Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2020-132-RC2, 2020 © Author(s) 2020. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.





Interactive comment

## Interactive comment on "Ship-borne measurements of XCO<sub>2</sub>, XCH<sub>4</sub>, and XCO above the Pacific Ocean and comparison to CAMS atmospheric analyses and S5P/TROPOMI" by Marvin Knapp et al.

## Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 29 September 2020

Knapp et al's manuscript "Ship-borne measurements of XCO2, XCH4, and XCO above the Pacific Ocean and comparison to CAMS atmospheric analyses and S5P/TROPOMI" is an excellent piece of work describing ship borne measurements of total-column CO2, CO, and CH4 gathered during a transect across the Pacific Ocean at  $\sim$ 30 deg N. There is a focus on the technical aspects of protecting and successfully deploying a solar-observing Fourier Transform Spectrometer in this challenging environment. There is also a satisfactory description of the trace gas retrieval process and bias correction efforts. Comparisons to both TROPOMI satellite observations, as well

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



as to CAMS model fields, are also described in detail. As the ocean environment is a measurement poor region for validation of our global models, this work is significant and very worthy of publication following a few minor technical corrections listed below.

The EM27/SUN data is made available by the authors; however, this reviewer struggled to quickly locate and download the exact CAMS product used for both the retrieval a priori and for the final comparison. If this was a special product produced for this campaign then that should be stated clearly and the data should be archived along with the EM27/SUN measurements. Or, if the model fields used are a standard product that I simply overlooked, I suggest including a link to the exact data.

Technical corrections:

L10: is found TO BE 0.24 ppm

L45: Agree with Reviewer #1 - change "disposes of"

L101: I assume the authors are stating that the ventilation takes up 160W when the electronics are running at full power? – this should be made clearer if so.

L147: Is the factor of 0.9693 simply an empirical correction? Is there a physical justification for it?

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2020-132, 2020.

## ESSDD

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

