

Interactive comment on “Overview of the Manitou Experimental Forest Observatory: site description and selected science results from 2008–2013” by J. Ortega et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 14 March 2014

This article provides an in depth overview about the conceptual design, implementation, site characteristics, and brief summary of key research findings of the Manitou Experimental Forest Observatory. Compared to a number of other overview articles that I have read, this manuscript impresses with the detail of the topics that are addressed. Sections of the article obviously were written by different contributing authors, but they have been nicely merged to yield a cohesive and well readable article. One could question if an overview article should go as deep into providing instrumental operating variables etc as done in this work.

Where are the data from these experiments deposited? A short section on data policy

C467

and data sharing would be a good addition. A few minor suggested corrections are given below. I see no further need for content changes or additions.

Please check for consistent consecutive numbering of Tables and Figures and that all figure graphs are mentioned and discussed in the text.

1657/17: ..data are available ...

1658/20: ...show very little ...

1663/21: Please double-check and mention, where appropriate, what substrate/variable was measured/investigated (i.e. ambient air, fluxes, emission samples, leaf litter, ...)

1664/17: Provide trees species that were investigated.

1666/12: Has MEFO been defined?

1676/17: Mean and standard deviation results should be given with same number of significant and decimal digits. Please double-check standard deviation result. 5.2 ppbv seems amazingly low. Does this result reflect the variability of hourly mean values? Or maybe daily mean values?

1677/23: Front Range Urban ???

1678/23: ..in Indiana, USA ...

1695: Inconsistency in figure formatting, i.e. font size of axis titles, legends, titles, date and time format should be corrected.

1701: Discussion of data should be in the text not in the figure caption. Figure caption should explain the figure.

1702: Are there any thoughts on the large disagreement between the modeled and measured HCHO flux? There seems to be a large discrepancy in these results that is not really addressed in the text?

C468

