Geoscientific
Model Development
Discussions
Open Access

GMDD

8, C1859–C1861, 2015

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on "The simple two-dimensional parameterisation for Flux Footprint Predictions FFP" *by* N. Kljun et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 2 September 2015

The manuscript is very well written, and provides a focused and well justified description of an improved approach for footprint modeling. I have several minor comments (listed below), regarding reference to recent publications that have used footprint models, and regarding the order and flow at which the formulation is described.

I salute the fact that a link to the code is provided with the manuscript. I think this should be moved to an earlier point in the paper (perhaps just after the introduction) and not hidden past all the appendices, but this is just my preference and I will accept the authors preference for the placement of the "code availability" section. However, I checked the website listed and the source code is not provided there. There is only a link to an online version of the model, which is a far cry from the code itself. I assume that a link to the code will be posted when the paper is accepted, but the editor should

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

verify this before the final posting of the manuscript.

P6759 Line 16- Matheny et al 2104 JGR 119:2292-2311 and Morin et al JGR 2014 119:2188–2208 are two additional example for novel applications of a 2-D footprint model, for scaling the contribution to flux measurements from a disturbance area and for gap-filling of CO_2 and methane fluxes from a heterogeneous wetland site. Morin et al is also provides a relevant for Page 6761 Line 5, and for remote-sensing driven footprint climatology (see Morin's figure A1) discussed in page 6775, lines 15-20.

Page 6762 Line 8-10: What happens in airborne measurements? The vertical reference cannot be assumed as fixed there. Upon further reading, the topic of footprint for moving measurements, such as airborne flux measurements, is not addressed at all. I recommend removing the comment about airborne measurements in Page 6760 Line 8 as it is creates a false expectation that the solution you are about to present can handle these as well.

Page 6762 – the formulation here tells us about the footprint function, but does not tell what it actually is. We end up with a symbolic representation of a footprint function (eq. 3). Took me a while to figure out where you are going with it and to get to the solution. Can you add a few words here to the effect that later in the manuscript you will derive the parameterized forms for D and (fˆy)bar.

Page 6772 – at some point around equation 13 I ran out of patience and started going over all the equations looking for a formulation of (fˆy)bar and sigma_y , which are the key to solving the footprint function (eq 10). After a somewhat frustrating quest, I finally found it, way later, on page 6772, hidden in the numerical recipe of example 5.2, and not strictly formulated (the reader is instructed to invert equations 8 or 9 and 13). I admit that my jumpy reading style and short attention span should not be considered the norm or burden the authors, but would it be possible to write the inverted forms of eq9 (or eq8) and eq13 (i.e. (fˆy)bar = . . . and sigma_y = . . .) at an earlier point, and say that they could be solved and substituted in eq10 to find the footprint function, provided

empirical formulations for sigma_y* and Fˆy*. I think the end of section 3 would be a suitable spot for this, as it will provide a logical transition to the parameterization in section 4.

Page 6777 Line 7 – See nice example of a flux tower-based study of the roughness parameters in a forest site in Maurer et al 2013 AFM.

Page 6777 lines 9-12 – the letter h is often associated with canopy height and not always with boundary layer height as in this paper. As it is mentioned immediately after z_0 (which is a function of canopy height) it confused me. Please move the explicit definition of h to this point, to prevent confusion, i.e. "Measurements of the boundary layer height, h, are available only rarely..." (it is currently about 5 lines later, in "a small variation in the input value of the boundary layer height, h ...")

———————————————————

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 8, 6757, 2015.