

Response to Anonymous Referee #2 for HESS Discussion Article

doi:10.5194/hessd-11-1-2014

Sulistioadi, et al., 2014

Satellite Radar Altimetry for Monitoring Small River and Lakes in Indonesia

1. General Comments

The authors gratefully thank the 2nd anonymous referee for his/her critical comments. These comments and suggestions are vital in improving the quality of this manuscript, as the authors desired. In the following sections, each comments and corrections are addressed. The final version of the article will reflect the changes listed here.

2. Specific Comments

| Issues | Solutions |
|--|--|
| Some additional background or references are needed to justify some assumptions investigated relative to the “buffers” of the lake | <p>It is realized that the hypothesis on the influence of distance between satellite altimetry footprint center and the lakeshore was not well-posed in the introduction part and only mentioned briefly in the method section (p. 2833). A paragraph that discusses this matter, along with some background references will be added into the introduction section of the revised version of the manuscript.</p> <p>References: Sarmiento and Khan (2010) studied the Great Slave Lake (GSL) and found that Jason-1 performed worse measurement over areas within 20 km “buffer” distance to the coastline, as compared to Topex/Poseidon measurement within 10 km distance to the coastline.</p> |
| Interpretation of results with conclusions being drawn from insufficient data, in particular the case of narrow river where no validation data available | <p>The same concern was posed by the first referee. The offered solutions are to re-phrase all related statements regarding the altimetry measurement on virtual station UM03 that has 54 m river width. Emphasize in the text that the water level fluctuation was only “indicated” rather than actually “measured”. In the conclusion section, it has been mentioned using “potentially observable” term. The same situation happens to the measurement of Karangmumus River.</p> |
| Need more detail in determining the water level anomaly when more than one point is available during a satellite pass | <p>The most critical process was outlier removal, which then followed by averaging. Will explain explicitly in method section of the revised version of the manuscript.</p> |

3. Technical Corrections

| Page | Line | Issues | Solutions in the revised version of manuscript |
|------|-------|--|--|
| | | Abstract | |
| 2826 | 4 | “e.g.” is not appropriate | Correction accepted. The sentence will be revised into: “(i.e. satellite revisit period) |
| | 6 | For river | Will be replaced with “to rivers” |
| | 11 | Indicate the size of lakes | Herdendorf (1982) and Chang (1987) defined the large lakes as those with surface area greater than 500 km ² . In addition, Berry et al. (2005) also limited their study to lakes with extent greater than 500 km ² . |
| | 12 | Confusing sentence | Re-phrased into: “... using satellite altimetry through careful selection of waveform shapes that correspond to the retracked water level.” |
| | 18-19 | Do not repeat the river size | Size definition will not be repeated |
| | 20 | What is “reasonable accuracy”? | Will be replaced with “similar accuracy as shown by other studies” |
| | 20 | “the procedure” | Will be replaced with “a procedure” |
| | 20 | Identification or selection | Will be replaced with “identification and selection” |
| | | | |
| | | Introduction | |
| | | More background regarding different re-trackers | E.g. cases they tend to (or are expected to) produce similar/different results. Specific literature summary will be added for this matter |
| 2827 | 6 | “for various reasons” | Will be deleted |
| | 7-9 | “In contrast, despite ...” | Sentence will be re-phrased into “The installation and operation of in-situ measurement such as permanent gauging is often considered costly and less important. However, the need for continuous hydrological monitoring of small rivers is increasing” |
| | 12 | Space geodetic | Will be replaced with “space geodesy” |
| | 17-18 | “very limited if not none of them” | Will be replaced with “most of them” |
| | 21 | Earlier references for altimetry for inland waters | Will re-arrange line 21-23 into one compact sentence |
| 2828 | 1 | “Even” | Will be replaced with “While” |
| | 1-2 | Contradictory sentences. Consider re-phrasing | Will be revised |
| | 4 | Therefore | Will be replaced with “At present, ... “ |

| Page | Line | Issues | Solutions in the revised version of manuscript |
|------|-------|-------------------------------------|---|
| | 9 | Describe “specular characteristics” | Add this sentence into line 10. Specular refers to a reflection characteristic where a signal is reflected into one direction, thus match the reflection by a mirror (e.g. Torrance and Sparrow, 1967). In the context of radar signal processing, this is the mechanism when the radar signal hits very calm/smooth water surface, thus presenting a peak in a return signal power, as represented by the shape of the waveform. |
| | 18 | “hence, it is later called” | Replaced with “It is called model-free re-tracker” |
| | 19 | “This algorithm...” | Simplified into “The Ice-1 re-tracker was ...” |
| | 20 | “ntil” | Replaced with until |
| | 21 | “claimed” | Replaced with “was found to be” |
| | 21 | Frappart et al (2006) | Yes. They compared the four re-trackers as this study |
| | 26 | After all | Replaced with “So far” |
| 2829 | 29/1 | “This led to...” | Rephrased into: “This situation motivates the authors to integrate geospatial information, remote sensing and satellite altimetry measurement to monitor important water bodies.” |
| | 9 | Rephrase | Replaced into: “This study focuses on ...” |
| | 12 | “oriented” | Replaced into: “These regions, shown in Figs 1 and 2, represent different geomorphology, climate and anthropogenic situations, which described as follow” |
| | 15 | Missing “The” | Will be added |
| | 17 | ... declares... | Will be replaced with “makes” |
| | 21-23 | Grammar check | Will be revised |
| | 23-24 | “the” | Will be removed |
| 2830 | 2-8 | rewrite | Will be rewritten |
| | 9 | Missing “The” | Will be added |
| | 18 | Counts as | Will be replaced with “is” |
| | 19 | i.e. | Will be removed |
| | 23 | Included as | Will be removed |
| 2831 | 13-16 | Explain how to get 18Hz data | Will elaborate more details on this matter based on Envisat RA-2 Product Handbook |
| | 17 | Explain MWR/SGDR | Will be added |
| | 20 | In addition | Will be removed |
| | 22 | cycles | Will be replaced with cycle |
| | 22-23 | The Envisat and sites | Will be revised |
| | 24 | geocentric | Will be removed |
| | 25 | the | Will be added |

| Page | Line | Issues | Solutions in the revised version of manuscript |
|------|--------------------------------|---|--|
| 2832 | 5 | prove | Will be replaced with “test” |
| | 6 | On the Ice-1 as | Will be replaced with “that Ice-1 is” |
| | 13-14 | corrections | Indicate that the authors did not perform all of these corrections (i.e. corrections have been completed beforehand as part of Level-2 product development) |
| | 21 | image | Will be replaced with “imagery” |
| | 21-24 | Repetitive description on Landsat color composite | Related to the next paragraph (line 21-24). This paragraph will be rewritten into: “..., i.e. through dark-blue color reflected by the water bodies in the pseudo-natural color composite of Landsat imagery, or (2) ...” |
| | 26-27 to p2833 line 1 | Repetitive description on Landsat color composite | “... development and contrast adjustment of pseudo-natural color composite from red-green-blue combination of bands 5, 4 and 3 of Landsat 5 and Landsat 7 or bands 6, 5 and 4 for the recently launched Landsat 8”. |
| 2833 | 3 | Choice of buffer values and background studies or references to justify this test | From previous research, it is known that the presence of variable land cover (e.g. vegetation in the riverbank, lakeshore or coastline, as well as islands or sandbanks within the river or lake) affect the returned radar signal in altimetry measurement (e.g. Deng and Featherstone, 2006; Berry et al, 2005). Specifically, Sarmiento and Khan (2010) found that altimetry-measured water level from lake area closer to the lakeshore shown lower performance compared to those with further distance. This study tries to see if there is any different effect caused by different distance from the satellite footprint center to the lakeshore. There was no specific consideration in determining the buffer distances other than to see any difference should the distance is greater. Neither this nor other studies exclude data points near the lakeshore. Instead, this study compares data points based on gradual distance increment. |
| | 6 | The use of river buffer | The river buffer determined in this study was not used to test the effect of different buffer distances as those in the lake areas. The buffer was developed to accommodate any errors related to geo-referencing and projection in the preparation of satellite imagery and topographic maps. The authors realized that the buffer magnitude (5 m) is not relevant with the 350 m satellite ground track |

| Page | Line | Issues | Solutions in the revised version of manuscript |
|------|-------|---|--|
| | | | interval |
| | 20-21 | Unclear sentence | Revised into: “influenced by other surface within the projected radar footprint.” |
| 2834 | 14-15 | Need to rephrase | Although the altimetry measurements that carry non-qualified waveform shapes had been excluded, some measurements are still far beyond the mean and median value. |
| | 16 | Mild outlier | Mild outlier or minor outlier refers to data value beyond the 1.5 quartile away from the nearest quartile |
| | Eq 1 | 1.5(IQR) | Will be replaced with “1.5*IQR |
| | 21-23 | Definitions of equation | Will re-arrange the sentences and define the variables of the equation immediately after the equation. A note describing how IQR determined will also be added. |
| 2836 | 7 | Trend | Will be replaced with “fluctuation” |
| | 8-19 | | The paragraph at line 13-22 will be revised. The authors realized that the measurement of very small rivers in this study indicates the potential of satellite altimetry to monitor such small rivers. The two paragraphs (line 3 to 22) will be revised accordingly and specifically discuss the results from each classes of rivers (i.e. small (< 200 m width) and medium sized (200-800 m width)). |
| | 15 | River width in (Michailovsky, 2012) | Will be revised into “40 m” |
| | 16 | “...without validation” | Will remove “, also without validation” |
| | 19 | remarkable accuracy | Will be replaced with quantities revealed by the original article |
| 2837 | 2 | Why Figure 6 & 7 only show Ice-1 retracker? | Will add SeaIce re-tracker and in-situ data (even with limited in temporal coverage, i.e. 2002-2004) in the revised version of this paper |
| | 3-6 | Figures 6 & 7 do not directly correlated with the statement | Will consider to remove the first sentence since it is well known, has been mentioned in the beginning of the paper and not directly represented by the figures |
| | 6-10 | Need to re-arrange the sequence of this section | Will be re-arranged accordingly |
| | 10-15 | Need to re-arrange the sequence of this section | Will be re-arranged accordingly |
| | 16-20 | Need more specific when discussing results | The idea to expose the longest gap between satellite measurements is greatly appreciated since it is well correlated with the applications of this research |
| | | | |

| Page | Line | Issues | Solutions in the revised version of manuscript |
|------|-------|---|---|
| | 20-25 | Averaging the water level on the same cycle done and consider the spread of water level in each cycle | The slope of the river was checked through SRTM elevation data (described at p 2838 line 2-3), so that the authors decided that its effect is negligible. However it is worth to have a closer look at the spread of water level in the same cycle and evaluate above assumption. |
| 2838 | 16 | Double-check all values. Keep all river width and ranges in the table. Add Birkinshaw et al. (2010) | Will be done in the revised version of this article. |
| | 20 | Mention if outlier was removed by in-situ data | The outlier removal did not use in-situ data |
| | 24 | Mention possible improvement | Will include the following text into the revised version of this article: “Among the improvements are using other altimetry missions (e.g. Jason-1, ICESat), detailed evaluation of retracked water elevation within a cycle and compare them with actual river slope.” |
| | 26 | Need to highlight the observation about river orientation relative to satellite ground tracks | Might include additional note about this in the conclusion section |
| 2839 | 5 | The ground track does not intersect with the river | The satellite ground track may deviate up to 1 km at both directions (east and west). That explains why the data point in the Karangmumus River (which significantly zoomed in the IKONOS imagery) looks far away from its “theoretical ground tracks”. In this research, the authors only consider altimetry measurements with center-of-projected-footprint that fall within the water body. Thus, no off-nadir data involved. That being said, the qualified measurement should not fall in the floodplain that might be dry during non-flood situation. |
| | 7 | WSE instead of WLA | Will be replaced with WLA in the revised version of this article |
| | 11 | Reference to Fig 12 | Will be added at the end of the sentence |
| | 8-18 | Interpreting the plot, linear relation | Will be re-evaluated and revised accordingly |
| | 18-20 | Should not conclude with very limited data | “conclude” will be replaced by “indicates”, while the rest of the sentence will be revised accordingly |
| | 26 | Sampled waveforms in Fig 13 representative? | Fig 13 shows some examples of waveform shapes that are different with those retrieved from river. We are |

| Page | Line | Issues | Solutions in the revised version of manuscript |
|------|------|---|--|
| | | | trying to say that these shapes are only present in the lakes and were not found in the river. In addition, these shapes are not the majority of the returned signal from the lakes, thus excluded from further processing due to our “qualification system” |
| | 26 | clearly | Will be replaced with “It seems like” since we did not do any quantification about this “distinguished waveform shapes” |
| 2840 | 21 | Reasoning for complex result on different buffer distance | Might consider to remove the sentence due to absence of supporting data and background studies |
| | 27 | “best match...” | It was a typo, therefore will be removed in the revised version of this article |
| 2841 | 1-12 | The two paragraphs do not describe the results | The two paragraphs indeed do not describe the results, but they provide background information related to the magnitude of water level fluctuation as presented by Figure 14 & 15. |
| | 20 | Double check the RMS Error value, especially for Lake Matano. Seems like the RMS Error is much higher than 0.33 m | Will do thorough double-check and revise accordingly |
| | 25 | In-consistent | Will be replaced by “cannot be verified” |
| | 29 | Un-necessary sentence | The last sentence in line 29 will be removed while adding “ (see Figs. 18 & 19) at the end of the previous sentence ends at line 29. |
| 2842 | 2 | complicated | Will be replaced with “ambiguous” |
| | 12 | Geographic location | Geographic location may be omitted in the sentence |
| | 12 | Discuss the magnitude of difference between re-trackers | Will consider to discuss this matter specifically in the revised version of the article |
| | 22 | Include RMS values | RMS value will be mentioned in line 23 at the end of the sentence |
| 2843 | 1 | Reasonably good | Will be replaced with “..., as indicated by altimetry-derived water level anomaly for a river with 54 m width with a good temporal coverage, ...“ |
| | 6 | reliability | Will be replaced with “potential” |
| | 12 | It is obvious though | Will be replaced with “This study also indicates ...” |
| | 21 | On the other hand | Will be removed |
| | 22 | Selection of waveform shapes allow the use of | The recommendation will be rephrased to reflect the statement |

| Page | Line | Issues | Solutions in the revised version of manuscript |
|-------------|-------------|---|--|
| | | classic/available re-trackers | |
| | | Tables and Figures | |
| Table | 4 & 8 | Sulistioadi (2013) | Will be replaced with “Current Study” |
| Figs | 1 & 2 | Small writing, explanation of the number in the circles, highlight the label for measurement points | Will be improved |
| Figs | 4 | Split after geo-masking | Will be revised to reflect the process. Yes the detailed geographic masking is done after waveform selection |
| Figs | 8,14,15 | Re-arrange the legend not to block the data | Will be improved |
| Figs | 11 | Text not readable | Will be improved |
| Figs | 12 | Plot goes to 2010 but no data | Will be improved |