

## ***Interactive comment on “FTS measurements of column CO<sub>2</sub> at Sodankylä” by R. Kivi and P. Heikkinen***

**G.P. Weedon (Referee)**

graham.weedon@metoffice.gov.uk

Received and published: 25 February 2016

General comments: This paper documents, for the Sodankyla site, the instrumentation and about six years of measurements of FTS column CO<sub>2</sub> (XCO<sub>2</sub>). As part of the Total Carbon Column Observing Network this is a useful paper that can readily be made more valuable especially for a general reader.

Specific comments: Title: Although the site may be well known to the TCCON community the title should finish with: “..., Finland”.

Abstract: Similarly the abstract should cite the latitude and longitude (rounded to the nearest degree) and explain the significance of the site location for the TCOON monitoring.

C1

Section 1 Introduction:

The authors state that “compared to the surface in situ measurements the XCO<sub>2</sub> is much less affected by vertical transport” (lines 2-3 p2). Apparently the authors think this is an advantage, but the significance needs to be explained. Instantaneous surface in situ CO<sub>2</sub> measurements are more relevant for modelling gross primary productivity since they more accurately represent the atmospheric composition encountered by plants. The authors should spell out why their XCO<sub>2</sub> provide an advantage over these in situ values. It would also be helpful to explain how the XCO<sub>2</sub> measurements are dominated by lower tropospheric components given the atmospheric density/pressure profile. Additionally, they should cite studies that directly compare ground based FTS XCO<sub>2</sub> against satellite FTS XCO<sub>2</sub>.

Section 4 XCO<sub>2</sub> time series and the annual cycle:

1) The authors should discuss the actual measurements shown in Fig 6 before the mean seasonal cycle shown in Fig 5. Hence swop the fig order and move the paragraph on lines 9-14 on p7 to the start of section 4.

2) Fig 6 (to become Fig 5) shows how variable the scatter and numbers of measurements are from month to month. The figure would be improved by plotting in a new panel the mean monthly XCO<sub>2</sub> (i.e. for each month of each year) plus their uncertainties (as 95% confidence intervals).

3) In obtaining the mean monthly XCO<sub>2</sub> over 6 years from the data the authors must have subtracted the linear interannual trend. The authors have not explained how estimated the trend – did they use a regression of each monthly mean allowing for the uncertainty in each month (i.e. allowing for dependent variable errors) or did they regress using the individual measurement values shown in Fig 6? We are also not told what “+/-0.3 ppm per year” represents (+/-standard deviation or +/-standard error or +/-95% CI).

C2

4) The mean monthly XCO<sub>2</sub> over 6 years in Fig 5 is shown with standard deviations as though error bars/uncertainties. This is incorrect as it is the standard error of the mean (or better the 95% CI) and NOT the standard deviation that indicates the minimum uncertainty in the mean values. The highly variable number of observations per month would be reflected by the SEM or 95% CI ranges. In fact the uncertainty in the mean monthly values over 6 years should also allow for the effect of the uncertainty in the linear trend.

5) We are told (p 6 line 23-24) that minimum XCO<sub>2</sub> occurs in August due to CO<sub>2</sub> uptake by plants. This is far too vague. They should cite publications describing variations in gross primary productivity and heterotrophic (soil) respiration since net ecosystem exchange (NEE) is relevant here. This issue returns on lines 7 and 8 of p7 where ECMWF modelling of decreased XCO<sub>2</sub> (by modelling NEE via phenology etc) is said to precede the Soldankyla FTS XCO<sub>2</sub> by a whole month. The significance of this mis-match cannot be judged without knowing how the timing of observed Finnish NEE varies compares to the variation in Soldankyla FTS XCO<sub>2</sub> (which must be later – but by how much?). In fact it would be useful to know how the new XCO<sub>2</sub> values vary on average (over 6 years) over time scales much shorter than a month (e.g. weekly).

Technical comments:

p2 line2 “HDF” > “HDO”.

p2 line2 Put “in situ” into italics here and later to be consistent with p1 line 24.

p3 line9 “is working” > “has worked”.

p3 line 27-28 “on monthly” > “on a monthly”.

p3 line 30 “phase orientation” > “phase orientation errors” (similarly correct caption of Fig 2 and Y axis in lower panel Fig 2 to “phase orientation errors”).

p3 line 32 Move sentence starting “Modulation efficiency...” in front of sentence on line 31 p 3 starting “The spread of values...”.

C3

p4 End of section 2 Explain why amplitude modulation for 2012 is so different to 2013 & 2014. Explain why July 2012 phase orientation error so different to other dates.

p4 lines 22-23 “This is increasing” > “This increases”.

p4 lines 26-27 “which is making” > “which makes”.

p4 line 30 “In ideal” > “In an ideal”.

Fig 2 Add arrow and note for August 2013 “Positioning board replaced”.

---

Interactive comment on Geosci. Instrum. Method. Data Syst. Discuss., doi:10.5194/gi-2015-38, 2016.

C4