

Interactive comment on “Modelling studies of wind field on urban environment” by K. Radics et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 9 January 2003

The paper deals with wind conditions in Budapest, the capital of Hungary. The title promises more than the contents of the paper reveal. Results of different wind measurements are discussed and supplemented by results of a case study with the WASP model. But I miss the context between the single results. As numerous studies on the wind conditions within and over cities exist, the paper should give an answer on the question, which new results are presented in the paper. In the present form, the paper is a case study without any scientific value and its information is restricted to Budapest. I recommend the authors to add a short review about international publications on urban wind conditions in chapter 1 or as a separate chapter referring to deficiencies. They could be the objectives of the paper. In addition, I recommend the following corrections: (1) Page 1980, line 20: What do the authors understand exactly by “this century”? (2) Page 1981, line 7: Is the model WASP suited for applications in urban

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Original Paper

environments ? Please, add some suited quotations. (Compare Page 1984, line 17) (3) Page 1981, line 11: Location of Hegyhátsál area ? (4) Page 1982, line 18: exact location of BudapestÚLörinc meteorological station (e.g. southern or northern suburban site, downtown) ? (5) Page 1985, line 20: Meteorological conditions for modelling must be explained (not only values of roughness parameter), e.g. geostrophic wind speed or wind direction or atmospheric stability. How frequent are these conditions at the simulation area ? (6) Page 1989: Table 1 is not necessary. It is sufficient to mention the wind instruments within the text. (7) Page 1991: The colours for the different surface types are not ideal. They should be changed to achieve a better differentiation. (8) Page 1992: Fig. 2 has no importance for the contents of the paper and therefore is not necessary. (9) Page 1994, Legend of Fig. 4: Please, add the exact years after five-year-long. (10) Page 1995: Fig. 5 is not necessary.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 2, 1979, 2002.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Print Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Original Paper](#)