

Interactive  
Comment

## ***Interactive comment on “Processing and validation of refractivity from GRAS radio occultation data” by K. B. Lauritsen et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 22 June 2011

**Scientific Significance:** 2 While this manuscript does not contain significant new scientific advances in the field, it does provide a good documentation of data processing algorithms used to process the Metop/GRAS operational refractivity data products. For this reason, I believe publication of this manuscript in AMT is warranted.

**Scientific Quality:** 2 The scientific quality of this manuscript is good. It provides a logical presentation of the research, it cites and discusses previous work. It follows the OLC approach by Gorbunov (2002), but it should provide more specific details on how this implementation is different from Gorbunov 2002 and whether these algorithm differences are significant. This work does not mention data gaps that are known to exist in GRAS BA data. The authors should discuss how they process through these gaps and what impact they may have on inversion errors.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Presentation Quality: 1 The manuscript is presented with high quality. The text and figures are clear and concise.

Comments for Authors:

- It is known that GRAS CAF bending angle data have gaps. How does the GRAS SAF process through data gaps in BA? Please describe.

page 2194, lines 14-16: "The approach differs from the approach by Lohmann (2005) as well as that of Gobiet and Kirchengast (2004)...". This approach differs from the OLC (Gorbunov, 2002) as well. Please specify clearly the algorithm differences between the described implementation and the OLC implementation (Gorbunov 2002). Once the differences are mentioned, those important differences should be explained in more detail. As pointed by Gorbunov (2002): "Really important is what climatological data are used for the initialization at big heights, and what estimations of signal and noise covariances are used in the height range 30-50 km." Is searching through a library of background profiles compared to using fixed profile an important difference? Is 2-parameter fit compared to 1-parameter fit an important difference? Application of the background error estimates obtained in UTLs for the upper stratosphere (Gorbunov 2002, Lohmann 2005, this study) is based on the assumption that they are fractionally about the same in these height intervals. How justified is this assumption? Besides fitting of the background and dynamic error estimation, Lohmann (2005) also considered the vertical error correlations. How important is that difference?

Pg 2195, line 10: "Estimation of ionospheric signal and noise variance using the highest part 10 (above 50 km) of the occultation." Is there a maximum height considered when estimating this noise so E-layer scintillations are not included? Please state.

page 2195, line 11: "Calculation of relative mean deviation of neutral bending angle from the model bending angle using the data at heights 12–35 km (giving an estimate of the model variance)." By "model bending angle", does this mean "model bending angle that has been scaled and offset"? Please clarify.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 4, 2189, 2011.

**AMTD**

4, C919–C921, 2011

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C921

