

Interactive comment on “Airborne laser scan data: a valuable tool to infer partial beam-blockage in urban environment” by R. Cremonini et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 28 April 2016

The paper is a good presentation of a tool to infer partial weather radar beam-blockage in urban environment. The methodology is well presented addressing good point and limitations, so I think the paper can be accepted by the journal.

Some minor revision are necessary: 1) The paper refers to a weather radar beam blockage. It is better to change the title to put in evidence it. 2) In section 2 (page 2, rows 46-54) you said that laser scanning are already completed or programmed in different countries. In section 4 (page 5, rows 45-48) it is reported that airborne laser campaigns take place rarely. I would better address this concept in the conclusions, saying that laser for the proposed methodology periodic ALS campaigns should be performed in order to make the methodology itself even more useful. 3) In the "conclusions" (page 6, row 16-18) you say that the proposed results can be used to redefine the scan strategy of a weather radar in urban areas. That is true, but with the limi-

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



tations described before in the text. The methodology is very good if you have all the needed data and, potentially, money to perform the campaign. I think this fact could be explained better.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2016-76, 2016.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

