

Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., referee comment RC1  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-2022-138-RC1>, 2022  
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

## **Comment on amt-2022-138**

Anonymous Referee #1

---

Referee comment on "Quantification of motion-induced measurement error on floating lidar systems" by Felix Kelberlau and Jakob Mann, Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-2022-138-RC1>, 2022

---

The paper addresses the quantification of the error, induced by the motion of a floating lidar and explains the logic behind the low error values obtained, with such a lidar, from a field trial.

Both the 'simulator' and the 'analytical' methods reveal that the pitch motion (tilt motion // in the wind direction) is the predominant one and capable to produce a systematic bias error. The developed analytic model is of significant value and can be applied to PW-lidars too.

The main conclusion of the paper is that the expected motion-induced wind speed error, for the wave motions recorded during an (older) field campaign, is lower than the uncertainty of the ref. wind sensors (cup).

A general comment for the paper (or suggestion for future work), is that both models are extremely difficult to be verified by offshore field campaigns. The expected errors are small and some influencing factors, like: i) the separating distance fixed-MM/lidar to floating lidar, ii) the fixed-MM blockage effect and iii) the different probe volumes (fixed lidar is usually 10m higher than the floating one), can be sources of deviations. Instead, a campaign similar to the mentioned Hellevang and Reuder (2013) would be ideal to verify the models accuracy.