

Interactive comment on “In-situ air temperature and humidity measurements over diverse landcovers in Greenbelt, MD Nov. 2013–Nov. 2015”
by Mark L. Carroll et al.

Mark L. Carroll et al.

mark.carroll@nasa.gov

Received and published: 10 August 2016

The authors would like to thank the reviewer for taking the time to review the paper.

In response to the reviewers main concern that the registration step defies ESSD free data policy we respectfully disagree. It is typical for data providing entities to require registration prior to access of the data. This registration is completely free and allows the user to "opt-out" of future communications from the DAAC which makes it truly free. While the registration does expose the reviewers identity to the DAAC, it does not reveal the identity to the authors so the review is still anonymous to the authors. We urge the editor to keep these facts in mind when considering the reviewers recommendation to reject based on data access.

C1

Responses to specific comments:

- 1) rename Appendix A as a table Agreed, the table was included for informative purposes and we will relabel it and refer to it in the text
- 2) word choice / grammar Agreed, will replace "the" with "each" and the sentence will flow better
- 3) Reference to GSFC not Greenbelt Agreed, will add "Greenbelt" to the location description for clarity
- 4) Homer et al reference omitted from reference list Agreed, will correct the oversight
- 5) Use Local Climate Zones instead of Land cover We will look into this and see if the LCZ has a meaningful resolution for our study area. Thank you for the suggestion
- 6) Need additional information regarding BARC weather station data Agreed, we will add more description of the BARC data.
- 7) "each logger deployed in a distinct land cover" Agreed, loggers were mostly deployed in pairs for duplicate measurements of each surface type with the exception of the forest and water management structures. The text will be revised to clarify this point
- 8) flags are hard to see in figure 1 Agreed, there is a delicate balance between making the flags small enough to not dominate the figure but also large enough to be distinct. We will adjust the size to make this easier to see
- 9) figure 4c difference between Beltsville and GSFC unclear Agreed, with response to comment 6 we will address the clarity of this issue