

Interactive comment on “A Database of 10 min Average Measurements of Solar Radiation and Meteorological Variables in Ostrava, Czech Republic” by Marie Opálková et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 22 January 2018

Review of paper “A database of 10mn average measurements . . . , Czech Republic” by Opalkova et al

General comments This paper presents a newly set-up database of solar radiation plus few meteorological and pollutants measurements carried in Ostrava, NE of the Czech Republic. This database has been built by scientists from the University of Ostrava in collaboration with french scientists which expertise in the area of solar radiation measurements and analysis is acknowledged. The sites, sensors used and their maintenance, and the quality checks performed on the raw data and their results are detailed. In particular authors propose a new procedure for checking the quality of irradiances

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



in specific spectral bands which is an adaptation of procedures used for QC of total irradiances.

Specific comments As I'm not an expert in solar radiation data QC I can not fully judge the validity of the new procedure proposed. I therefore mainly comment on other aspects as rationale, statistics, and form

Rationale: The stress is put on the utility of the measurements set-up as a mean to understand the impact of variations in solar radiation, especially those related to atmospheric pollutants, on vegetation in Ostrava. Have the authors any idea of the surface of the city, presented as industrial, occupied by vegetation and if this is less, in the average or more than similar cities? Rather than impacting the vegetation in the city itself, don't the authors think that given air-mass movements, the neighbouring areas ie the gardening belt of the city might be impacted and your measurements if representative or extrapolable would be useful to assess also crops sensitivity to variations in PAR due to pollution. Lastly what might be the counter-effect of pollutants deposits vs increase in diffuse radiation on vegetation photosynthetic capacity? Similarly with regards to health issues what might be the balance between a lower exposure to UVA/UVB due to attenuation by pollution vs breathing these aerosols ... I would like the authors to expand a bit their introduction considering these aspects to enhance the rationale of their in-situ measurements.

Statistics: At the beginning of section 2.1, authors give mean values of sunshine duration air T° ... first we don't understand if this is for Ostrava or the Czech republic. Second it would have been interesting to provide also these values as obtained from you in-situ measurements even if 3 years are available only. In section 2.2 authors present additional pieces of information provided in the database, in particular the type of weather. Yet they do not explain how they have assigned each day to one of the three type of weather. What are the statistics and distance metrics used? Supervised classification? Amplitude and variance of the diurnal cycles? This must be developed and explained. For the information relative to the season I do not

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

really understand the usefulness of it. Can you explain it a bit?

Maintenance: In section 2.2 authors also describe the way sensors are maintained and the frequency of these maintenances (each one or two months depending on the season). From the QC performed can you infer that this frequency is high enough? How far the measurements rejected by the QC correspond to hours when the maintenance was operated? Have the authors the exact dates / hours of maintenance? If yes these dates / hours should be reported in the database in a dedicated column so that users can exactly know if the erroneous data (i.e. those not passing the QC) are due to maintenance (and maybe do interpolations from the hours preceding / following the maintenance) or another failure.

Technical corrections

Abstract: lines 14-17: the authors should better stress there that they propose a new procedure for QC of irradiance in different spectral bands (cf beginning of section 3).

Introduction: page 2 last sentence: This sentence is confusing: we don't understand if you propose to extrapolate the measurements or the procedure to other regions and which ones exactly (what are the regions similar to Ostrava?). please reword.

Measurements sites: on the whole I find very difficult to follow / understand what are the sites you speak about along the whole paper. The way you name and call them is confusing. First starting from the map in figure 1 I would label the two sites BGOU (S1, S2) and CHMI (S3) than 1 and 2. This would be very helpful. + add the coordinates on the map. Without these coordinates I can not figure out where is the PHI site (please if possible locate it on the map in figure 1 as well) which is important with regards to atmospheric dynamics and dominant winds ... Pictures of the sites – unless confidential - would be a nice supplementary material to provide on the PANGEA website

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



For easing the review please do not present a same table on two different pages (a bit annoying) and number the lines with a step of two.

P3 : lines 26-27 : I couldn't find any info about altitude in Tab1 or Fig 1 so delete (Tab1, Fig1)

P4, line 13 (and elsewhere in the paper): please be more precise about dates: from the 1st of July 2104 + hour to the 31st of December 2016 + hour (since in some databases records are provided for non complete years).

P5, Line 17: as the stations were only 3m apart

P6, Line 4: Within its network of X (? please provide this number) stations, the station the nearest of BGOU is located approximately at 1.7km (GPS coordinates)

P6, Line 11: For the sake of simplicity → remove this sentence which is unnecessary here (explanations provided later in the paper)

P6, lines 13 and 14: change CHMI area in Poruba for CHMI station and change the location in Poruba for CHMI.

P6, line 19: broadband irradiance as exemplified in Fig.2 which presents profiles ...

P7, line 15: LibRadtran software (and not a package of software as R or Matlab ...)

P8, line 1: for BGOU and CHMI sites (instead of both locations)

P9, line 7: add (BGOU) after S2 and (CHMI) after S3
line 13: change for the station at CHMI (S3) had ... than stations at BGOU (S1, S2)

P10, last sentence: use the plural form. Can these effects be neglected for your study purposes i.e. impact of SR variability on vegetation?

P11: lines 6 – 15: move that in a table lines 16-18: delete It means if it ... minimum. explanations given before in the paper. Line 19: are

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



present + I couldn't find the figures in the files I uploaded. You should rather provide them as supplementary files just as the figure done from google earth which present the shading effect Line 23-25: Data of air pollutants and meteorological parameters measured by ... these data.

P12, line 5: for modeling the influence line 9: studied in different environment conditions: please be more precise: meteorological and air pollution conditions I guess ... line 10: reword this sentence I don't understand what is a correct function of microclimate line 11: spectral ratios? Do you really mean ratios or bands? If you mean ratio please give example of bands you could use to compute ratios ...

Tab 2: wonder if you should not split the table into two because it is confusing with regards to the sites where the instruments are implemented. For what I understand all instruments belonging to OU are on sites S1, S2 and S3 whereas instruments belonging to PHI are on a site 1.7km from BGOU

Tab 4: legend: numbering your columns would ease the reading of the table. You should also add BGOU and CHMI after S1/S2 and S3.

Fig2. Legend: please provide the dates of these three days of March 2015 ...

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2017-111>, 2018.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

