Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 5, S2091–S2093, 2008

www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/5/S2091/2008/ © Author(s) 2008. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribute 3.0 License.



HESSD

5, S2091-S2093, 2008

Interactive Comment

Interactive comment on "Evaluation of radar-gauge merging methods for quantitative precipitation estimates" by E. Goudenhoofdt and L. Delobbe

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 5 December 2008

The authors summarize seven different methods (with different degrees of complexity) to merge radar and rain gauge data at the daily scale. This is an interesting study and I think that the paper should be published after moderate revision.

General comments:

- What is the spatial resolution of the radar data?

- Given a certain radar pixel size, why do you average the 9 radar pixels (pg. 2980, line 9)? Even though you are working at the daily scale, spatial sampling errors (e.g.,



Villarini and Krajewski 2008) would increase. Please justify your choice or use a single pixel estimate.

- The study by Sun et al. (2000) showed that cokriging of radar and rain gauge data (over other merging techniques) significantly improves flood estimation. In a study like this, I think that cokring should be included.

- Can you say anything about the transferability of these results to other regions?

Specific comments:

- On pg. 2977, line 5: the references about radar-rainfall uncertainties are a bit dated. I would also add Germann et al. (2006) and Ciach et al. (2007).

- A paper dealing with hydrological applications of merged radar and rain gauge data was recently published (Cole and Moore 2008). It may be a good reference to add.

- On pg. 2978, line 16: it should be "rain gauge networks"; instead of "rain gauges networks."

- On pg. 2979, line 2: I am not sure what a "watchdog scan" is. Please explain in the text or remove.

- On pg. 2980, lines 18-19: the unconditional bias only corrects for an erroneous coefficient a in the Z-R relation. Please clarify in the text.

- On pg. 2983, line 20: please add that the variogram is assumed isotropic as well.

- On pg. 2986, last sentence: can your statement be explained by summer convection?

- When possible, add grids to the figures.

- Figure 1: could you add a DEM to the map to give the reader information about the topography of the area?

- Figure 5: why do you show the results for only 4 methods? Please add the other three.

HESSD

5, S2091–S2093, 2008

Interactive Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



References

Cole, S.J., and R.J. Moore, Hydrological modeling using raingauge- and radar-based estimators of areal rainfall, Journal of Hydrology, 358, 159-181, 2008.

Ciach, G.J., W.F. Krajewski, and G. Villarini, Product-error-driven uncertainty model for probabilistic precipitation estimation with NEXRAD data, Journal of Hydrometeorology, 8(6), 1325-1347, 2007.

Germann, U., G. Galli, M. Boscacci, and M. Bolliner, Radar precipitation measurement in a mountainous region, Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society, 132(618), 1669-1692, 2006.

Sun, X., R.G. Mein, T.D. Keenan, and J.F. Elliott, Flood estimation using radar and raingauge data, Journal of Hydrology, 239, 4-18, 2000.

Villarini, G., and W.F. Krajewski, Empirically-based modeling of spatial sampling uncertainties associated with rainfall measurements by rain gauges, Advances in Water Resources, 31(7), 1015-1023, 2008.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 5, 2975, 2008.

5, S2091-S2093, 2008

Interactive Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

