

Interactive comment on “Calibrating electromagnetic induction conductivities with time-domain reflectometry measurements” by Giovanna Dragonetti et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 7 July 2017

TDR conductivity measurements show larger conductivity close to the surface as it should be expected since it is closer to the source of conductive material (added saline water). For this aspect, it is acceptable to consider TDR conductivity measurements as providing more reliable information, which could serve to calibrate “less reliable conductivities” obtained with EMI measurements (or their inversion). I therefore agree with the overall approach. I find the paper clear and well-written. I have nevertheless few questions at the EMI inversion stage which, I think, should be explored, or at least discussed before acceptance. I also think that Authors should show the final results for the other transects in order to see if the calibration performs well for the different irrigation experiments. This being said, this manuscript is interesting as it addresses

C1

the problem of relating ground truth and EMI output with a pragmatic approach.

Non-uniqueness of the conductivity model resulting from the inversion:

One particular choice of the present study (compared to other cited studies) is to calibrate the conductivity after inversion instead of EMI apparent conductivity data (E_{ca}). However, the argument of non-uniqueness of the inverse problem, which is actually used by the authors in the introduction to question a calibration with ERT method, could be used here in the same way to question the presented method.

This said, are you sure that the selected solution obtained using sharp regularization is the best solution to be compared with TDR? Actually, some of the smooth models (e.g. sounding numbers 5, 13, 17 in Figure 2) show better vertical concordance with what should be expected and with the best misfit. Anyway, Figure 2 clearly highlights the non-uniqueness of the problem, because it is possible to obtain very different models at similar misfits. Why, for example, not putting some effort to stabilize the regularization of the smooth inversion in order to have sounding N5-like results all along the transect? I do see that, because of fixed interfaces and a very little number of layers, your parameterization does not allow enough model space flexibility to have stable smooth results along the transect. But there are many ways to fix such issues (like, for example, among others, increasing the number of layers or applying some lateral constraints). I would also like to point out that the smooth misfits are slightly higher than for the sharp method (of 1-2 %, except for the few soundings mentioned above. This feature supports my previous comments), which is not in favor of the smooth regularization in a context of fair comparison. For all this, I would not qualify the smooth inversions presented here as a “standard” approach as it is not used with an optimal way (you use few layers with fixed interfaces). For Figure 2, I really recommend to plot the profiles of collected EMI data together with modeled (after inversion) data to see exactly how well all the channels were fitted. This would allow to properly evaluate and discuss the two methods of inversions. This is also important for a second aspect : in a cultivated area, I would expect some lateral anisotropy of the conductivity of the soil

C2

layer due the preferential orientation of the lines of the agricultural work. If this is true, inverting HCP and VCP together would not be an optimal choice as such geometries induce eddy current with different preferential directions. Did you try to consider HCP only, and/or VCP only? Maybe there would be a better qualitative and quantitative consistency between TDR and EMI inversion results?

To sum up, I would have interpreted the results shown in Figure 2 in a different manner. After acceptance of the non-uniqueness of the EMI data inversion, I would have tried to find the right parameterization and regularization to get sounding N5-like results along the transect before starting the comparison with TDR. As a consequence, I believe that the calibration procedure presented in this study also corrects error due to the non-uniqueness inherent to the considered inverse problem (in addition to the spatial fractality problem already discussed in the text). And in the eventual case of lateral anisotropy, it maybe also correct for less realistic EMI results resulting from joint HCP and VCP inversion. However this two features means that the overall calibration procedure could be dependent on the initial method of inversion. In my opinion, this aspect should be explored in this study, or at least discussed in the text.

Application of the method to the four transects:

I think you should show the resulting sections (like Figure 8) for all the transects in order to check the consistency of the calibration procedure over larger areas (and implicitly for broader geological/irrigation settings) as it is claimed in the conclusion.

Some minor comments:

In the discussion about magnetic permeability (p7 line 239-241), you cite a non-published paper (Deidda et al, submitted). Here, it is necessary to also cite already published papers on this topic. There are a couple of recent studies dealing with the inversion of in-phase data for retrieving the magnetic permeability for the case of small EMI sensors.

C3

Figure 8 shows spectacularly that the TDR conductivity of the first layer is largely underestimated by the EMI sharp inversion results. Are we sure that this first layer is well constrained by the considered EMI vertical soundings? Maybe it would be good to show and analyze the a priori covariance on model parameter associated to the selected 4-heights/2-geometries data set.

Summary of my recommendations:

Plot the measured data versus the modeled data in Figure 2. Explore or discuss the dependence of the overall procedure on the method of inversion. Show the final results for the four transects to confirm the robustness of the method on different irrigation contexts.

Sincerely

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2017-288>, 2017.

C4