

# ***Interactive comment on “Stability of the Regional Brewer Calibration Center for Europe Triad during the period 2005–2016” by Sergio Fabián León-Luis et al.***

**V. Savastiouk (Referee)**

vl@dimir.ca

Received and published: 9 February 2018

This can be an important paper showing the quality of work these authors are doing at Izana. From personal experience I know that the work done at RBCC-E is excellent. However, this version of the paper is extremely poorly written. Not only it requires a complete overhaul of the English language usage, it also needs some proper structure and logic. If I didn't know the authors personally I'd think they don't understand what they are writing about, to be honest. The Brewer spectrophotometer doesn't "measure spectral lines" as the paper suggests. Saying that "several" countries agreed to the Montreal Protocol is irresponsible, there were 197 countries, including all UN members

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



and the EU. And the presence of SO<sub>2</sub> is not the main reason for measuring at more than one wavelength with the Brewer. I strongly recommend to clearly state the goal of the paper in the abstract and then support that goal in the text. Try to be focused, do not deviate to other (however interesting) topics. Re-arrange the paper to have a logical flow to it. If you introduce a new variable then explain it right-away, not several pages later. The Brewer-related papers from RBCC-E keep using the slit numbering that is not conventional and keep calling the dark count as a slit measurement. I strongly disagree with this terminology. The paper suggests using the Brewer ozone observations as an indicator for selecting the days when ozone is stable for Langley method. It is fundamental to understand that this explicitly says that you assume that the instrument(s) is (are) calibrated already and do not require a new ETC.

Please see the supplement PDF file with detailed comments and highlights/underlines of questionable statements. Looking forward to seeing a new version of this paper.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.atmos-meas-tech-discuss.net/amt-2017-460/amt-2017-460-RC2-supplement.pdf>

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2017-460, 2018.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)