Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 8, C1435–C1436, 2015 www.atmos-meas-tech-discuss.net/8/C1435/2015/

© Author(s) 2015. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribute 3.0 License.



AMTD

8, C1435-C1436, 2015

Interactive Comment

Interactive comment on "Retrieval of vertical profiles of atmospheric refraction angles by inversion of optical dilution measurements" by D. Fussen et al.

D. Fussen et al.

didier.fussen@oma.be

Received and published: 8 June 2015

[a4paper,10pt]report

Anonymous Referee (1) Received and published: 16 April 2015 General Comments This paper describes an approach for determining atmospheric refraction angle versus altitude from optical dilution. The paper is very well written, does an excellent job of establishing the relevant theories and analysis approach, and successfully applies the established methods to derive refraction angle profiles from different data sets. The established method will be useful in past and future experiments, and the authors have

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



described the approach such that others will be able to implement it. Specific Comments My main concern is that the utility of a refraction angle profile is not clear from this work. While there may be other uses, in my experience refraction is a means to obtaining vertical profiles of atmospheric density (and ultimately temperature/pressure). The reason I mention this point, is that the errors in the retrieved refraction angles ultimately determine the uncertainties in the atmospheric property of interest (e.g., density). Establishing these connections will make the paper more meaningful to a broader audience. In rough terms refraction angle and density both vary logarithmically in height, and so it can be anticipated that density and refraction angle errors will be proportional. More rigorously, refraction angle and density are related through an Abel transform, which yields a straightforward analytic solution. In either case it should be a minimal effort to relate refraction angle and density uncertainties.

OK 3 lines [214-216] were added (see supplement)

Technical Corrections The manuscript is very well written and technical errors were rare. line 65: "refraction" should be "refractive"

Done

line 194: There is no need to use all capital letters.

Done

equation 28: Use full size brackets.

Done

line 266: "depending" should be "dependent"

Done

line: 277 (and elsewhere): "percents" should be "percent"

Done

AMTD

8, C1435-C1436, 2015

Interactive Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

