

Interactive comment on “Considerations for temperature sensor placement on rotary-wing unmanned aircraft systems” by Brian R. Greene et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 28 June 2018

This is an interesting paper which describes measurements with temperature sensors at different locations under the rotors of an octocopter drone. The measurements are made in the laboratory, so the issues with aerodynamic stability of the aircraft, that follow on from this work, are not addressed. In summary I think that subject to some revision to improve the clarity (see the points below) this paper should be accepted for publication in AMT.

- 1) Why thermistors, and not fast thermocouples which have fewer issues from self heating?
- 2) page 4, line 5 "is" should be "are"

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Interactive
comment

3) What is the solar shield made of? In particular is it opaque to solar IR radiation - many plastics are not. (I realise that this is irrelevant to the laboratory measurements, but presumably the same shield is intended for use in the field.)

4) The description of the various sensors is a bit confusing. One reads that the sensors are iMet thermistors in section 2.2. Then one reads in the next section that the sensors are Campbell Scientific ones - and in "the sensors" I emphasise "the". (As an aside the sentence with "... two stainless steel probes from Campbell Scientific known as the 109 were used." is an odd way of putting it. Are they model 109 or what?) I think that the different sensors are there for intercomparison but it isn't clear from the way that section 2 is written, and it wouldn't hurt to be a bit clearer and more explicit at this early stage of the paper.

5) The caption of Figure A3 needs work; b) and c) need to be better described to make it clear what the different things that they show are. I can work out what is shown in b) by looking at a) but I can't be sure about c). Is c) the same thing from a different angle? Would a line drawing be more effective here? Certainly it would help to have a circle drawn on the photo on a) to indicate where the detail illustrated in b) is located. It would also be good if the main photo could be retaken with better attention to lighting as it is not a very clear photo. The ceiling light behind one of the rotors is very distracting and degrades the contrast of the apparatus that is the main subject of the picture.

Interactive comment on *Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss.*, doi:10.5194/amt-2018-65, 2018.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

