

Interactive comment on “Digitizing scanning lidar measurement campaign planning” by Nikola Vasiljević et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 21 May 2019

The manuscript “Digitizing scanning lidar measurement campaign planning” by Vasiljevic et al. introduces and describes a planning tool for finding the optimal device position for dual-Doppler lidar setups. Though I believe that this is a very relevant tool, corresponding to a major contribution by the authors, its presentation in the manuscript is not adequate for a scientific article. In many sections the text is written rather in the style of a manual than that of a paper. I strongly recommend to rearrange the manuscript, publish some of the contents in a manual-style technical report and focus in the paper on the research questions and the answers to these. Detailed comments (both technical and editorial):

Page 2, line 1 – I would like to suggest to add reanalysis date here, as a quite common option for a long-term correlation.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



p. 2, l. 23 – Something wrong with the sentence “This impacts the positioning of scanning lidars can be placed. . .”

p. 3 l. 4 – The reference with the information in parentheses is too detailed here.

p. 3 ll. 8 – There should be no empty space in between two headings. Same for p. 9 ll. 26.

p. 3 ll. 12 – I would suggest to refer to the respective subsections within this listing.

p. 3 l. 17 – I think for a scientific paper it is not relevant that the algorithms have been developed in Python. (This really sounds as in a manual. . .)

p. 3 l. 17 – Here it should be briefly specified what kinds of “public databases” it is referred to.

p. 3 ll. 25 – I am missing a verb in the sentence “The approach we have used to. . .”

p. 4 subsection 2.3 – It is only introduced in l. 27 that a dual-Doppler setup consists of “two scanning lidars”. But already in l. 21 it is referred to “one of the two lidars”. Check the order of information.

p. 11 Figure 3 – I am wondering why there is so much empty space in the graphic. Is this figure really relevant, or couldn't it be combined with Figure 5.

p. 12 Figure 4 – It is rather difficult to interpret these plots, amongst others because red and white is used for two different things each.

p. 14 Table 1 and following tables – Not sure if so many details are needed for a scientific publication (I would say rather not).

Interactive comment on Wind Energ. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2019-13>, 2019.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

