

Interactive comment on “Eddy Covariance flux measurements with a weight-shift microlight aircraft” by S. Metzger et al.

J. Hacker (Referee)

Jorg.Hacker@flinders.edu.au

Received and published: 30 April 2012

General Comments: The paper addresses important aspects of airborne EC measurements. Its scope and the employed methodology is not only applicable to such measurements using an WSMA, but most would also apply to any airborne platform. As such, the paper lays the foundation for subsequent analyses for specific airborne systems. The paper is very comprehensive in its treatment of the issue, well structured and there are very few improvements I could suggest.

Specific Comments: As the principles and methods used also can be applied for other airborne platforms, it may be worthwhile to mention this in the discussion. In terms of scientific issues, the only question I have is if the possibility was evaluated what direct effect the spike removal process in the tower data has on the H-flux.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Technical Corrections: * Abstract Line 20: replace "price" with "cost"

* throughout the paper, the WSMA's combined GPS/IMU system is called "INS"; in my opinion it would be more appropriate to call it GPS/IMU, because an INS has additional navigation facilities which the GPS/IMU does not offer (at least not in a direct sense).

* Para 2.1, Line 22 says that the response time of the thermocouple and the IRGA is 50Hz. This appears to be rather fast to me. Can this be substantiated ?

* Para 2.2, Line 18: Perhaps "energetic" should rather be "energy"

* Para 2.4.5, Lines 5/6: "have been" should be replaced with "were"

* Para 3.3.4, Lines 2/3: "close to one another"

* There are some instances, where abbreviations should be defined before use. This applies, for instance, to MLFR or NPE. The former is defined in the Abstract, but then used in the text without reference. The latter occurs as an expression just above the abbreviation (Page 2616, Lines 26 & 29). Perhaps it should put first into brackets before it is used in its abbreviated form.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 5, 2591, 2012.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

