

Interactive comment on “Assessment of surface solar irradiance derived from real-time modelling techniques and verification with ground-based measurements” by Panagiotis G. Kosmopoulos et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 26 December 2017

General remarks:

The study presented in this paper is referring to the real time estimation of surface solar irradiance. Three different methodologies have been used and compared with ground-based measurements to check their performance under different conditions. The method of the multiregression function (MRF) and the neural network (NN) were also the integrated spectrum for the spectral irradiance is considered additionally (NNS). For both methods (MRF and NN) the outputs are compared with Baseline Surface Radiation Network (BSRN) observations and with the training dataset, created by the

C1

libRadtran model. In the comparison, the authors make use of observations from nine stations covering different climatological conditions and latitudes, presenting nicely in the results section the potential of a general applicability of the proposed methods. Furthermore a sensitivity analysis about the impact of the aerosols and cloud optical depth on the GHI is also discussed in detail. The paper is well written and easy to be following by the reader, explaining in an appropriate way all the steps and the limitations of the methodology.

All in all the paper is of high interest and suitable for publication on AMT.

For completeness, there are few points that can be taking into account in the final version of the manuscript.

Specific comments:

The performance of the methods presented for the estimation of the GHI in real-time are well presented and discussed. The proposed methodology is useful for the estimation of the GHI and other relevant quantities at regions where ground based observations are missing.

The paper is focused to methods for real-time estimation of the GHI, thus a potential use of the method for forecasting application can be mentioned in the manuscript.

Paragraph 3.2.1 Cloud effect, line 15: The mentioned regression lines should be included in Figure 8.

Paragraph 3.2.2 Aerosol effect: The authors present only the comparison between Izaña ground AOD measurements and CAMS model AOD in order to estimate the errors produced by the AOD differences. As the AOD is of high importance parameter for the estimation of the GHI, the authors should stand in the manuscript (maybe in the conclusion part) that CAMS performance should be checked in case of the application of the methodology to different regions (e.g Eastern Mediterranean-Middle East).

Figure 9: Units are missing from Standard deviation

C2

Figure 10: misspelling at the x-axes title. PRF AOD instead of PFR AOD

Interactive comment on *Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss.*, doi:10.5194/amt-2017-351, 2017.

C3