

Interactive comment on “Bias correction of daily satellite-based rainfall estimates for hydrologic forecasting in the Upper Zambezi, Africa” by Rodrigo Valdés-Pineda et al.

Rodrigo Valdés-Pineda et al.

rvaldes@email.arizona.edu

Received and published: 9 January 2017

Dear Editor, this referee has made valuable contributions to improve our manuscript. Most of them had been also stated by referee 1, therefore we have shortened our responses in this revision. In general we will be adopting most of the suggestions and comments proposed by this referee trying to keep the consistency between both revisions. This referee refers mostly to improvements that can be applied to our novel PCBC method. Most of these suggestions are easy to handle, however we will appreciate if you can also give us some feedback about the best way to present our manuscript to the readers. Thanks once again for your comments and suggestions to our submission. This study compares three satellite-based precipitation products

C1

adjusted by two bias correction methods and evaluates performance of streamflow modeling forced by these products. This manuscript is a well-written case study for a data-sparse catchment where satellite precipitation information can play an important role to improve real-time hydrologic forecasting. However, throughout the manuscript, it was difficult to find a novel contribution or a new finding. A newly developed bias correction method, PCBC, lacks description on detailed procedures and advantages and could not demonstrate its improved performance over the conventional approaches in the most comparative results. Although the authors argued inclusion of additional components would improve the performance of PCBC, demonstration of superiority of a new algorithm is not a kind of work which can be left as a future endeavor. In addition, applications and analysis on hydrologic forecasting lack essential components required for forecasting and do not provide improved understanding. Therefore, the manuscript is not recommended to be published in a high ranked journal, HESS. Despite this objection, if this manuscript would be accepted, I hope the followings would be addressed before final publication: We acknowledge this author for pointing out the fact of our novel contribution for bias correction. As mentioned in the previous review (referee 1) we did not clarify our motivation (or objective) adequately; therefore, there is still an opportunity to describe and demonstrate the potential of PCBC in correcting SPPs. At some point we thought that it would be more valuable having a new and more elaborated version of PCBC in a new paper; however, given the recommendations and suggestions of this reviewer we will include them in the revised version of our manuscript.

1. Detailed description, justification and demonstration of a new bias correction algorithm, PCBC: - What are the advantages of PCBC over the conventional bias correction methods? Please elaborate the limitations of the conventional methods and how PCBC could overcome these limitations. In addition, please describe what advantages can be expected using this method from statistical and computational perspectives. - Authors argued that performance of PCBC could be improved if additional components would be included. As mentioned above, this demonstration could not be left as a future

C2

research because the current results do not prove advances of the proposed methodology. We will elaborate a more detailed description, justification and demonstration of PCBC, mentioning the advantages and disadvantages over conventional methods. We will also mention the computational advantages of PCBC and will include an example about how the retention of a less number of components could improve or reduce the performance of this method.

2. Limitation of PCBC: - SPPs are crucial information for hydrologic forecasting in poorly gauged or ungauged basins (PUB). However, PCBC requires grid-based statistics on observation, which could make applications of this method for PUB inefficient or nearly impossible. - More importantly, there is an unresolved question about whether adaptation of principal component without using the main benefit, reduction of the dimensionality, can be statistically useful to correct biases in precipitation information. As shown Figs. 12 and 13, PCBC failed to not only correct spatial pattern of bias in the raw data (Fig. 12) but also reduce the variance of bias (Fig. 13). The current version of PCBC seems to work only for reducing total sum of bias without significant improvement in spatial pattern and variance. We will provide the results of PCBC including an example of how the reduction of the dimensionality could potentially benefit the bias correction of SPPs. We understand that all these methods (Quantile Mapping and PCBC) are limited in poorly gauged basins; however, we also know that the trend of hydrological applications is migrating towards the implementation of new products, especially gridded datasets from remote sensing. The revised version of our manuscript will include these new results.

3. Hydrologic forecasting or retrospective modeling: - The methodology used in this study can be used for a part of hydrologic forecasting, but lacks important other steps in hydrologic forecasting. Since satellite precip products are information for the current time step, without addressing and demonstrating the methodology using forecasted forcings, the current work is about not hydrologic forecasting, but hindcasting using historical data. If the manuscript could be meaningful in terms of hydrologic forecast-

C3

ing, the following research questions should be addressed and demonstrated: What precipitation and weather forcing could be used in the forecasting step without losing consistency to satellite precip info in the current time step? What sorts of bias correction would be used to adjust forecasted forcing having different spatio-temporal biases with varying lead times? Specific comments: 4. Fig. 12: The range of legend should be the same among different sub-plots for the fare comparison. This rule should be applied for all figures comparing spatial distribution. 5. Many potential readers wonder how distribution of principal components and singular values in Eq. (5) look like. Please add one example in the appendix if available. 6. Fig. 13: Why do hydrologic simulations by PCBC show significant underestimation in the several cooling seasons? 7. Figs. 3 and 4 may not be required because observations are being presented in the other plots.

In this paragraph there are several questions and comments that were previously stated by referee 1 and answered in the previous review. We will be including more discussion and results about PCBC method dealing with this referee's comments. We will include the distribution of leading modes from PCBC and will modify all figures accordingly with his suggestions.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/hess-2016-473, 2016.

C4