

## ***Interactive comment on* “The design and development of a tuneable and portable radiation source for in situ spectrometer characterisation” by Marek Šmíd et al.**

**Vladimir Savastiouk**

vl@dimir.ca

Received and published: 23 January 2021

This paper introduces a portable and accurate method for wavelength calibration for the Dobson spectrophotometers. Wavelength accuracy is indeed an important consideration for instruments used in the long-term ozone observations. The paper is well written and is an important contribution. I have a couple of questions and a few suggestions after reading the paper, the reviewer comments and authors response. First, the paper starts with mentioning both the Brewer and the Dobson spectrophotometers, but eventually discusses only a dedicated Dobson unit. It would be good to know whether the same unit can be used for the Brewers, or a different one is under develop-

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



ment/testing. Second, and most important: while wavelengths accuracy is crucial and a good calibration unit is always a welcome addition, how big of a problem wavelength accuracy is in the Dobson instruments? The paper results seem to suggest that the central wavelengths are very close to nominal in all tested Dobsons. However, it seems that the results suggest that the slit widths, especially those at longer wavelengths are wider than nominal for all instruments. How does this affect the effective ozone absorption calculations? Here are some cosmetic suggestions: Repetition: lines 114-117 and 118-121 are identical line 15 (and some other places): Both the Brewer and the Dobson are mentioned, but the paper only addresses a dedicated Dobson unit. Suggest wording this line differently to either clarify that the Brewer unit is under construction/testing or to say it's the subject of another paper. Unless the same unit can be used with the Brewer and then this needs to be stated. line 63: "vertically" instead of "vertical" lines 65-71: it is a little confusing when the "second mirror and the grating" are both in the fixed position and are on and adjustable stages. How is it different from the first mirror? line 110: remove double comma line 160: "requires" instead of "requests" line 171: "bandp" - a typo?

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2020-244, 2020.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

