Atmospheric
Measurement
Techniques
Open Access
Discussions

Interactive comment on "A new algorithm for detecting cloud height using OMPS/LP measurements" by Z. Chen et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 31 October 2015

General comments:

This manuscript deals with the description and application of a novel cloud height detection algorithm for limb-scatter observations with the OMPS Limb Profiler. A sample data set was analyzed with this new algorithm and the results were compared to co-located cloud/aerosol observations with the CALIOP Lidar on the CALIPSO spacecraft, showing good overall agreement. The paper is in general well written and easy to follow. The manuscript should eventually be published in AMT in my opinion, but I ask the authors to consider the specific comments listed below.

Specific comments:

Page 10161, line 8: 'Several techniques to retrieve cloud information from remote sens-

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

ing measurements have been developed.'

This statement is certainly correct. It's somewhat curious that allmost all of the papers cited in the following sentences deal with cloud remote sensing based on nadir observations, not limb observations. Please also cite the relevant papers dealing with cloud detection in limb-scatter observations:

Bourassa A. E., Degenstein, D. A., Llewellyn E. J.: Climatology of the subvisual cirrus clouds as seen by OSIRIS on Odin, Adv. Space Res., 36, 807 – 812, 2005.

von Savigny, C., Ulasi, E. P., Eichmann, K.-U., Bovensmann, H., and Burrows, J. P.: Detection and mapping of polar stratospheric clouds using limb scattering observations, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 5, 3071 – 3079, doi:10.5194/acp-5-3071-2005, 2005.

and perhaps:

Eichmann, K.-U., Lelli, L., von Savigny, C., Sembhi, H., and Burrows, J. P.: Global cloud top height retrieval using SCIAMACHY limb spectra: model studies and first results, Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 8, 8295-8352, doi:10.5194/amtd-8-8295-2015, 2015.

Page 10162, equation (2) and Figure 1: Your cloud detection method is based on the spectral dependence of the vertical gradient in limb radiance – or more precisely the natural logarithm of the limb radiance. Fig. 1 suggests that there is always a clear difference in the spectral dependencies between cloud free cases (Rayleigh only), aerosols and clouds. I'm not fully convinced this is actually correct and I suggest also plotting perhaps 2 cloud free cases for tangent heights between 10 – 15 and 20 – 25 km. I'm thinking along the following lines: At 5 – 10 km the vertical gradients in limb radiance are quite small in the Rayleigh only case for the 500 – 900 nm spectral range (i.e. limb radiance does not vary that much with tangent height), because the atmosphere is not optically thin any more along the line of sight. If you take the 20 – 25 km tangent height range instead, then the radiance profiles at longer wavelengths (around 90 km) will drop off already quite quickly, while this will not be the case for

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

the shorter wavelengths (around 500 nm). Therefore, I would expect a larger spectral slope also for cloud-free cases if one looks at higher tangent heights.

I don't think this point is a major problem for your paper, because the results shown later demonstrate that the method works well. But it would be good to show the spectral dependence of the radiance gradient for cloud free cases also at higher tangent heights.

Page 10163, line 12: '.. consistent with the spectrally independent gradient expected for clear sky'

Again, I don't think that cloud-free cases are necessarily associated with a spectrally independent gradient (see previous point), but I expect that for cloud free cases the spectral dependence will also depend on tangent height.

Page 10164, equation (5): I don't fully understand how the approach described in section 3.2 allows you to separate between clouds and aerosols – without any further assumptions or tests. The ASI will certainly indicate the presence of aerosols, but it will also respond to the presence of clouds, right? It seems one has to make further assumptions, e.g. thresholds, to distinguish between radiance enhancements due to aerosols and clouds.

Moreover, as far as I can tell, the ASI concept is not used further in this study, e.g. for the comparison with the CALIOP observations. If this is the case, then the necessity of section 3.2 can be questioned. If ASI is used for the comparisons with CALIOP, then this should be explicitly discussed and sufficient details provided, in my opinion.

Fig. 2, top right panel: It's very difficult – if not impossible for a hardcopy version of the paper – to read the abscissa & ordinate labels. They should be increased significantly. Please also increase the size of the axis labels of the bottom right panel.

Fig. 3 b): Same comment as for Fig. 2

Fig. 4, top panel: I suggest plotting vertical lines showing the latitudes of the measure-

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

ments A and B. This would make it easier for the reader to interpret the Figure.

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper