

## ***Interactive comment on “Eddy covariance methane measurements at a Ponderosa pine plantation in California” by C. J. P. P. Smeets et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 21 April 2009

Although the measurement period analysed in the paper is quite short, there is not very much published papers on Los Gatos -based CH<sub>4</sub> measurements, under different meteorological conditions and for different ecosystems. In this sense, the paper provides new useful information. The following items must be considered.

1. It is not very clear and not specified exactly what was the software related problem, which was corrected. In Abstract, that could be shortly explained and it should be stressed how this is generally interesting. Also in Conclusions, p. 5214, lines 25-26, what is exactly the upgrading done? This also relates to the point raised by Referee 1, that what is the exact focus and aim of the paper.

2. p. 5206, line 5: is the LAI value total (all-sided) or projected?

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

3. This is just a suggestion for the future, not needed for this paper, why not to dry the sampled air, then you wouldn't need any WPL correction for water vapour.

4. It is not clear what kind of filtering was generally used for the data, especially was any friction velocity limits used and any stationarity tests?

5. p. 5214, lines 1-3: it could be added that the flux values represent upward fluxes.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 9, 5201, 2009.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper