

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Validation of the Suomi NPP Ozone Mapping and Profiler Suite total column ozone using Brewer and Dobson spectrophotometers” by K. Bai et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 3 July 2013

General comments.

This paper presents a first attempt of a “Validation of the Suomi NPP Ozone Mapping and Profiler Suite total column ozone using Brewer and Dobson spectrophotometers”. While it is of great importance for all new satellite products to be validated quickly so as to become part of the scientific pool of data, this paper fails to provide the necessary analysis as to the quality of the OMPS TOCs.

There are numerous reasons why this paper should not be published in AMT. Firstly, a purely validation paper is beyond the scope of AMT and more appropriate to more

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



geophysically-oriented journals. Secondly, the paper lacks major parts that should be provided for e.g. the OMPS algorithm discussion, the validation criteria discussion as well as a more comprehensive statistical analysis of the comparisons between ground and satellite. As explained in the Specific Comments section below, a number of questions arise when reading this paper, not least of all the fact whether the differences seen can be attributed to sampling or other statistical reasons apart from the behavior of the OMPS and/or ground-based instruments. The scientific methods are not clearly outlined, nor is there enough traceability of results. A global mean difference of 0.21

I hence recommend that the authors withdraw the manuscript, perform the suggested alterations on the text, greatly enhance the analysis and discussion sections and re-submit to a more appropriate journal. The paper has a good structure and can form the basis of a valuable reference article once the necessary work is performed.

Specific comments.

1. Page 1, Line 10: is this value a global value? A mean of daily or monthly values? What is the associated r-squared? I think that in the abstract great care is needed when quoting actual numbers since those are the ones to be references in the future by other studies.
2. Page 7: maybe some error estimates from the ATBD can be mentioned in the text as well? What is the instrumental/algorithm uncertainty of OMPS?
3. Section 2.1.2. Was any filtering applied to the OMPS data?
4. Section 2.2. This Section should be enhanced by extensive reference to other validation papers that have used the WOUDC data, focusing of course on the ground-based instruments and not the satellite data. Also, how where the Brewers/Dobsons chosen? In WOUDC there are far more than 35 of the one and 39 of the other. Any filtering applied?
5. Section 2.2. There are also various networks on line that monitor

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

other satellite TOCs using the WOUDC ground-based stations such as the Canadian Ozone and Ultraviolet Research and Monitoring network, <http://exp-studies.tor.ec.gc.ca/e/ozone/ozone.htm>, the EUMETSAT ozone validation facility [<http://lap.physics.auth.gr/eumetsat/index.php>] and the World Meteorological Organization Ozone Mapping Center found here <http://lap.physics.auth.gr/ozonemaps2/>. All these manage and/or use the WOUDC data for validation purposes.

6. Section 2.3. A very quick online search in Google Scholar leads to the following OMPS validation works: <http://cires.colorado.edu/events/rendezvous/2007/posters/II35R.pdf> and <http://larss.science.yorku.ca/QOS2012pdf/6156.pdf> and <http://satelliteconferences.noaa.gov/2013/docs/Tuesday>

7. Page 9, line 2: why was 30km chosen when the instruments' footprint is 50km? what do you mean by "Except the spatial and temporal inconsistency between satellite instrument and ground measurements caused error..?"

8. Figure 1. It is not surprising that a scatter of daily ozone values between Brewer/Dobson and OMPS would provide such excellent results since the number of observations is so large, around 6500 and 8500 values reported. The authors should first present either some individual station statistics both at typical mid-latitude regions as well as at the more challenging regions such as the Arctic, the Antarctic and the Tropics. It is well-known that the NH ground-based stations perform better than the SH ground-based stations, and it would be of value to see how OMPS performs at different latitudes in detail.

9. Page 9, last paragraph. A global daily average of 0. 213

10. Page 10, discussion of Figure 3: are these issues due to the ground-based measurements, the ground-based coverage or the OMPS data? Great care should be taken when making such statements. For e.g. there is only one Brewer near the Equator hence the statistics and RMSEs etc. is meaningful only as far as the performance

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

of this one instrument is concerned.

11. Page 10, Figure 4. The actual TOCs by the satellite and the ground should be plotted so that it can be understood whether the features seen are due to one or the other. Is the reported “large positive bias is observed near equator with MBE of 1.5

12. Page 11, line 1: what is the degradation of the OMPS instrument? This is the first time this issue is raised in this work. How big a degradation? Numbers? References? How does it affect the validation of total ozone?

13. Page 11, Line 4: SZAs themselves cannot introduce errors in satellite observations, unless the authors are referring to something else?

14. Page 11, discussion of Figure 7: it is obvious that a more comprehensive discussion of the cloud algorithm employed by the OMPS algorithm is needed before any discussion of the comparisons may be performed.

15. Page 12, Figure 9: Extreme care is needed when discussing the dependency of TOC differences on the TOC itself. The ozone hole conditions are represented by very few co-locations [information that can be inferred by other works, since the collocations are not provided in this one] which will surely bias the comparisons. Large SZAs coupled with low TOCs may indeed cause problems in both the ground and the satellite algorithm. Which is which? Also, the comparisons are bound to change if Figure 9 is shown with the Ground TOC on the x-axis. As discussed in detail in” Fioletov, V. E., D. W. Tarasick, and I. Petropavlovskikh (2006), Estimating ozone variability and instrument uncertainties from SBUV(2), ozonesonde, Umkehr, and SAGE II measurements: Short-term variations, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 111, D02305, doi:10.1029/2005JD006340” natural ozone variabilities coupled with instrumental uncertainties may affect greatly such comparisons and lead to erroneous conclusions.

16. All Figures: since a little more than one year of data are presented in this work, it is of great importance to the discussion to also note the amount of collocations and

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



how these alter from month to month. Similarly for the SZA, VZA, Cloud, Reflectivity and TOC comparisons.

Technical corrections.

1. The paper requires comprehensive reading and re-writing of the pertinent parts by a native English speaker. I begun to alter the text where appropriate however by line 15 of page 2 it became obvious that this cannot be the role of the scientific reviewer. I strongly urge the authors to either request that a native English speaker colleague of theirs reads through the text or to make use of the Copy-Editing for English service offered by most journals.
2. Page 2, Line 1: Place the references in chronological order. Please apply this rule throughout the text as the same issue occurs numerous times.
3. Page 2, Line 23: provide references and full title of the Dobson Brewer spectrophotometers.
4. Page 2, Line 29: add the references for the GOME/GOME2 instruments themselves and not only the validation papers.
5. Page 5, line 7: add references.
6. Page 5, line 16: is there no more recent reference on the instruments than Dittman et al., 2002?
7. Page 6, line 8: add references, such as the instrument web pages, etc. Who is the PI of the instrument?
8. Page 7, line 6: is there an article describing the OMPS algorithm? It is customary for an algorithm paper to appear before the associated validation paper. Maybe there is one in press or in print?
9. Page 8, line 4: it is more appropriate to reference articles such as for e.g. " Fioletov, V. E., et al. (2008), Performance of the ground-based total ozone network assessed

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



using satellite data, J. Geophys. Res., 113, D14313, doi:10.1029/2008JD009809” and “Fioletov, V. E., J. B. Kerr, C. T. McElroy, D. I. Wardle, V. Savastiouk, and T. S. Grajnar (2005), The Brewer reference triad, Geophys. Res. Lett., 32, L20805, doi:10.1029/2005GL024244” and many similar other works than Anton et al., 2010 and Bai et al, 2013.

10. Table 1 : there are a few errors on this Table. For e.g. station 111, Amundsen-Scott is in Antarctica and managed by NOAA - Climate Monitoring and Diagnostics Laboratory in Boulder. Similarly, station 499, is also in Antarctica, managed by the Royal Meteorological Institute of Belgium in Brussels. Please go through the stations with great care and update the information.

11. Table 2: as per Table 1. For e.g. station 232, Faraday is in Antarctica and is managed by the British Antarctic Survey.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 6, 4577, 2013.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)

