

Interactive comment on “Correction of albedo measurements due to unknown geometry” by U. Weiser et al.

U. Weiser et al.

ursula.weiser@zamg.ac.at

Received and published: 30 October 2015

We thank the reviewer for the helpful comments and suggestions on how to improve the manuscript. In the course of revision of the manuscript several changes were made. Therefore, some of the suggestions have been included and others were obsolete due to the changes. Please see our answers to the points below:

General comments This paper presents a method to correct snow and ice broadband albedo measurements affected by tilts of the surface and pyranometer, when the latter are unknown. For this, the tilt of the pyranometer is first estimated using a reference measurement from a nearby leveled sensor. The tilt of the surface is then fitted in a simple radiative transfer model to match the measured diurnal cycle of albedo, assuming that the true albedo is constant over a day of measurement. Once both tilts are

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



[Interactive
Comment](#)

determined, the true albedo of the surface can be computed from the measured one. The question of albedo measurements errors due to tilts is critical because i) these errors can significantly impact the estimated surface energy budget of snow and ice surfaces and ii) such albedo measurements are used in a wide range of applications by users not necessarily aware of the complexity of performing accurate albedo measurements. Hence proposing a method to correct albedo measurements is of great interest and the ideas developed in the present paper are interesting. Unfortunately, the method proposed relies on questionable assumptions. In particular, it neglects the dependence of snow albedo on solar zenith angle, which represents a significant shortcoming. In addition, the overall manuscript is poorly written, the introduction and discussion being particularly hard to follow for the reader. The structure generally lacks of organization and clarity which makes very difficult for the reader to understand the ins and outs of the method. The multiplication of inappropriate or approximate terms along with too abundant equations exacerbates this feeling. As is, the manuscript does not meet the standards required for publication in The Cryosphere, and should not be accepted unless substantial parts are entirely rewritten and major corrections are made. Specific comments 1) The manuscript is overall poorly structured, with many repetitions, misplaced information and inappropriate content. Several paragraphs are made of a single sentence which perturbs the flow of reading. The abstract could be substantially improved, for instance by adding a context sentence and illustrating the main results with numerical values. The introduction fails to introduce the context, issues and approach of the study. These ideas are indeed presented in a very fuzzy way, without an obvious consistent organization. Hence it is difficult for the reader to understand what the authors really aim at doing before the Methods section. The last paragraph is more clear but a description of the paper organization would be very helpful at this point. I would recommend the authors to rewrite completely the introduction, following generic steps such as: i) Context: surface energy balance of snow surfaces critically depends on snow albedo ii) Problematic: accurate albedo measurements are difficult to perform because of tilt errors iii) Objective: developing a method to correct

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

albedo measurements since current methods are not satisfying iv) Approach: simple geometric considerations and use of a leveled pyranometer to estimate successively pyranometer and slope tilts, from which the true albedo can be retrieved. The Methods section is more clear but several paragraphs are unnecessary or should be moved to the introduction. Many equations are displayed while some of them could/should be skipped. There is some redundancy between the model description and the algorithm description that come in two distinct sections. See more details in Technical corrections. The Results section is too abrupt. For each experiment described, the context should be reminded to the reader for more clarity. The discussion is currently a succession of independent sentences that form individual paragraphs. It contains information that should be placed in the introduction or Methods and does not discuss much about the results. As for the conclusion, it does not provide any perspectives for future work or consequences of this research, while this is the main interest of proposing a method to correct albedo measurements. The abstract and introduction has been rewritten and a description of the paper organisation was added. The methods improved and more details added. More results and errors were added. The discussion has been rewritten, also the conclusions.

2) A major flaw of the study is the assumption that the albedo of a snow surface is constant throughout the day. In fact, snow albedo varies with the solar zenith angle (SZA), which generates a diurnal cycle (e.g. Wang et al. 2011). This effect might be negligible compared to tilts errors when the latter are very large (e.g. 25° in the text) but probably becomes significant for small tilt errors and at high SZA. As a consequence, using a concrete surface to validate a method dedicated to snow surfaces is not ideal because snow and concrete do not reflect light the same way. I'd recommend to use a parameterization of albedo that accounts for this dependence. Carroll and Fitch (1981), Gardner and Sharp (2010) and Kuipers Munneke (2011), among others, propose that kind of parameterizations. At least, the limits of the constant albedo assumption should be discussed in more details, and the method adapted in consequence. The assumptions have been improved, referenced and explained in details

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

[Interactive
Comment](#)

in the rewritten discussions. The appendence of the albedo of SZA has been eliminated, as we only used SZA ranges $<50^\circ$. The validation of albedo of concrete is not explained to show the reflectivity of the surface, it proves that albedo of any surface has to be corrected on clear-sky days when either the sensor or the surface or both are tilted.

3) The manuscript makes reference to only 17 studies (10 in the introduction). This is clearly not enough for a topic that has already been largely investigated. This number should be at least doubled to strengthen the argumentation and method. Some suggestions are made in the Technical corrections. Currently, the few studies used as references are poorly used. In the introduction they mostly appear as a concatenation of previous works without any clear progression from one to another. Furthermore, the description of these studies is often unclear (e.g. Dirmhirm and Eaton (1975)). Much more references are added and used, since the abstract, the introduction, the discussion and the conclusions have been rewritten and the methods changed into a more scientific section.

4) The use of inappropriate or unusual terms in the text (e.g. “global radiation” or “flat zenith angle”) sometimes makes it complicated to understand their meaning. The unnecessary multiplication of inter mediate symbols in the formula also participates to an apparent complexity of the method while it is actually not complicated. Efforts should be made to make the reading easier. All terms have been explained now and unnecessary terms have been removed. An Appendix with all used symbols, their explanations and units has been added. The workflow is more comprehensible now.

Technical comments NB: *Italic indicates suggested vocabulary changes* Title: It is too fuzzy. What kind of albedo is corrected? Broadband, spectral? On which surface? Any, concrete, snow, glaciers? What does geometry refer to? Also, the correction is not “due to” unknown geometry, it is a necessary consequence of it. Suggestion: “Correction of [broadband] snow albedo measurements affected by unknown slope and sensor tilts” Title changed.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

Abstract: I.1: This first sentence is vague. “can be relatively high” should be more quantitative. The tilt errors (slope and sensor) should be mentioned as soon as possible. Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

I.2: Clearly state that the present paper proposes a general method of correction. Then describe the method. Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

I.6: is needed – is used Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

I.10: can be corrected – are corrected Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

Introduction: p.2710 I.1: remove “reflected solar radiation and hence” because reflected solar radiation is determined by (not “depends on”) albedo. Add reference. Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

I.2: the surface energy balance of a glacier defines... Changed.

I.20: before saying that tilts are difficult to estimate, state that tilts alter albedo measurements Agreed. Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

I.23: what are “physical conditions”? Description added. Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

p.2711 I.1: what is “the cosine law”? Description added. Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

I.2: “other measurement errors and uncertainties” is unclear Description added. Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

I.3: you mention “Many publications” but don’t provide a single one with such numerical values References were added.

I.9: “specular components of daily albedo” is unclear Explained, rephrased and referenced.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

I.19: add reference References were added.

I.23: detail the kind of “problems” mentioned in that paper? Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

p.2712 I.7: specify why snow albedo changes with time? Maybe mention SZA effect, metamorphism, preferential orientation of surface roughness... (e.g. Pirazzini et al., 2004) Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

I.9: it is not clear why they consider “the extinction through the atmosphere”. More generally the work of Allen et al. (2006) is difficult to understand Explained and rephrased.

I.12: “in the following” is awkward. Prefer “contrary to” in the next sentence. Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

I.19: clouded – cloudy (also elsewhere in the text) Thank you, changed.

I.20: it is not clear what Weiser (2012) has done with regards to Mannstein (1985) Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

Methods p.2713 I.4: title of subsection does not sound like a method. Most of this subsection should be merged with the introduction Title of subsection left, because the explanation of albedo over snow and ice surfaces is essential for the described method. Contents rewritten.

I.5: avoid to make a reference to an equation that appears later in the text Removed.

I.5: “in turn” is inappropriate, there is no causal relation between both assertions. Removed.

I.8: global – incident Changed.

I.13: add reference Rephrased and references added.

I.15-17: add reference Rephrased and references added.

I.18: explain why tilts increase over time Explained

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

p.2714 l.1-4: too general. The reader has no idea how the method concretely works Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

l.9-12: consider removing this paragraph and adding a reference after “pyranometer” instead Paragraph left because accurate measurements are essential in this manuscript, also the sensitivity of the used sensors. Reference added.

l.17: cosine error should be defined or a reference should be added (e.g. Grenfell et al., 1994) Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

l.20: maybe add GPS coordinates and Table 1 here Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

l.26-28: is the full description of the inclinometer necessary for the understanding of the method? Description left because accurate measurements are essential in this manuscript, also the sensitivity of the used sensors.

p.2715 l.8: at this stage, it is not clear what the optical properties of the atmosphere are and why they are needed? Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed, and explained in detail.

l.18: the method has not yet been described, so the reader does not understand why measurements on concrete are presented. Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

l.20-21: how does this reference serve the manuscript? This reference defines the albedo values of concrete, which is important for the described method because the experimental measurement proves that albedo on clear sky days has to be corrected when either the slope, or the sensor or both are tilted.

l.22: for sake of clarity, it might be useful to have an overview of the method with the main steps before to start the detailed description of each step. This might correspond to subsection 2.3. Overview added at the end of the Introduction.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

p.2716 I.3: check the consistency of the terms (irradiance is in Wm^{-2}). The various terms “irradiance”, “solar radiation”, “radiant flux” are quite confusing. Do they all actually correspond to distinct quantities? All terms explained, we also added an appendix with all used symbols and their units added.

I.15: This formula is probably valid only for clear atmospheres without multiple scattering. If this is the case, specify here (and maybe in the abstract and/or introduction) that the method is valid only for clear skies. It is explained earlier that the whole method of correction is valid for clear sky days and why it is not used on cloudy days.

I.22: please clarify the difference between S_{terr} and I . Also it seems that S_{terr} is the measured solar radiation, not the full solar radiation as suggested by the definition I.10. All terms explained, we also added an appendix with all used symbols and their units added.

p.2718 I.2: is it necessary to describe the idealized case with only direct radiation if later on the diffuse part is accounted for in the method? I’d recommend to introduce the diffuse part from scratch. Due to changes in this part of the manuscript this part is now changed. The diffuse part is described in details.

p.2719 I.9: “derived” is awkward because Eq. (13) does not contain F_{dir} and F_{diff} as expected. Just keep the end of the sentence that introduces the albedo formula. Thank you, Eq. (13) changed to Eq. (14). Sentence left for a better understanding.

p.2720 Eq. (18): remove the last term and reverse the 2nd and 3rd terms for clarity. But again, why to introduce this equation when the more realistic/general Eq. (19) comes just afterwards? Removed.

I.4: specify here that v_p is derived as in Eq.(7) because “inclination angle” is not clear. Eqs. (19) and (20). Use α_{meas} instead of the ratio. Rephrased and changed.

I.16: assumptions can be made, but they should as much as possible be supported by relevant references and/or discussed in the discussion if questionable. Due to changes

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

in this part of the manuscript this part is now changed.

I.19: two objects with different dimensions are compared: spectral range (wavelength in microns for instance) and irradiance (Wm^{-2}) Due to changes in this part of the manuscript this part is now changed.

p.2721 I.2: the assumption about constant albedo cannot be used without a reference to support it, especially because it is a major shortcoming. Due to changes in this part of the manuscript this part is now changed.

I.3: add reference Due to changes in this part of the manuscript this part is now changed.

p.2722 I.3: Reference to Eq. (13) is not straightforward. Thank you, Eq. (13) changed into Eq. (15).

I.8: Eq. (22) should appear on p.2720 when v_p is first introduced Thank you, removed.

I.22: use a proportionality sign rather than “=” Left, because it is equal, not proportional.

p.2723 I.9: Eq. (25) should appear on p.2720 when v_t is first introduced Thank you, removed.

I.11: the optimization method is not clear because I.11 suggests that C is optimized while σ_t and γ_t actually are. Phrase added at the end of Step C for a better understanding.

Eq. (26) meaning is not clear Phrase added at the end of Step C for a better understanding.

I.18: it seems that the true albedo could be derived simply from Eq. (23) now that v_t is known, so that Eq. (20) appears useless. This equation should anyway not be rewritten here. Phrase added.

p.2720 I.1: what is the “opening angle” of a pyranometer? Is it a field of view, an

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



apparent SZA? Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

I.2: “flat” zenith angle – high SZA Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

I.3-6: this sentence is probably not necessary Sentence removed.

I.7-14: this subsection seems useless. It could serve as a start for a discussion but should be removed from the methods The correction of albedo values is essential for the radiative balance, see also Introduction, Results and Discussion.

Results: p.2724 I.21: Do these values compare well with known measurements or previous studies? Explanation and references added.

I.21: “which occurs” - as a result of Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

p.2725 I.4-5: Keep only (Step B) in parenthesis Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

I. 4-6: Are you applying the method to a specific case study? Then mention it because it is not straightforward for the reader. Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

I.7subsequently (to what?). σ_p is very large, is it realistic for in situ measurements? Explained later in the text.

I.8-10:consider removing this sentence Removed.

I.11: keep this sentence with previous paragraph Thank you, changed.

p.2726 I.1-3: this should be mentioned when detailing the model assumptions Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

I.9-10: this sounds more like a conclusion of this subsection rather than an introduction Sentence removed.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

I.20: where the actual tilts measured at some point to validate the retrieval? Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed. Not relevant.

Discussion: p.2727 I.18-19: the method was described for clear-sky days. How can it be applied to mostly cloudy days? Why 2-3hrs? How does the method deteriorate with less time to perform the fit? Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

I.24-26: I don't understand the point of this sentence. Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

P2728: I.10-16: this is certainly one of the most understandable paragraph in the paper and the whole discussion should be built on that kind of statement. Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

I.17-20: after a whole study on the impact of tilts this sounds like a common place. This should be moved in the introduction or just removed Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

Conclusions: p.2728 I.24: This sentence is awkward. Just say that a method was developed to retrieve the tilts and directions of sensors and slopes in the case these parameters can hardly be measured in situ. This could be moved to the introduction. Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

I.26: to compensate - to overcome Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

p.2729 I.3-7: the description of the method is not understandable at all. Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now changed.

I.11: "prove" – validate Changed.

I.12: again the validation of a model dedicated to snow measurements using a concrete surface is very questionable Due to changes in the manuscript this part is now

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

changed.

Tables: 2: Remove “results” from the caption. “Corrected” - retrieved 3: same as 2 Results, because the Tables represent the results.

Figures: 2: the solar azimuth is not clear. Maybe add dots starting from the incident beam to show the correspondence. Sigma changed into σ_t .

5: increase labels size Left, because label does not overwrite data.

7: increase labels size and figure size. Left, because label does not overwrite data.

8: Add ylabel Added.

Additional changes of the manuscript: Abstract, Introduction, Discussion and Conclusions rewritten. High resolution radiation model introduced to improve and expand the described method. Solar zenith angle limited to 50° , where no albedo dependence occurs. Appendix with all used symbols and their units was added.

Interactive comment on The Cryosphere Discuss., 9, 2709, 2015.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

