

Interactive comment on “Assessment of high-resolution satellite rainfall for streamflow simulation in medium watersheds of the East African highlands” by M. M. Bitew and M. Gebremichael

H. Leijnse (Referee)

hidde.leijnse@knmi.nl

Received and published: 3 December 2010

This manuscript describes a comparison of the quality of different satellite rainfall products for hydrologic modelling. The paper is very well written, concise, and scientifically sound. I therefore think it can be published with only a few modifications. I have some comments and questions, which are listed below.

Specific comments

C3850

- Are the rain gauge data that are used in this study also included in the TMPA 3B42 product? I assume they are not, given the large differences between the two.
- There seem to be large differences in SWAT parameter values for the different rainfall products, as well as for the different catchments. These differences could also be used to discuss the large differences among the rainfall products. Could the authors mention something about this in the manuscript?
- What are the reasons for the fact that the calibration results for Koga seem to be much better than those for Gilel Abay?
- Could the CDFs of nonzero rainfall (as in the middle panels of Fig. 4) be added to Fig.3? This would add useful information regarding the distribution of rainfall rates.
- On p. 8220, line 4, it is stated that “the accuracy of the simulations” is discussed in Section 3. However, in the remainder of Section 3, the simulation results (and not the simulation accuracy) are discussed.
- On p. 8221, line 10, “3B42” should be “3B42RT”.
- On p. 8221, line 11, “3B42RT” should be “3B42”.
- On p. 8221, line 16, “3B42” should be “3B42RT”.
- On p. 8221, line 17, “3B42RT” should be “3B42”.
- On p. 8226, Table 1, please add the names of the different rainfall products to the table header for the last five columns.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 7, 8213, 2010.

C3851