The observations were apparently well planned and executed but the manuscript lacks some key methodological details. In the Methods section, please add the following details: - How many clear, cloudy and overcast days were observed? - How long did each observation last? - For each sky type, how were measurements from different days processed, e.g., did you average them? If so, how? I also find Figure 2 confusing. As the figure caption indicates, plot (c) is a visualization of plot (a) which is the solar spectrum above the canopy in a clear day. But how come the y axis of plot (c) is height above ground? The pattern in plot (c) does not appear to be uniform along the y axis so it must not be an attempt to match the rest of the plots. Also it needs to explain, with an equation, to show how the normalization on a scale from 0 to 1 is done. Is the denominator the total energy across the full spectrum for a given height? Because there are no error bars on the figures, I assume the authors display results from measurements in a single day. Then it will be necessary to explain why these particular single days are chosen. It might be informative to point out in the plots some of the key spectral features.
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