

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Operational considerations to improve total ozone measurements with a Microtops II ozone monitor” by J. L. Gómez-Amo et al.

J. L. Gómez-Amo et al.

jlgomeza@uv.es

Received and published: 2 February 2012

Thank you very much for your comments and suggestions. Certainly the Microtops should be calibrated more frequently. However, it was not possible. We went in some occasions to high altitude places to try the Langley Plot calibration but the meteorological conditions were not good enough to obtain successful results in any of them. We also tried to carry out Langley Plot calibrations using the Microtops measurements from the campaigns described in this article. This was done by selecting only days with really low aerosol optical depth and stable atmosphere within the desired airmass

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

range. All of the campaigns took place in low altitude stations during a limited number of days and we have only a few days sparse in 2002 and 2011 campaigns. These calibrations are not really useful for the period in which the calibration was not performed since: a) high altitude Langley Plot calibrations were performed in 2002 at Veleta peak and 2010 at Mauna Loa; and b) it was impossible to perform an statistical analysis for the calibration coefficients using so few days. This prevents us to trust enough in these coefficients and we decide using the interpolation between consecutive calibrations. Yes, the airmass limit for the Channel I is confused in the text. For airmasses larger than 2.3 (not 2.6) the accuracy of the retrieval diminish. This will be changed in the final version of the paper.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 4, 7529, 2011.

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

