Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss.,
doi:10.5194/amt-2019-249-AC2, 2019


Atmospheric Measurement Techniques Discussions



# *Interactive comment on* "Automatic Quality Control of the Meteosat First Generation Measurements" *by* Freek Liefhebber et al.

**Freek Liefhebber et al.**

bos@stcorp.nl

Received and published: 31 October 2019

Apologies, I have forgotten to address a comment:

[COMMENT]: Table 4: Please add the detection performance for each anomaly type to the table; also please add information on the affected satellite channel, if appropriate.

[ANSWER]: The overall Probability of Detection of the anomalies has been determined based on the results from the training set. The POD of each anomaly type has not been determined, because the number of occurrences in the training-set is considered to be too low to reliably calculate the POD. For some anomaly types the sensitivity level of the algorithm (should an image where an anomaly is vaguely visible be flagged or not) could be subject to end-user's preference, and as such the sensitivity level will affect the



Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

POD and the false alarm rate of the algorithm. The simple anomaly categories, such as "corrupt or missing" and "hot pixel", the anomalies are detected in all cases. For the more complex anomaly types, such as "direct stray light" and "suspicious spectrum", the POD is around 90%.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2019-249, 2019.



Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper