

Interactive comment on “The On-Orbit Performance of the Orbiting Carbon Observatory-2 (OCO-2) Instrument and its Radiometrically Calibrated Products” by David Crisp et al.

David Crisp et al.

david.crisp@jpl.nasa.gov

Received and published: 6 November 2016

We greatly appreciate the review by anonymous referee #3. We have attempted to address all of the issues that they have raised. These changes are documented here and in the text. We hope this adequately addresses this concerns.

p.2 l.30 : The order of the operating temperatures in the parentheses is reversed.

Corrected. It now reads: “. . . cooled to their operating temperatures (near -6.4 °C and -152.4 ĀC, respectively)”

p.13 l.17 : According to Table 3, a single bad sample is added on "1" July 2015 in the "WCO2" channel.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Corrected in text. It now reads “was increased by one sample on 1 July 2015”

p.15 l.10 : The "V"7 cloud screening

Typo corrected. It now reads “The V7 cloud screening . . .”

p.16 l.24 : According to Table 4 and Figure 12, there are "3" discontinuities in the WCO2 channel.

Corrected. It now reads: “to only 3 in the WCO2 channel“

p.18 l.32 : (Figure "17")

Corrected.

p.24 l.7 : Haring et al. 2002 is not referred in the text.

This reference has been removed from the list.

p.29 Figure 4 : It is better to unify the temperature unit in _C.

We find that when we label both axes in degrees C, readers often believe that they can exchange the axes. This is not the case, since the right-hand axis for the cold head (CH) has been stretched and shifted relative to the on right for the FPAs. To clarify this, we have added the note: “ The CH temperatures are shown as grey points (horizontal grey lines) in the top plot, and their values are labeled on the right hand y-axis (note: CH temperatures are shifted and stretched relative to the FPA temperatures and expressed in Kelvin rather than Ć to avoid confusion with the FPA temperatures).”

p.44 l.2 : 755 (blue) and 771 nm "(red)"

Done.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2016-281, 2016.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

