

Interactive comment on “Pre-launch calibration results of the TROPOMI payload on-board the Sentinel 5 Precursor satellite” by Quintus Kleipool et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 23 March 2018

General Comments: This paper is too long. There is a reason that scholarly journals restrict paper lengths to 15 pages, 20 pages at the most. That is because doing so forces the authors to avoid excessive detail and to summarize their findings in a way that helps the reader understand what was performed and what was concluded. The specific details of the TropOMI analysis are of little benefit to readers outside the TropOMI instrument team. No one will attempt to repeat the steps outlined here, so it seems these are included here as a substitute for an internal team report. It is important to describe problems and the general techniques used to address those problems, but by including too much detail the authors fail to provide a useful summary to the readers.

The sections dealing with electronics and with spectral characteristics are well organized and written. The same cannot be said for the sections about radiometric response. These sections would benefit from some hierarchy in the discussions. As it is, the reader is presented with too much detail and not enough overview. What is the calibration philosophy/approach? Why were the measurements performed in the manner they were? Why were the characterized parameters chosen the way they were? These sections could also use more critical evaluation of the results. Do the results make sense? Are the validations sufficient to give us confidence in the error estimates?

General technical: Many of the plots lack axis labels, and some do not even have a description of the axes in the caption. Reference to detector "columns" and "rows" is ubiquitous, and should be replaced more generally with "spectral" or "spatial" dimension.

Specific Technical:

Page 1, Line 20: I don't understand the sentence starting "In case ...". The way this is written implies that there will not be a product problem if random errors are larger than systematic errors. I don't think the authors mean to say this, so I advise a different choice of words. Or simply delete this sentence, because I don't see its relevance in the abstract. The abstract should highlight key points of the paper, and this sentence does not seem to fit that objective.

Page 1, Line 39: I don't understand the term "In-compliance." Do the authors mean non-compliant?

Page 11, Line 3: I don't agree with this description of full-well. Typically, an immediate flattening of the linearity curve indicates register full-well rather than pixel full-well. When the latter occurs it appears as a sharp curve, but over a finite range of integration times. To me, the term "immediate" implies a slope discontinuity in the linearity curve.

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

Section 6.1: The abbreviation ISRF is not defined until later in the paper.

Section 6.2: This discussion is confusing, and could be clarified by better defining terminology. The authors use the terms in-field, in-band, out-of-field, and far-field but don't clearly explain what stray light falls into each category. This is important because the choice of terms contradicts common definitions used elsewhere. Words like "band" and "range" have subjective interpretations if left undefined. It might be simpler to use the terms spectral and spatial stray light. A schematic or detector image might help to clarify the definitions. From the section title I assume this section pertains to spatial stray light, yet other characterizations are described such as out-of-spectral range.

Where are the detailed descriptions of measurements? This section deserves the same level of detail as Section 6.3 has.

Spatial stray light can be rather difficult to characterize, especially when the instrument is looking out of a chamber through a window. How do you know what portion of the measured SL is contributed by setup and OGSE? Telescope SL is also the simplest of stray light components because it is driven almost entirely by the roughness of the telescope mirrors. Therefore, it is straightforward to model this SL. Have the authors done this as a way to validate their in-band measurements?

The parameters v and w are poorly defined. It sounds like one is spectral and the other spatial, but I cannot tell which is which. This is important for Fig. 14 because the spatial dimension will show the slit image (the telescope stray light) as a stripe illuminating all rows at the source's wavelength. A similar stripe in the spectral dimension can be an indication of a grating defect.

The abbreviation PRF is not defined until later in the paper.

The hole-in-cloud measurement and validation seem to ignore spectral stray light. How is spectral stray light characterized and how is it validated? Past experience with imaging spectrometers has shown that spectral stray light is much more important to science

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

products than is spatial stray light.

Section 6.3: This type of spectral stray light is more commonly referred to as out-of-range because it is beyond the measurement range of the instrument.

Rather than describing a distinct characteristic of the instrument, as is done with other sections, this one describes a separate measurement campaign. This is confusing, but if the authors feel this needs to be done they should do a better job reconciling this discussion with that of Section 6.2. For example, the authors describe in-band measurements as part of this campaign. Such in-band measurements were also part of the discussion in Section 6.2. Were these the same measurements or different ones. If different, how do they compare? Why was one technique chosen versus the other?

Also, the depth of discussion in this section is in direct contradiction to that of Section 6.2. Section 6.2 has too little description of the measurements and analysis, but Section 6.3 has maybe too much.

Page 18, Line 65: The terms in this equation are not defined.

Figure 16 requires more explanation.

Section 6.4: This section contains multiple subsections, each describing a step in the data reduction. Lacking is a description that ties all these steps together. Why are each of these corrections necessary? Why is it important to separate the radiometric response into low and high frequency components?

The Figure 20 caption is incomplete. What source are we looking at?

Section 6.5: The distinction between ABSRAD and RELRAD is confusing. The authors provide a clear description in Page 24, Lines 4-10. However, Fig. 26 appears to be a combination of ABSRAD and RELRAD, even though the caption talks only of ABSRAD. Furthermore, the BSDF discussion in Section 6.7 is clear about using only ABSRAD, yet Fig. 31 contains row dependence. Does ABSRAD contain RELRAD or not?

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

Page 27, Lines 3,4: Doesn't this caveat invalidate the distance offset approach the authors are describing? No stray light estimates are provided to prevent the reader from drawing this conclusion.

Section 6.6: This section contains only a brief mention of diffuser feature smoothing. Other than that, there is no discussion of fitting data or separation of high and low frequency components, so the reader must assume this was not undertaken. How is this reconciled with the exhaustive analysis described in Sections 6.4, 6.5 for radiance? Aren't many of the radiance artifacts also present in the irradiance data?

Section 6.7: Given its importance to Level 2 products (as the authors note in lines 39, 40), this should be the primary radiometric description of the paper, yet it appears to be presented only as a validation. Why was so much time and effort placed on the radiance calibration, such as described in Section 6.4 and 6.5, but no effort to ensure that the BSDF calibration is smooth and represents the expected characteristics of the diffusers? The approach taken seems backward, since a smooth, physical BSDF is more important than artifact-free radiances alone. For instance, can the authors explain why the spectral dependence of BSDF has the unusual shapes exhibited in UV and UVIS? And why does it have the structure shown in SWIR? How does the derived BSDF compare to the QVD BRDF?

Page 28, Lines 57, 58: What do these numbers mean and where do they come from? They contradict Figures 30, 31.

Page 38, Lines 71-79 Can the authors speculate why the Earth port and sun port wavelength registration yields significantly different results? This is an unexpected result, is it not?

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2018-25, 2018.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

