Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 8, S9192–S9193, 2008 www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/8/S9192/2008/© Author(s) 2008. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribute 3.0 License.



ACPD

8, S9192-S9193, 2008

Interactive Comment

Interactive comment on "Ozone Monitoring Instrument spectral UV irradiance products: comparison with ground based measurements at an urban environment" by S. Kazadzis et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 17 November 2008

The paper discuss agreement between OMI estimated UV irradiance at the ground at GB measurements at an urban site in Greece. Methods to take into account the effect of aerosols present is performed with success. The paper is clear and well organized. One general question? How large part of the grid is covered by urban area and how much is ocean?

Special comments: p. 17471 Line 23. Is there a reference for the correlation between PM 10 and AOD at this site?

p. 17472 line 1. Why are only three wavelength compared, why not 310 and 340 nm line 17. Descibe briefly how SSA is retrieved at 340 nm (Bais 2005) line 26. Reference

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Eck 1995 missing

- p. 17474 line 14. Why use the median of RT? Line 20. Is there any background for setting SSA to 0.90. Other references? Line 25. Table 1. I do not see the point of giving W10 and W20 values in Table 1 with three decimales.
- p. 17476 line 16. Why is 324 nm used to calculate AOT?
- p. 17485 Title of the table show reflect content. RT statistics. Use rather OMI/GB ratio of ….
- p. 17486 replace RT. Replace methodology with aerosol absorption optical tickness corrections…
- p. 17487 Erythemal weighted dose rates? rather than dose

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 8, 17467, 2008.

ACPD

8, S9192-S9193, 2008

Interactive Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

