

Interactive comment on “Towards a consistent eddy-covariance processing: an intercomparison of EddyPro and TK3” by G. Fratini et al.

G. Fratini et al.

gerardo.fratini@licor.com

Received and published: 7 May 2014

We would like to thank the anonymous Referees for a careful review of our Discussion paper and for several interesting inputs and comments. In the attached supplement we provide detailed replies to all comments. Here we would like to make a general comment that may help clarify our aims and methods, and put our following replies in perspective. With our analysis, we want to show the difficulty of ‘having full control’ of an EC software and to assess its performance with respect to another software, even when you are the developer of that software. It is reasonable to expect – and it is our overwhelming experience – that any other individual would incur at least in issues of the same type. We want to warn against such issues, which may easily

C852

be overlooked. The considerations related to ‘in-house software’ follow (heuristically) from our analysis, insofar as in many cases - not always – such software tend to be less easy to manage and, in practice, less managed (see also the reply to Comment 6 of Referee 2). Hopefully, with the detailed replies and the corresponding modifications of the manuscript, we made our aims and rationales more clear.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.atmos-meas-tech-discuss.net/7/C852/2014/amtd-7-C852-2014-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 7, 2107, 2014.

C853