Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2019-629-RC1, 2020 © Author(s) 2020. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



# **HESSD**

Interactive comment

# Interactive comment on "Technical Note: Improved Sampling of Behavioral Subsurface Flow Model Parameters Using Active Subspaces" by Daniel Erdal and Olaf A. Cirpka

# **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 10 March 2020

### Content Comments:

- 1. Page 5, Figure 2 Consider labeling the red line "Behavioral Limit Line" for clarity. Can one assume the point has to be above the limit line to be considered acceptable behavior? Could Figure 2 be moved so that it is after Line 115?
- 2. Page 5, Line 105 Where does the active subspace come from that the initial candidate parameter sets (say, the first 1-99) are projected onto? Line 113 states that the active subspace is recalculated after adding 100 state-1 accepted parameter sets but, how do you start?
- 3. Page 5, Line 106 Can you provide any insight about how the values/criteria (e.g., 5

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



closest neighbors plus 1% radius) were selected for this work that would be beneficial for another researcher trying to implement this method?

- 4. Page 6, Line 121 Is the "acceptance ratio" the ratio of candidates that are stage-1 accepted to the total number of candidate parameter sets (stage-1 accepted + rejected)? Or, is the "acceptance ratio" the ratio of candidates that are stage-1 accepted to those that are stage-2 accepted (i.e., the amount of pre-accepted candidates that become accepted). This clarification would also help interpret Figure 3.
- 5. Page 6, Line 121 and 136 Intuitively, I am struggling to understand why P=0.75 is the fastest when it should, in my mind, be the most difficult to achieve. And, along those lines, why P=0.75 sampling results in a significantly different distribution from the unbiased pure Monte-Carlo scheme. Do you have any insight into why this is occurring?
- a. Furthermore, do you think the P value selected is dependent on the model/application? Based on your experience, is the exercise of comparing different P values and selecting one necessary for another researcher trying to implement this method, or do you think the P=0.55 scheme is broadly applicable?

## **Grammar Comments:**

- 1. Page 4, Line 67 Line states that the model considers 6 observations, but there are only 5 listed below this sentence. Should 6 be changed to 5?
- 2. Page 4, Line 67 Consider revising the sentence to state "...observations that define acceptable behavioral performance..."
- 3. Page 4, Lines 69-73 Make the list style consistent in regard to the period placement at the end of each list item (or remove them all).
- 4. Page 4-5, Lines 87-93 Add period after list item number 4.
- 5. Page 6, Lines 109 and 111 Remove hyphen between "parameter-set".

# **HESSD**

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



6. Page 6, Line 125 – Present the acceptance ratio at 0.005 (not a percent) since the acceptance ratios are shown as decimal values on the y-axis of Figure 3.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2019-629, 2020.

# **HESSD**

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

