

Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., referee comment RC2  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-2021-237-RC2>, 2021  
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



## Comment on amt-2021-237

Anonymous Referee #2

---

Referee comment on "Investigation of space-borne trace gas products over St. Petersburg and Yekaterinburg, Russia by using COCCON observations" by Carlos Alberti et al., Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-2021-237-RC2>, 2021

---

Alberti et al. compared multiple products of total column measurements of greenhouse gases, including ground- and space-based observations and model simulations, at two high-latitude Russian cities, St. Petersburg and Yekaterinburg. As high-latitude total column observations are sparse, such evaluations are quite useful. The paper is well written, with some structural improvements, it will be suitable for publication at AMT.

General comments:

- Many products are compared. However, it is not clear whether there is a reference. On the one hand, COCCON retrievals were described biased low compared to other products, on the other hand, COCCON retrievals were used to scale the CAMS simulations. Are COCCON retrievals linked to the WMO scales? In a similar way as done for TCCON. With the current version, it gives the readers an impression that various products were compared.
- The scaling of CAMS data based on the COCCON data is a practical way of obtaining more matches. The scaled CAMS data could be called bias corrected CAMS data, instead of upscaled COCCON data. Since COCCON retrievals are obtained by scaling the priors, if the priors would be CAMS, it will be more straightforward to obtain the scaling factor, correct?

Some detailed comments:

L84: in this region instead of on this region

L94: compare already means intercompare/inter-compare, just use compare

L224: please rephrase the sentence. The dry air column from the ECMWF simulations?

L279: were averaging kernels considered in the integrating process?

L290: why is COCCON XCO<sub>2</sub> biased low by about 0.81 – 3.1 ppm? Is the difference indeed

caused by a bias in COCCON XCO<sub>2</sub>? How is it known?

L417: how many points? It seems that very little data is available at Yekaterinburg.

L432: I wonder whether the linear regressions are significant? What are the R-squared values?

L478: please show some objective ways of assessing the agreement as "close agreement" cannot be judged.