

Interactive comment on “A thermal infrared instrument onboard a geostationary platform for CO and O₃ measurements in the lowermost troposphere: observing system simulation experiments” by M. Claeys et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 1 June 2011

Overall this is an interesting paper that quantitatively compares the ability of two proposed geostationary infrared sounders to improve air quality forecasts. The paper focuses on ozone and carbon monoxide in the lower most troposphere, 0- 3 km, over Europe. The two instruments compared are essentially a high spectral resolution (0.05 cm⁻¹) instrument (GEO-TIR) and a low resolution (0.6 cm⁻¹) one (GEO-TIR2). As I like high resolution instruments, I am pleased that the conclusion is that the higher resolution instrument gave more improvement in the forecasts, and points to the value of such an instrument in geostationary orbit. I have a few comments and corrections: 1.

C785

Pg. 820, line 7. The authors need to add that MAGEAQ was not selected. The two cited references are rather unhelpful. Is there anything better to cite? 2. Pg. 824, line 6. I agree that the NESR is the correct metric to quote, but could the authors quote a “typical” signal-to-noise ratio for the bands in question? As no spectra are displayed in the paper it is hard to judge what the quoted numbers mean in a geophysical sense. 3. Pg. 833, line 5. Missing figure number. 4. Pg. 842, line 4. “help better detect” 5. Pg. 846: many of the references are not very helpful in that they are reports, book chapters, conference abstracts, etc. that are not very readily available. Even the web links given for Clerbaux et al. 2008a and WHO 2005 do not work. Any updates (e.g. ACP for ACPD papers) or alternate, more accessible, references would be good.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 4, 815, 2011.

C786