

Interactive comment on “Quality control of CarboEurope flux data – Part II: Inter-comparison of eddy-covariance software” by M. Mauder et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 24 January 2008

General comment: the paper is technically very good. The topic is important although this is not the first time when eddy cov softwares are compared. However, the item is not fully explored yet.

Specific comments: I admit that the difference of 5-10% between flux values by different softwares is rather good, but what does it mean when annual balances are estimated. The annual carbon balance is one of the main aims of many projects and the big concern is cumulative errors. This could be commented.

As Referee #1 also pointed out, to apply planar-fitting over 5 days may not be sound. I would not do that. Good arguments should be given why the authors think there are no problems in it.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

