

Interactive comment on “EARLINET: potential operationality of a research network” by M. Sicard et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 2 September 2015

In their paper Sicard et al., present an operational application of the Single Chain Calculus, developed within the EARLINET network, which involved the participation of eleven stations with continuous 72 hours of measurements. The paper is highly relevant for the AMT special issue; it contains a lot of useful information and good quality data. However, to my opinion the paper misses a clear focus. The authors, as it is also demonstrated in the paper title, want to demonstrate the operationality of the EARLINET network using the SCC as an automated tool and for this purpose they conducted and performed a dedicated mini 3-days campaign in 2012. The paper looks more like a report for the campaign and most of the information provided is very useful for the participants but it is not obvious, as it is written, how can be useful for non-participants. I understand that the authors do not aim to analyze in detail

C2816

the measurements themselves, this is done in a companion paper to be submitted in the same special issue. Instead, apart from demonstrating plots and highlighting the potential of SCC in future application/studies, the authors should provide more details to a potential user on the problems involved and how these can be solved during a semi-automated operation.

In particular:

The author should provide more details on configuration problems related with SCC. What are the most common problems?

They should comment on the consistency of SCC with the operational algorithms at the various institutes. Most groups involved have published numerous papers without using SCC, so it is important to know if switching to SCC does not introduce problems and discontinuities.

They should provide more details (present some indicative examples for good and bad cases) for the reasons why SCC failed and how they overcome these problems (if at all) etc.

They should provide more details, what it means a successful pre-processing and/or retrieval, apart from the fact that the software crashes. What are the criteria?

Why don't the authors consider to show contour plots for Figures 8 to 11?

Since the evolution of the event will be studied and presented in a companion paper, the authors should eventually consider shortening section 3.2 or at least change its focus.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 8, 6599, 2015.

C2817