

## ***Interactive comment on “The "Lung": a software-controlled air accumulator for quasi-continuous multi-point measurement of agricultural greenhouse gases” by R. J. Martin et al.***

**R. J. Martin et al.**

r.martin@niwa.co.nz

Received and published: 13 June 2011

Interactive comment on “The "Lung": a software-controlled air accumulator for quasi-continuous multi-point measurement of agricultural greenhouse gases” by R. J. Martin et al. Anonymous Referee #1 Received and published: 6 April 2011 General comments: The paper describes an extension of a well-known measurement technique (gas chromatographic (GC) analyzer) to detect concentrations of the greenhouse gas N<sub>2</sub>O. This instrumentation enables continuous measurements at several sampling points with a single GC. The application for concentration gradient or micrometeorolog-

C858

ical flux as well as chamber measurements is shown. Further applications with more sampling points are possible. The scientific topics of this paper are relevant and within the scope of AMT. The sampling of multiple points with one instrument is an important task. The measurement results from this technique are compared with another independent measurement technique (tunable diode laser absorption spectrometry) to detect concentration gradients. The paper is well written, the results are sufficiently described and the conclusions are clear. The related work is well cited.

Thank you for your helpful comments. I have considered and incorporated these as appropriate and the result I feel will be an improved paper. My have inserted comments in between your text. RJM 14 June 2011

Specific comments: Page 1943, line 18: “. . .with only a few percent difference between the two methods” – what does it mean: How much percents?

I have moved this to the discussion section where it is appropriate.

Comparison of the difference value to accuracy, detection limit etc. of both measurement methods? Page 1946, line 17: “. . .is shown in Fig. 4. The GC/ECD and TDL measurements show excellent agreement.” This conclusion is too early here. In the following sentences it is quantified. After this discussion such a conclusion makes sense. Page 1947, line 4: “There is excellent agreement between the two instruments. . .” But there are differences in the beginning and at the end of the measurement period. Discuss this please.

This has been moved towards the end of this section and some discussion on differences added here too.

Page 1949, line 6: “. . .has been shown to be a simple, non-intrusive way of measuring greenhouse gas fluxes continuously. . .” How you can measure nonintrusive if you use tubes and bags?

I have changed the wording to make it clear that I was making the comparison with soil

C859

chambers: ...has been shown to be a simple, non-intrusive way of measuring greenhouse gas fluxes continuously at the paddock scale, compared with a soil chamber system where air circulation and gas concentration immediately above the soil surface is perturbed. Added a reference.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 4, 1935, 2011.

C860