Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 12, C5846–C5848, 2015
www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/12/C5846/2015/

Hydrology and Earth System Sciences
Discussions

Interactive comment on "Estimating field scale root zone soil moisture using the cosmic-ray neutron probe" *by* A. M. Peterson et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 29 December 2015

The authors present 3 methods for estimating root zone soil moisture storage from a cosmic-ray probe at a well instrumented study site in Saskatchewan. This is the first attempt to assimilate CRP data to provide the critical root zone product that the scientific community desires. While this is a common problem in remote sensing this is a novel and needed study for continuing to advance the CRP methodology. The authors find good agreement with the 3 methods with the most promising one being the exponential filter for transferring to other less instrumented field sites. The paper is well written and appropriate for HESS following minor changes.

Minor Comments:

P12795 L7-14. The authors chose to use a single calibration period to estimate the free N0 parameter. In addition, 4 more calibration efforts were used to validate the

Full Screen / Esc
Printer-friendly Version
Interactive Discussion
Discussion Paper

CRP values. More recent work (c.f. Iwema 2015) suggests ∼3 calibration periods at different VWC to effectively calibrate a probe. While not critical here given the good agreement, using 3 calibration samples to estimate N0 might further reduce any bias in the CRP vs. the "true" area average VWC. The Iwema 2015 article should be included in the citations and some discussion on using a few calibration samples to estimate N0 could be included.

Iwema, J., R. Rosolem, R. Baatz, T. Wagener and H. Bogena (2015). "Investigating temporal field sampling strategies for site-specific calibration of three soil moisture–neutron intensity parameterisation methods." HESS 19: 3203–3216.

P12805 L21-25. This is a key point about the CRP vs. other remote sensing with shallower penetration depths (∼2cm). My feeling is the depth of the CRP at >10-15 cm captures the entire evaporation front and therefore a majority of the latent energy flux in sparsely vegetated areas (like grasslands). This is key for accurately assimilating the signal to provide an accurate root zone product. This point could be better highlighted in the conclusions. While this depth only accounted for 40% of the seasonal changes (although I have my opinion that the effective CRP depth may be deeper than first believed because of the revised moderated detector energy bins, Kohli 2015 WRR, McJannet 2014 WRR, unpublished MCNPx simulations and unpublished SWE measurements), this still likely captures the evaporation component of latent energy flux. Not sure what the E vs. T ratio for this grassland is but imagine fairly high in E vs. T.

P12808 L 6-10. I feel that instruments like electromagnetic induction or GPR could help resolve some of the spatial patterns of texture variability and vertical structuring at a CRP site to then run an exponential filter. A reconnaissance style survey would then help constrain the exponential filter model without a need for detailed soil surveys or widespread destructive sampling. The idea of joint methods in hydrogeophysics coupled with physical models is an exciting and emerging area within the hydrogeophysical community (Binley 2015 WWR, "The emergence of hydrogeophysics for improved understanding of subsurface processes over multiple scales"). No action items, just more

HESSD

12, C5846–C5848, 2015

of a comment.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 12, 12789, 2015.