

Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., author comment AC1
<https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-2021-79-AC1>, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Reply on RC1

Benjamin Männel et al.

Author comment on "GNSS-based water vapor estimation and validation during the MOSAiC expedition" by Benjamin Männel et al., Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss.,
<https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-2021-79-AC1>, 2021

This is an article on our present day ability to derive good quality ZTDs from GNSS data obtained on a moving platform, in this case a slow moving ship. It is interesting, wellwritten, easy to read, and deserves publication. In principle the manuscript can be published as is, but I have a few suggestions for improvements for the authors to consider.

A: Thank you for the encouraging review and your comments.

1) The term "crows nest" will to most readers mean something else. Consider to just remove the first entry and say "top of ship" or "top of mast" in the second.

A: Actually "crows nest" is the lookout point (like a cabin) at the mast. You are right it might be misleading to some readers. We added a short explanation when using "crows nest" for the first time.

2) Consider to include statistics on ZTDs from NYA2 versus ERA, possibly also from NE Greenland if you have easy access to GNSS data from there. Those from NYA2 you have already.

A: We considered the usage of additional stations while defining the study. However, Polarstern's trajectory was not close enough to use GNSS stations in Greenland in a reliable way. Especially in Kronprins Christian Land which is closest to Polarstern's trajectory we are not aware of any permanent GNSS station (in addition to the tracking networks of IGS, G-NET and UNAVCO (e.g. <https://www.unavco.org/data/dai/?lat=72.131764&lon=1.400925&zoom=2.73>)).

3) The processing is done after the expedition. Include a few sentences whether the quality of the GNSS ZTDs would be different was it done in near real-time, which is important for the potential use of ZTDs from ships in NWP.

A: The quality in near real-time would not differ much (for static stations described e.g. in Gendt et al., 2004), however, given the very limited bandwidth it was not possible to transfer the GNSS data in near real-time. Processing on the ship would be possible but was not done as the focus was on collecting the measurements. Nevertheless it might be a very interesting approach for further developments.

4) Ground based ZTDs are (to my knowledge) not assimilated in ERA, which strengthen then use of ERA as an independent data source. You could mention that.

A: You are right, they are not assimilated. We added the suggested information: "As GNSS-based ZTD are not assimilated in ERA5 the associated ZTDs are an independent data source."

Then two comments that are more ment for eventual future work. Presumably a research vessel will carry a high quality pressure sensor. It can be expected to provide better quality ZHD than ERA on average. On top, with respect to daily variability it will be effected by the earthly and atmospheric tides as the ZHD proper, while those effects are not well represented in an NWP model such as ERA. The barometer could be used for the derivation of ZHD, to derive ZWD from the GNSS ZTD. The on-board barometer could also provide an a priori for the ZHD in the GNSS data processing, when deriving GNSS ZWD to obtain the GNSS ZTD. As humidity levels are very very low in part of the year in the Arctic, a dominant part of the ZWD estimated in the GNSS data processing is in reality due to variability of the pressure (and hence ZHD). Using a better apriori for ZHD would reduce the problem that the mapping functions for ZHD and ZWD are not identical in the GNSS data processing.

A: We agree with this suggestion and will incorporate the locally measured pressure data for the determination of ZHD in the future. However, at the GFZ operated GNSS sites we observed usually only very small discrepancy between local pressure measurement and ERA5 data.