

Interactive comment on “H₂¹⁶O and HDO measurements with IASI/MetOp” by H. Herbin et al.

H. Herbin

herve.herbin@univ-lille1.fr

Received and published: 19 July 2009

Response to Reviewer 2:

> First, we thank the referee for his very useful comments, which have helped improving the manuscript. Below are the responses to his comments and suggestions.

1) First, I'd appreciate a few more sentences comparing the IASI measurements and algorithms to those from TES. There are very few measurements like these being made currently, and some discussion of the similarities and differences would be gratefully appreciated by the community of users who are not specialists in remote sensing. Appropriate comparisons should be made in terms of the spectral resolution, field of view, pixel footprint, global coverage, vertical resolution, and retrieval algorithms. This is not necessarily calling for a detailed intercomparison, just a quick reference to the main similarities and differences between the two sets of measurements.

C3025

> We agree with the referee that this information was missing and the text has been modified accordingly.

2) Second, the case study of Typhoon Krosa is interesting, but I'd like to see it become more developed. I would suggest that the study, in its current form, does not represent a 'detailed' study but is instead a preliminary study that simply illustrates our ability to remotely sense water isotopologues from space. A little more work would make the case study much more relevant (and enticing) for the meteorological community. The authors need to provide some additional context about water isotopologues in typhoons - there is already a modest literature on the subject from Gedzelman and Lawrence, and some of these references would be helpful. Typhoons actually are an excellent test-bed for these kinds of measurements because of the intense isotopic depletion associated with them. Please take a couple of sentences to explain this.

> Additional information about water vapour isotopologues in typhoons has been added in the text as suggested.

In Figure 5, do the authors really need to show the column-integrated water in molecules per square centimeter? This is a nonstandard unit at least in the meteorological literature. Something like mm would be more appropriate for comparison with other studies.

>The unit of the Fig 5 has been changed in mm.

The authors mention that they remove all cloudy spectra above and around the typhoon's eye. I'd be interested in seeing some of the lesser quality data - can we be sure that there's nothing interesting (from the point of view of typhoon dynamics) in these other parts of the data set?

> Of course, it would be very interesting to obtain information for the cloudy spectra in particular for typhoon dynamics studies and we hope to be able to do in a forthcoming work. Nevertheless, retrievals and characterizations are more difficult for this kind of

C3026

spectra and the latter have been rejected in this preliminary study.

Figure 6 kind of disturbs me, since the dD values span all the way from 0 to -300 per mil! I see a lot of structure in Fig. 5, but Fig 6 reminds me of noise. Would there be more structure here if they just plotted the data above, say, 4×10^{23} molecules/cm²?

> As suggested by another reviewer, we have modified the Figure 6 to make easier the comparison with the Figure 5.

Fig. 5 suggests a nice inverse relationship between water concentration around the typhoon eye and the dD values, but this doesn't show up in Fig 6. The discussion of the Rayleigh distillation lines is in accordance with current interpretations, but I am not sure that they are entirely relevant for typhoons. The authors do mention the importance of 'mixing' processes, but I'd like them to dig deeper into the typhoon literature (just a bit - take a look at the Gedzelman and Lawrence papers) and see if they can come up with a more satisfying explanation. The current discussion is largely disconnected from the larger literature on the hydrological cycle of tropical cyclones. Making those connections would render the paper much more interesting and relevant for the broader community of atmospheric scientists interested in using this kind of data.

> Some sentences have been added in the text to improve this part of the discussion.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 9, 9267, 2009.