

## ***Interactive comment on “Assimilation of SMOS brightness temperature into a large-scale distributed conceptual hydrological model” by Renaud Hostache et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #3**

Received and published: 24 November 2019

I fully agree with the author to try out the usability of a conceptual hydrological model (when compared to detailed LSMs) assimilating TB, in terms of capturing hydrological processes at large scale. Such concept of spatially calibration (or DA to enable optimal estimate) is very innovative to overcome certain calibration problems of distributed hydrological model with only one stream flow gauge. I do have several comments for the authors to consider: 1. The manuscript focused on SFX model simulations and their coupling with CMEM as well as the whole setup in the DA framework, as well as the results comparison with the previous study using CLM. Although it is understandable that the author try to maintain the quasi similar setup to enable the consistent comparison, the current presentation of such ‘similarity’ is not clear. Lots of details

C1

need to dig out by readers via reading the paper of Rains. This reviewer is wondering if the author can make better presentations on this perspective, either via a diagram, via summary tables, etc. 2. It is very good to see the forward simulation comparisons between SFX-based and CLM-based models. On the other hand, the advantage of assimilating SMOS TB on soil moisture and ET is not presented in a satisfied manner. The manuscript only shows the performance for the in-situ sites, but not the spatial pattern changes of soil moisture and ET (before and after assimilating Tb). This point should be addressed to show straightforwardly the advantage of incorporating spatial information for distributed conceptual hydrological model simulations. 3. It is not clear if the author only run the model at the timestep of satellite observation intervals or also run the model in between observations? E.g., if the model only start to run with the satellite observation when they are available, then the author missed a lots of details in between satellite observations It is assumed with the forcing the model can get more frequent simulation results as outputs to capture hydrological processes? 4. Last but not least, it is strongly recommended to have a native English editor to go through the manuscript. Some specific comments please find attached PDF.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/hess-2019-414/hess-2019-414-RC3-supplement.pdf>

---

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2019-414>, 2019.

C2