

Interactive comment on “Uncertainties in land use data” by G. Castilla and G. J. Hay

G. Castilla and G. J. Hay

Received and published: 25 October 2007

We have followed most of the reviewer's advice. In particular:

- 1) We have accrued the discussion on error of commission and omission, which now includes a comment on Receiving Operating Curves (ROC).
- 2) We have included a comment on post-classification smoothing when describe the classification process.
- 3) We have included a citation of a paaper by Burroughs describing fuzzy k-means classification.
- 4) We agree with the reviewer that uncertainty is a good thing, as among other things it is a mark of any living system, including us. However we have kept our definition of uncertainty as a measure of the degree of distrust, essentially because we would like

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

users to link uncertainty analysis to the reliability of the predictions made by models using uncertain data and its implications in decision-making.

5) We have made our best to correct the typographical and grammatical errors mentioned by the reviewer.

6) We have included a legend in the map of figure 1. As for the uncertainty landscapes, we have kept them, and now we stress in the text that areas of higher uncertainty corresponds to pits and canyons in the images. The suggested color scale would be effective for fig 3b, but not for 3a, since in this case it would give the appearance of a classified image.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 3439, 2006.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper