

## ***Interactive comment on “Ship- and island-based soundings from the 2016 El Niño Rapid Response (ENRR) field campaign” by Leslie M. Hartten et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 26 February 2018

The overall quality of this paper is high and presents a unique and important data resource. I would recommend publications with a just a few minor revisions – the majority are covered in specific comments. The authors discuss in detail the needs for sounding reprocessing in light of the errors that can be introduced by incorrect ground observations. The paper would benefit if the authors quantified the uncertainties in variables at the varying processing levels.

A significant part of this paper details launches from a moving platform (although not explicitly stated it is assumed that the sounding station was appropriately configured for). When entering the surface observations of wind speed and direction there is debate so to which is more accurate: the raw or those corrected for motion of the platform. The paper would benefit from stating which approach is used and why.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Specific comments: Page 4 line 32. “ , Colorado. . . . . hotel building.” This seems to be a snip-it left over from an edit cut-and-paste. This needs to be cleaned up. Page 12 line 20. The formatting of this line needs addressing. Page 13 line 1. The authors reference the British Atmospheric Data Centre (BADC). BADC technically no longer exists and has been superseded by the Centre for Environment Data Analysis (CEDA): <http://www.ceda.ac.uk/>. If you are using CEDA as a link to your readers regarding NASA-Ames data format it would be better to put in an explicit link. Page 15 line 13. Formatting

---

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2018-7>, 2018.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

