

Geosci. Instrum. Method. Data Syst. Discuss., referee comment RC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/gi-2021-20-RC2>, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on gi-2021-20

Anonymous Referee #2

Referee comment on "Wind speed influences corrected Autocalibrated Soil Evapo-
respiration Chamber (ASERC) evaporation measures" by Bartosz M. Zawilski, Geosci.
Instrum. Method. Data Syst. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gi-2021-20-RC2>, 2021

The discussed topic is really interesting, and author focused the attention on an aspect that can be considered very important in this field of research and that can increase its significance in next years.

The paper is technically sound, and certainly of interest for the Journal. However, in my opinion a significative reformulation of the work is needed.

General comments

- I found many difficulties in reading the paper, both for the English style (which, to my opinion, needs extensive revision) and for the overall structure of the work.
- Abstract should be focused more on the goals and the structure of this research, providing then specific highlights on the main findings and conclusions.
- Introduction should provide a general background on the current state of the art, leave at the disposal of the reader all the elements for contextualize the topic and what will discuss later. As an example, Par. 1 could be moved to this section.
- Par. 2.4: is it necessary to add a paragraph for a few sentences?
- Par. 3: the nested structure of this paragraph heavily affects the readability of the paper. Furthermore, I would appreciate if the whole paragraph should be reformulated in a shorter form.
- Please, check the compliance of formal use of unit of measurement to the International

System

- A table of acronyms and unit of measures can be a precious support for the readers.

Specific comments and technical corrections:

- Line 22: are you sure that "WMO168 2008" is the right way to cite the reference?
- Line 40: could you add a general framework related to eddy covariance technique?
- Line 47: 2 should be moved as subscript;
- Line 51: Zawilski in progress...what is this reference?
- Line 61: why reporting this information about the maize? Is it necessary for the discussion?
- Line 98: why a point after "USA"?
- Lines 121-122: again, are you sure that is the right way to cite the reference?
- Line 146: why minutes is not abbreviated as the other units?
- Lines 170-183: is it necessary to report the mathematical description of the solution?
- Line 187: please, check Eq. 5
- Line 201: "Results and discussion" and not "Result and discussion"
- Lines 209-210: there is a different way to list all the elements?
- Line 211: could you provide references to this sentence?
- Lines 218-219: I think is not the correct form for writing the sentence
- Line 223: you mention the "Venturi effect" also at line 305 with the same references. Why not describe only one time?
- Line 241: tau_63 stands for...?
- Line 242: RH is Relative Humidity?
- Lines 302-303: could you highlight from the text "wing pumping", as reporting it with italic font?
- Line 325: is it necessary the underlining?
- Line 397: could you highlight from the text "Air Entry Value", as reporting it with italic font?
- Line 401: Fig. 9 is reported later in the text (order is lost)
- Line 404: please, change "." with ":" at the end of the sentence
- Line 452: why the use of "or" while listing the references?
- Lines 526-527: why not use a table?
- Line 454: you declared that W_s is wind speed in the abstract. Then, it is not necessary to repeat again. Please, check about the opportunity of explicitly referring to the modulus of wind velocity.
- Line 545: H stands for hours?
- Line 571: Figure and not picture.
- Line 578: could you highlight from the text "dynamic effects", as reporting it with italic

font?

- Line 585: why air and not Air?
- Line 611: Conclusions and not Conclusion