

## ***Interactive comment on “Polar baseline surface radiation measurements during the International Polar Year 2007–2009” by C. Lanconelli et al.***

**C. Lanconelli et al.**

c.lanconelli@isac.cnr.it

Received and published: 14 December 2010

### General Comments

**Q:** Main requirement: In summary, a convincing argument is needed to explain why a paper needs to be written on a subset of a well documented existing archive which is widely known.

**A:** We agree that the purpose of the paper may not have been adequately identified. We appreciate this being pointed out and have taken this opportunity to expand up the explanation and justification for this paper. This work and the resulting paper were pursued in response to an expressed need for providing a specific dataset, analysis and summary for use by IPY researchers. The dataset provides additional processing and

C161

analysis beyond that routinely available at the BSRN archive. This paper describes that value-added aspect of the data as well as a summary of the data and quality control applied to the data. The following sentence has been added to the Introduction.

A subset of the BSRN archived data was prepared at the request of IPY participants so that these data would be uniformly evaluated and made available for IPY applications. Although the data are routinely acquired and available at the BSRN archive, this paper provides additional evaluation and summary of the data that will be of interest to IPY participants and others who wish to focus their research on the polar regions. In this paper we highlight certain observational and data evaluation issues specific to the extreme polar conditions.

As to the reviewer's concern about the nonstandard language use:

We thank the reviewer for pointing this out and providing a few specific examples. The text has been carefully reedited and those examples and several other cases of what was, or could have been considered, awkward or nonstandard English have been modified and improved. We believe that the paper now reads to proper standards.

---

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., 3, 259, 2010.