

Interactive comment on “Using reference radiosondes to characterise NWP model uncertainty for improved satellite calibration and validation” by Fabien Carminati et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 4 September 2018

The paper is well written and of interest. I can only suggest minor added info as follows:
- clarify the time range to match the raob and model fields, is it typically between 3-9h as currently done in NWP? It is said that only a small fraction is in slot 0-3-h. Is it then representative of 6-h forecast ? I would think most of the time differences is in range 4-8 h? - clarify if the balloon drift is taken into account. This is important as shown, e.g. by Laroche and Sarrazin, Weather and Forecasting, 2013, 772-782. - Total uncertainty for ATMS channels 18-22 shown in Fig. 6 increases from about 1.5 (ch 18) to 2.5 K (ch. 22). However values obtained at NWP centers are significantly lower than this for observed minus background (O-B), i.e. ~ 0.4 -0.8 K lower (for observation accepted for assimilation). Perhaps adding such stats for the two NWP centers would

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



be good, plus explain differences. - add basic info, reference on bias correction to radiosonde. It is said that the bigger part of the bias is linked to model error.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2018-219, 2018.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

