

Interactive comment on “A compact QCL spectrometer for mobile, high-precision methane sensing aboard drones” by Béla Tuzson et al.

Alan Fried (Referee)

alan.fried@colorado.edu

Received and published: 9 May 2020

This is an excellent paper and a real joy to read. The authors did a great job in both discussing their new instrument and in validating the performance in a variety of test environments. Such attention to detail is commendable and is not typically found in such new developments.

This paper is acceptable for publication with only 4 very minor points that this reviewer would like to see addressed.

1. It would be very informative to the reader if the authors could indicate how reproducible the Allan-Werle results of Fig. 4a were obtained. Does this figure represent typical performance or does this represent the best series of measurements? For that

C1

purpose it would be very interesting to plot a histogram of the 1second Allen-Werle deviations if the authors indeed recorded multiple plots.

2. Regarding the temperature sensitivity of their instrument, is there any possibility to further stabilize the temperature of the electronics and/or the entire optical system either actively or passively employing better insulation? Although the 4 ppb/K sensitivity (not 4 ppb/K-1) is quite good, 10 degree C temperature changes, as would be experienced by changing altitudes, seem to affect performance for time periods $\sim 20 - 30$ minutes (Fig. 5). It would be nice to mitigate this long equilibration time period.

3. It would be useful to indicate the H₂O sensitivity of their retrieved CH₄ results since situations where the H₂O mixing ratios can approach up to 3-4 times the 1% levels simulated.

4. The authors may wish to explain the slight UAV overestimate of CH₄ relative to the CRDS in Fig. 8 at just after 08:00 at 12 m sampling height.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2020-102, 2020.

C2