

Interactive comment on “Semi-automatic extraction of lineaments from remote sensing data and the derivation of groundwater flow-paths” by U. Mallast et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 2 April 2011

General Comments

This article presents a method to extract lineaments (as indicators for possible groundwater flow paths) from a coarse topographic digital elevation data in a semi-automated fashion. This method is applied to a fairly large (4160 km²) catchment of the Dead Sea (Israel), and the results, while not very precise, are at least consistent with existing groundwater flow studies and well data. While the parts of this study pertaining to this catchment are well thought out, in my opinion this article would benefit from significant editing prior to its publication for the following reasons:

1) The methodology is not very advanced, is not very accurate, nor is it very robust.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



However, due to its simplicity, this method seems useful for areas where only coarse topographic data is available and where groundwater flow paths are largely unknown. In particular it would be beneficial in the context of motivating a field campaign where one could benefit from knowing ahead of time where to investigate. The authors make this exact comment in the very last line of their conclusions, but I feel it should be introduced earlier as a fundamental motivation. The simplifications performed and the use of low resolution data would be then justified. I would not try to justify the use of very coarse topography, as the authors did, simply by the fact that few man-made features can be seen in it, and thus present a less confusing input to their procedure. In the study of other linear features (such as fault systems, e.g. EarthScope Northern California LiDAR Project), the highest resolution data (such as LiDAR) is always sought, and man-made features don't present too much of a problem as they can be removed efficiently by many filtering algorithms. I would motivate the authors' approach by the fact that for large parts of the world these data are not available, and a crude automated analysis would inform field campaigns. In the presence of high-resolution data this approach would not, in my opinion, be justified.

2) I think that this article would also benefit from being more focused on the task at hand: delineating lineaments of this specific area near the Dead Sea. I think that if the method were the focus of this study, as implied by the title of the article and by the abstract, then not only it would have to be motivated differently (as mentioned above), but many of the choices made would have to be more clearly justified: why not use a Laplacian of Gaussians instead of median filter then a Laplacian filter; why this filter size; why only 4 directions; why 30 training samples; why remove objects less than 20 pixels; why 0.8 threshold in binarization; why and what are the suitable line-link parameters based on our own criteria", just to mention a few examples. I do not dispute these choices for this site, and I applaud the authors for tweaking a vast number of parameters to get good results. However, for this procedure to be transferable to other sites, such choices need to be made less arbitrary and some guidance offered to the reader as to how one may come up with a parametrization for a different location. In

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

my view, this does not imply making major changes to the article, but rather some re-branding or re-packaging: a title change, some re-ordering in the abstract, and in the conclusions. I think this was a more than reasonable approach to follow in this specific site, as the lack of LiDAR and other digital data did not permit more sophisticated approaches. With suitable parametrization, this approach may be used in other areas where little data is available before going into the field and drilling wells at random.

3) The ordering of the sections is inconsistent regardless of what the authors may feel about my comments in 2). If, in spite of my previous comments, the method were to remain the focus, then it should be presented before a detailed description of the study area. If, on the contrary the focus of the paper is shifted to the extraction of lineaments in this specific site, then the method should be mentioned after the problem at hand is stated in both the abstract and in the conclusions. The body of the paper does present the study area first and lists the methodology in the methods section, in a fashion that is consistent with being a site-specific study.

4) The English in this draft is at times a little awkward. Editing by a native English speaker for clarity should be completed during this review process. I have taken the liberty of suggesting some such edits in the attached specific comments. Given all the above, my recommendation is that this article undergo significant revisions before its publication.

Please see attached supplement for line-by-line comments

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/8/C749/2011/hessd-8-C749-2011-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 8, 1399, 2011.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

