

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Tropospheric profiles of wet refractivity and humidity from the combination of remote sensing datasets and measurements on the ground” by F. Hurter and O. Maier

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 3 July 2013

Major Issues:

- generally: the use of ppm for errors is rather difficult to interpret, thus suggest to add the % in brackets at relevant text/table entries. This makes all the different error discussions also more harmonic.

- p4911, l26: are you using rs in the processing and validation? This is no independent validation!

Minor Issues:

- p4897, l14: please add IR to list and also use radio occultation here, this is commonly

C1479

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



used in this way, I have never seen radiooccultation before

- p4898, I01: missing reference behind are? The link itself in pdf seems to work.
- p4899, last lines: maybe there is a better write way for K h Pa-1, it looks a bit like the h is for hours
- p4900, I20: what about directional data use, not just zenith mapping?
- p4901, I16: is there a reference for Niell?
- p4902, I13: can a radio sonde really reach the tropopause exactly at 00 or 12UTC? I assume you give the launch times, not the tropopause time.
- p4092, I23: when you say restricted to the area, is e.g. an occultation just outside not considered? Given that occultations sample along the ray easily 100km or more, this might be a bit too stringent. You could thus get more collocations.
- p4904, I04: is the derived bias correction constant over the whole time? Including the downtime period?
- p4904, I12: how does this least-squares collocation actually compares to optimal estimation/1DVar methods?

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 6, 4895, 2013.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

