail.com)

Published: 15 February 2021

An incorrect header was inserted in Table 6. Please find the correct table below. The issue lies with the description of the second column. If the values are on the order of 200 %, the title should not include the word increase, but instead just say total useable data return. If the percentages were to describe an increase in data yield, the percentages should be on the order of 100 %. They could stay at 200 % if the column title does not define the increase, but rather the total data return, which is twice as high as it would be otherwise.

Table 6. Case studies of EMIT (Earth Surface Mineral Dust Source Investigation) and CHIME (Copernicus Hyperspectral Imaging Mission for the Environment) concerning a global cloud fraction simulation were used to understand the improvement yield of the cloud-screening tool.

Improvement yield based on case studies		
Case study	Simulated cloud coverage observed (%)	Total useable data return (%)
EMIT	Tropics: 65 %	238 %
	Midlatitudes: 57 %	285 %
	Arctic: 52 %	232 %
	Antarctic: 50 %	208 %
	All zones: 58 %	204 %
CHIME	All zones: ~ 50 %	200 %