

Ann. Geophys. Discuss., author comment AC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/angeo-2021-11-AC2>, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Reply on RC1

Pavel Hejda et al.

Author comment on "The geomagnetic data of the Clementinum observatory in Prague since 1839" by Pavel Hejda et al., Ann. Geophys. Discuss.,
<https://doi.org/10.5194/angeo-2021-11-AC2>, 2021

Answers to the Referee 1 comments

The authors are very grateful to the Referee for his/her valuable comments, which helped us to improve the quality of the manuscript.

Review of the manuscript 'The geomagnetic data of the Clementinum observatory in Prague since 1839' by Pavel Hejda, Fridrich Valach and Milos Revallo,
<https://doi.org/10.5194/angeo-2021-11>.

The manuscript describes a valuable and successful data recovery effort, to which the authors are to be congratulated, and makes a first interpretation of the obtained data. I strongly recommend publication of the manuscript after minor revisions.

General comments:

There are not many references and parts of the manuscript could be improved by adding earlier relevant studies. That would benefit the reader.

A number of references could be added that deal with historic geomagnetic time series in Europe but are not included in the introduction or discussion, e.g.:

Malin, S.R.C. and Bullard, E.C., 1981. The direction of Earth's magnetic field in London, 1570-1075. Phil. Trans. R. Soc. London, 299, 357-423

Alexandrescu, M., Courtillot, V., LeMouël, J.-L., 1996. Geomagnetic field direction in Paris since the mid-sixteenth century. Phys. Earth Planet. Inter., 98, 321-360

Korte, M., Manda, M. and Matzka, J., 2009. A historical declination curve for Munich from different data sources. Phys. Earth Planet. Inter., 177, pp. 161-172,
[doi:10.1016/j.pepi.2009.08.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pepi.2009.08.005)

Especially the last reference could be useful here as Munich is very close to Prague. The dataset presented in the manuscript would also lend itself to study historical Sq and the authors might mention this, cf.:

Cnossen, I. and Matzka, J., 2016. Changes in solar quiet magnetic variations since the Maunder Minimum: A comparison of historical observations and model simulations. *J. Geophys. Res. Space Physics*, 121, 10,520–10,535, doi:10.1002/2016JA023211

Referring to some review articles on geomagnetic observatories would also be helpful for the reader.

Answer: We have involved new information together with corresponding references, which are as follows.

Lines 25-32: Arneitz et al., 2017a; Schröder and Wiederkehr, 2000; Reay et al., 2011; Matzka et al., 2010; Malin and Bullard, 1981; Alexandrescu et al., 1996; Korte et al., 2009; Pro et al., 2018

Lines 36-39: Lockwood et al., 2017, 2018; Cnossen and Matzka, 2016; Ptitsyna et al., 2018; Korte et al., 2009; Dobrica et al., 2018

Line 102: Wolf, 1859, 1860; Wolfer, 1914; Svalgaard, 2009, 2012

I regard it as very important to also show the declination values (or any other component that was additionally measured) for the storm of 1939 in Figure 7.

Answer: We have added declination to Figure 7 and a simple interpretation to Section 5 (Lines 434-440 of the new manuscript). We have also mentioned incomplete records of inclination. The caption of the figure has been completed.

It would be nice to add plots of the data in the supplement, like annual means, all years, or daily means for each year. That would allow interested readers a quick evaluation of the data quality. (I have not plotted the data myself to evaluate the quality.)

Answer: We have added plots of the data (monthly means) in the supplement.

Detailed comments (number refers to line number)

18

supplied -> supplemented?

Answer: Corrected to "supplemented". (Line 17 of the new manuscript.)

19

to past few decades -> to the past few decades

Answer: Corrected. (Line 18 of the new manuscript.)

Note: The manuscript is well written, still it would profit from a native speaker quickly checking it. I refrain from further language corrections.

Answer: We have striven for the grammatical correctness of the text. Besides, in e-mail

communication with the journal editor, we were assured of that remaining language issues will be fixed by the publisher during the editing process.

23

Please explain the term 'scale units'.

Answer: We have added a short explanation of the term 'scale unit' in a parenthesis in Line 23.

28

mention space climate

Answer: We have mentioned space climate in Line 36 of the new manuscript.

47

1936 -> 1836

Answer: Corrected. (Line 59 of the new manuscript.)

70

shine?

Answer: "shine" was used as a synonym of "nice" (weather). The Referee was right indicating that the close relation to "sunny" could lead to misunderstanding. The word "shine" was therefore deleted. (Line 82 of the new manuscript.)

166

Ernest -> Ernst

Answer: Corrected. (Line 179 of the new manuscript.)

166

Remove 'Out of GMU'

Answer: Removed. (Line 179 of the new manuscript.)

193

Mention in this paragraph that the next paragraph will explain how you determined the substitute values.

Answer: The mention of the content of the following paragraphs has been added. (Line 208 of the new manuscript.)

208

You estimate the annual mean from three measurements in the second half of the year. So your annual mean seems to be representative for the second half of the year, not for the full year. You could further take into account the estimated secular variation to estimate the annual mean for the centre of the full year.

Answer: We used the assumed uniform secular variation and information about the diurnal variation to estimate the annual mean for 1852. (Lines 220-225 of the new manuscript.)

212

Same comment as I had for line 208.

Answer: We used the assumed uniform secular variation to estimate the annual mean for 1853. (Lines 229-232 of the new manuscript.)

379 (and Figure 6)

Alken et al., 2021, International Geomagnetic Reference Field: the thirteenth generation, states that IGRF covers 1900 to 2025, but you use it for the 1840ies and 1850ies. Please clarify.

Answer: Thanks to the reviewer for notifying us of this error. In fact, we used the gufm1 model for the data in the 19th century. We used an online calculator available on the NCEI website. We have added this fact to the Acknowledgments. On that website, the data before 1900, i. e. model gufm1, can be obtained under the item marked as IGRF (1590-2024), which confused us. In the revised text, we changed the IGRF to gufm1 everywhere (namely: Line 386 and the legend and caption to Figure 6). In Line 386 and in caption to Figure 6, we have also added a reference to the article (Jackson et al., 2000), which presents the gufm1 model. In Acknowledgments we included the National Centers for Environmental Information (NCEI) for the operation of the online Magnetic Field Calculators and mentioned the web address of the calculator, which we used in our study.

Section 5, Figure 7

Please add declination measurements to plot and discuss

Answer: We have added declination to Figure 7 and a simple interpretation to Section 5 (Lines 434-440 of the new manuscript). We have also mentioned incomplete records of inclination. The caption of the figure has been completed.

407

registration -> recording

Answer: Corrected. (Line 445 of the new manuscript.)

Figure 1

Please explain the colour of the plotted lines either in a legend or in the caption. Please also indicate the exact starting time of the corrupted data period.

Answer: The plotted lines are explained in the new version of Figure 1. The exact starting time of the corrupted data period is now more apparent for we removed the connecting line during the jump (when the corrupted data started). The caption of the figure has been completed.

Figure 5 c

Please indicated baselines determined by absolute measurements by symbols, then the reader can see on which data the blue line is based.

Answer: Done.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://angeo.copernicus.org/preprints/angeo-2021-11/angeo-2021-11-AC2-supplement.zip>