

Interactive comment on “Consumption of atmospheric O₂ in an Urban Area of Tokyo, Japan derived from continuous observations of O₂ and CO₂ concentrations and CO₂ flux” by Shigeyuki Ishidoya et al.

Thomas Karl (Editor)

thomas.karl@uibk.ac.at

Received and published: 11 March 2020

Concerning the treatment of urban fluxes, issues about proper QAQC treatment of eddy covariance fluxes have been raised. It is noted that (depending on the application) eddy covariance fluxes should generally be filtered according to several well established criteria (e.g. stationarity, u^* , stability). An appropriate method can for example be found in Lee et al. Handbook of Micrometeorology (ISBN 978-1-4020-2265-4). Chapter 9. Foken et al., Post field data quality control.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Another important issue for urban flux calculations is the treatment of sonic anemometer rotation (e.g. planar fit, or double rotation depending on the application). These rotations can be quite sector dependent in urban areas (see for example <https://www.atmos-meas-tech-discuss.net/amt-2019-272/amt-2019-272.pdf>). It should be noted which rotation was used, and whether it was applied sector dependent.

Flux footprint: Neftel et al. based their footprint model on Horst and Weil, and evaluated the footprint model specifically for grassland, which has a completely different surface characteristic than an urban landcover. While there is currently no true parameterization for the urban roughness layer, an updated footprint model by Kljun et al. (<https://www.geosci-model-dev.net/8/3695/2015/>), that was developed for tall canopies, would perhaps give a better representation of the urban flux footprint.

Interactive comment on *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2019-652>, 2019.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

