

Interactive comment on “Continuous monitoring of the boundary-layer top with lidar” by H. Baars et al.

G. Steeneveld

Gert-Jan.Steeneveld@wur.nl

Received and published: 15 July 2008

Dear authors,

I really appreciate your work in the PBL depth observations. I have a few remarks: 1. The problems you mention with the critical RI in COSMO can be circumvented using the work of

Vogelezang D. H. P., and A. A. M. Holtslag, 1996: Evaluation and model impacts of alternative boundary-layer height formulations. Bound.-Layer Meteor., 81, 245–269.

2. Furthermore the authors could make a remark in the paper on how useful the Polly s for nighttime PBLs. Since the NBL height is even more critical for air quality than

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



the daytime PBL depth. If Polly is also applicable for nighttime, further verification of the new NBL height proposal in this paper is extremely useful (evaluation of the Zilitinkevich paper you refer to):

Steenefeld, G.J., B.J.H. van de Wiel, and A.A.M. Holtslag, 2007: Diagnostic Equations for the Stable Boundary Layer Height: Evaluation and Dimensional Analysis. *J. Appl. Meteor. Climatol.*, 46, 212–225.

Interactive comment on *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 8, 10749, 2008.

ACPD

8, S4830–S4831, 2008

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

