

# ***Interactive comment on “Ensemble-based satellite-derived carbon dioxide and methane column-averaged dry-air mole fraction data sets (2003-2018) for carbon and climate applications” by M. Reuter et al.***

## **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 27 November 2019

Reuter et al. have updated and extended the first EMMA paper (Reuter et al., 2013). No breaking news for those who already read the first opus: the second one may even look a bit boring. For the newcomers, this is a solid and well-written text that synthesizes the state of the art in  $XCO_2$  and  $XCH_4$  retrieval performance from the point of view of a “community” retrieval product. There are a few typos or awkward expressions that deserve attention (l. 10, 99, 115, 127, 140, 206, 233, 359). I also regret that the authors have dropped the information about the data weight of each algorithm in EMMA.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



## Detailed comments:

- Table 6: data numbers and period covered are missing. Actually is 0.02 ppm for FOCAL at SOD significantly different from 0 (l. 360)?
- l. 382-5: repeated information

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2019-398, 2019.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

