



Interactive comment on “Validation of an AOT product over land at the 0.6 μm channel of the SEVIRI sensor onboard MSG” by E. Bernard et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 19 July 2011

Content

As stated in the title the article is about the validation of the results of an existing algorithm. However, the only reference is a report (that I found on the web)

Jolivet, D., Ramon, D., Riedi, J., and Roebeling, R.: Aerosol retrievals from METEOSAT-8, SAF on Climate Monitoring, Visiting Scientist Report, 2006. 3158, 3159

that gives less detail on the method than the presented article. I would like to see a better reference (if it exists) or some more elaboration on the used methodology and maybe a scope change of the article effectively changing the title to:

Description and validation of an AOT product over land at the 0.6 μm channel of the

C1100

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



SEVIRI sensor onboard MSG

Validation

The validation exercise done is excellent but due to the limited temporal and spatial information is not enough to extend to the whole SEVIRI field of view.

Cloud masking

As the authors point out that the cloud mask is the biggest source of errors and that they use a simple method for cloud masking one might ask the question why they do not use an external cloud mask of high quality as an input for the algorithm (e.g. the MSG cloud mask from the Nowcasting SAF)

English

A thorough correction of the English language seems in order.

Conclusion

I would like to see the following modifications before publishing - Better explanation of the algorithm used (or a better reference) - Correction of the English language.

Nice to have: - Rerunning the algorithm with a better cloud mask - Increase of the temporal and spatial sampling of the validation data.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 4, 3147, 2011.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

