

## ***Interactive comment on “Impacts of inhomogeneous landscapes in oasis interior on the oasis self-maintaining mechanism by integrating numerical model with satellite data” by X. Meng et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 15 March 2012

Summary:

This paper investigates the use of satellite derived soil moisture, land-use types, and veg frac compared to default values in MM5, on the oasis effect. Only a very short period is considered, during which there was apparently a field campaign, however, the authors do not use any of these observations in this paper. The very short simulation period, without any model spin-up, raises serious questions about the validity of the results. The discussion and presentation of results is rather poor and the authors fail to link their results with the rest of the literature. The paper shows very little evidence of

C365

proof reading, and there are numerous grammatical errors. Overall, i do not believe this paper is adding anything significant to our overall understanding of land-atmosphere feedbacks.

Major Comments:

In the introduction, end of first paragraph, the authors claim that surface heterogeneity can even have "global impacts". I do not agree with this statement. Several studies have shown that while land-use change has significant regional impacts, the global impact is rather small or restricted to the region of LCC. The jury is still out on whether land-use change has statistically significant "global" impacts. This needs clarification.

The authors initialise the model on 4th July 2004 at 1200 UTC and end on 5th of July 2004 at 1200 UTC. This is too short a simulation period! At the very least, the authors should allow for some model spin-up, which is usually two weeks. I do NOT have confidence in such a short simulation with no spin-up.

The authors describe observational datasets in section 2.2, but NONE of this is used in any of the analysis. Why is it mentioned in the first place, if it is not used? In fact, it appears that most of these observations were used in a previous paper.

The authors should plot the difference between the two, MOD-EXP. They talk about differences between the two experiments, but which one is closer to reality? Comparisons with observations would have been useful here.

Fig. 5, the authors compare 2 contour plots with interval 0.2. But both graphs need to have the same maximum and minimum contour levels to enable comparison. The contour labels should be the same on both plots, e.g., only show contour intervals from 1.6 to 4.8, with increments of 0.2 or 0.4. The graph is difficult to interpret. The higher density of contours on the EXP plot may just be due to the contour levels chosen. The same applies to all the other plots.

The authors do not relate their results to other papers on the subject matter. There are

C366

2 references used at the start of section 4.2, and then none until the end of the paper! This is not adequate. What do these results mean in the broader scheme of things?

The use of proper English grammar is overall very poor and not good enough for publication. The authors need to have their manuscript proof read by a native English speaker.

Minor Comments:

Page 1980:

1. Abstract, lines 2-3, replace "oasis self-maintaining" with "oasis self-maintenance". Also on line 2, replace "budget of the oasis" with "budget of oasis environments".
2. Abstract, line 3, replace "influence" with "the influence".
3. Abstract: It makes more sense to describe the control experiment first, i.e., with default MM5 settings, and then the one with satellite derived land-use type, veg frac, soil moisture.
4. Abstract, line 9, replace "and then be used specify" with "and then used to specify".
5. Abstract, line 10, replace "a real" with "a realistic". Replace "run" with "experiment".
6. Abstract, line 12, replace "relative uniform" with "relatively uniform".
7. Abstract, line 15, remove "a" from "a stronger". Line 16, remove "will".
8. Abstract, line 18, replace "the simulation of homogeneity" with "the control simulation".
9. Abstract, line 19, replace "relative lower" with "relatively lower".
10. Line 24, sentence starting with "Flying over a .....". This sentence is not saying anything useful about the science and should be removed.
11. Line 14, remove the "et al" and there is one too many quotes for "glacial wind".

C367

12. Line 23, replace "rapid growth of population" with "rapid population growth".
13. Line 26, remove "the" from "the oasis-desert".
14. Line 28, replace "several studies have been done to investigate" with "several studies have investigated".

Page 1981:

1. line 2, "similar to" not "similar as".
2. line 3, "are called as the non" - change this to "are referred to as". The authors use too much colloquial English! It's getting a bit tiresome to fix all of these!
3. line 4, "in the field experiment", which one??? if you are making a general statement, it should be "observed in field experiments" or "observed in the field".
4. lines 5 to 10 - switching from present to future tense here! Do not use "will".
5. line 9, "these processes are totally called" - ? colloquial English again! "these processes are referred to as".
6. line 10, "the oasis interior is very", NOT "are".
7. line 10, "constituting with water" - replace with "constituted of"
8. line 16, replace "numeric simulations" with "numerical simulations" ! And why do the authors need so many references to back-up such an obvious statement?

There are way too many grammatical mistakes in this draft, I have stooped fixing all of these from here onwards as it is too time consuming and utterly frustrating!

---

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 9, 1979, 2012.

C368