

## ***Interactive comment on “The STARTWAVE atmospheric water database” by J. Morland et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 6 February 2006

General comments.

A fine paper, bringing together a lot of basic research; whilst not producing any wild leap forwards in techniques, it is the sort of work that needs supporting. Please take most of the following comments as being of the style rather than substance. Overall I enjoyed reading it and it should be published with very few corrections.

There is little in the science worth worrying about. The last piece of section 5, the changes to the TROWARA measurements is a little odd with respect to the rest of the work (changes in the radiometer siting/construction would be useful to understand?); Figure 3 is too busy and not very informative. I'm not sure how useful it is illustrating that a homogenization scheme worked?

Section 11 could be reduced or removed with little decrease in value of the paper, but

that's a quibble.

I'm not a fan of the number of internal reports used as references, although it can easily be appreciated that these are very technical issues with limited scope for publication of these types of material (this being one of them). Would it be possible to collect these into a reasonably solid web address?

Specific comments:

Section 1.

Two references from internal postgraduate documents (Rohrbach 1999; Martin 2003). Replacements?

P10844, Comments made in Lines 9 to 12 are mainly repeated at beginning of Section 2 and should be rewritten.

Section 2.

Guerova et al. (2003) ref and notes on AGNES should be introduced in first paragraph. Equation 1. Assuming  $p$  is 'pressure at the surface', but this needs to be made explicit.

Section 4.

Mätzler (2005) is missing from reference list.

Section 6.

Unfamiliar with 'rosetta-like sky scan [10850;10]. (not sure what this shape is!) Is it the dodecagon that is illustrated in Figure 4?

Figures.

Figure 1 is unacceptable as it stands. The three symbols need to be rethought. They are confusing and unclear (too small, colours too 'close' together)

Figure 6. replace 'und' with 'and' in caption.

Figure 10. Could the spacing be between the charts rather than the names- it confuses the geographical attribution.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 5, 10839, 2005.

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper