Geosci. Instrum. Method. Data Syst. Discuss.,
doi:10.5194/gi-2016-41-RC2, 2017

Geoscientific Instrumentation Methods and Data Systems Discussions
Open Access
EGU

Interactive comment on "Wind Reconstruction Algorithm for Viking Lander 1" *by* Tuomas Kynkäänniemi et al.

J. Murphy (Referee)

murphy@nmsu.edu

Received and published: 24 April 2017

Derivation of a wind vector data set from the Viking Lander 1 wind sensor system is a tremendous addition to martian surface meteorology studies. The Viking Lander 1 meteorology data set remains the most time extensive surface-obtained martian atmospheric data set, but the lack of the wind measurements to accompany the pressure and temperature and opacity data sets has been a substantial deficiency.

The manuscript describes the methodology developed and applied to employ degraded wind directional sensor signals and additionally wind speed sensor signals, and presents some comparison of the derived winds using this/these methodologies with wind speed and direction measurement from when the full sensor system was operable. Additionally, derived winds are assessed in the context of slope-induced winds

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

anticipated at the VL1 location.

Specific Comments: There are previously published VL1 winds derived following the quadrant sensor failure (Murphy et al., 1990). The manuscript does not provide any comparisons between those previous derived wind vectors and those derived using the method in this manuscript; such comparisons are warranted, as is some additional measurement-by-measurement comparison with the SANMET derived winds during the initial 45 sols (in addition to hourly averaged comparison, Figures 25 & 26). The impact of the manuscript will be strengthened with the inclusion of presentation of some derived point-by-point wind speed and direction, in addition to the hourly averaged presentation included in the current draft. Will the derived wind data set be made publicly available in its entirety?

There is an apparent high-wind-speed bias that arises from the manuscript's methodology when compared to SANMET winds during sols 1-45. The manuscript does address this result but more attention is warranted to provide a more substantial basis for believing the derived wind speeds and directions.

It would be helpful if Figure 3 included Sol 45 quadrant sensor signals to illustrate what a fully uncompromised sol's measurements exhibit. The presentation would benefit from displaying the nominal quadrant sensor signal during a complete sol which subsequently transitioned to the instrument behavior change evident during the first few hours of Sol 46 and Sol 47 which then became persistent during Sol 48.

The substantial comparison within the paper of the newly derived wind vector results with wind vectors derived applying the SANMET software to the degraded sensor signals is unwarranted. [Figures 24, 25, and 26.] The SANMET software was designed to operate with signals from fully functional instruments. There is no doubt that SANMET-derived wind speeds and directions from the compromised instruments will be flawed, and using such flawed results as a comparison with the newly derived wind speeds and directions does not itself provide validation of the newly derived results. Rather, it

is better to compare the newly derived winds with anticipated environmental conditions and their presumed physical driving of the winds that were experienced.

For instance, the winds experienced at VL1 during the two global scale dust storms that occurred during the first year of the mission, initiating at Ls ∼205 and ∼270 (sols ∼210 and ∼315), are theoretically expected to have exhibited a semi-diurnal rotation of the wind vector, which the derived winds from Murphy et al (1990) were in agreement with.

The hodograph figures in Murphy et al illustrate this wind vector rotation arising from amplified thermal tides. Also, Viking Lander 1 camera images of the landing site provided evidence of surface material motion believed to be due to wind stress, requiring fast wind speeds from a direction indicated by the direction of material motion (Sagan et al, JGR, 82, September 1977, 4430-4438; Moore, H., JGR, 90, November 1985, 163-174).

In Section 3.1 the word 'segment' is invoked to describe each of the two time intervals (sols 46-377, sols 378-2245) during which the two specific wind derivation methodologies are implemented/applied. Since 'segment' is frequently used to describe a portion of a physical structure rather than a time interval, I suggest considering replacing 'segment' with a word that unambiguously indicates time, such as 'stage'. Stage 1 could correspond to the failed quadrant sensor during sols 46-377 while the wind sensor continued operating, while Stage 2 could correspond to the subsequent failed Wind Sensor element condition.

Since the concept of Nusselt number (introduced on Page 3) is very important to the paper's discussion of the wind sensor signals, I recommend providing a definition of Nusselt Number within the text.

In Section 2.4, final sentence of the 2nd paragraph, the statement '.. a significantly higher temperature than the ambient temperature' occurs, but there is no declaration as to the necessary magnitude of such 'significantly higher' temperature to permit the

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

derivation methodology to be successful. It would be very useful for the reader to know what magnitude of higher temperature is necessary for the derivation methodology to provide valid wind results.

Figure 11 could be eliminated from the paper without the paper's impact/presentation being compromised.

Technical Corrections: The manuscript will benefit from English language editing.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Instrum. Method. Data Syst. Discuss., doi:10.5194/gi-2016-41, 2017.