

Interactive comment on “Commentary on comparison of MODIS snow cover and albedo products with ground observations over the mountainous terrain of Turkey” by A. Ü. Şorman et al.

J. Parajka (Referee)

parajka@hydro.tuwien.ac.at

Received and published: 27 December 2006

This commentary complement existing studies focusing on the validation of MODIS snow cover images. Authors share their findings and experience obtained by comparison of MODIS snow cover and albedo images with ground based in situ measurements over mountainous eastern part of Turkey. Overall this is an interesting commentary, which is within the scope of HESSD journal. The contribution is technically appropriate, a quick English proof reading may improve clarity of some paragraphs. I have only

a few minor comments, which mainly relate to clarification and justification of some of the authors statements.

Specific comments

Analysis section: Could the authors provide some justification for the selection of 25.4 mm threshold?

It is not clear if only preceding (1 or 2) days are used to estimate snow cover for cloudy days or the days ahead (or both)? Please clarify this.

Discussion of results: Did the authors evaluate also the accuracy of MODIS snow cover images for cloud-free pixels? It will be interesting to compare these results with the findings of Parajka and Blöschl (2006).

The authors discuss the omission and commission errors, but it is not clear which contingency table is analysed. I would suggest to clarify this section of the commentary.

Figures: Figures are difficult to read. I would suggest to increase the resolution of pictures displayed in Figure 1, 2 and 3.

Caption of Figure 2 is not clear and should be rephrased. E.g. Topography of the Karasu basin and location of snow . . .

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 3655, 2006.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper