

Interactive comment on “Hydrometeor classification from polarimetric radar measurements: a clustering approach” by J. Grazioli et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 8 September 2014

This paper presents an exceptional work. It describes a novel approach of a hydrometeor classification using polarimetric data. It is a "a-prioriless" method where the hydrometeor types are not defined in the beginning. 7 common behaviors or clusters have been detected where each one has been relied to a hydrometeor type at the end. The results are compared to a classical hydrometeor classification algorithm and to a 2DVD classification output.

My comments starts with some general comments or ideas and then by some minor remarks :

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



1- The authors mentioned at the beginning that 3000h have been used. Then filtered with a SNR threshold and ground clutter contamination. What is the number of hours used at the end. its ok to not correct in solid precipitation cases but what about attenuation with liquid precipitation. Does the authors planned some sensitivity study?

2- What about calculation time? can this method used in operational environment?

3- At the beginning, the paper is really interesting. After when the equations start, it becomes really hard to follow. In my opinion, the Appendix B is not really important. I suggest, instead, to add a numerical example which better explains better the concept.

4- this paper missed some statistical or scores to show better the performance of the approach vs others.

5- Some sentence are long and commas are missed.

Different remarks :

8473, 4 and 11 : can the authors add the total scanning strategy including the time?

8473, 18 : the unit is dB km⁻¹ and not dBZ km⁻¹

8473, 25 : can the authirs add some references?

8474, 16 : what is the degree of confidence about the Z0 and what is the error margin?

8475, 6 : 25 deg/km !!! I think it is obvious. The intervals should be more realistic.

8482, 5.1 : I suggest to remove the numbering while the authors use first second ... Are all these indices are used? when? how?

Table 2 : I prefere to see more details about the scanning strategy.

Figure 1 : couldn't be better if the background is the topography instead of the google view?

Figure 5 : the light blue color is not really shown.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper