

Interactive  
Comment

# ***Interactive comment on “The GREENROOF module (v7.3) for modelling green roof hydrological and energetic performances within TEB” by C. S. de Munck et al.***

**C. S. de Munck et al.**

cecile.demunck@meteo.fr

Received and published: 9 July 2013

Our response to referee # 1 is in the supplement pdf document attached. It refers to the pages and paragraphs of a revised version of the manuscript. The revised manuscript contains a slightly different type of analysis, which was suggested by reviewer # 2. As our simulations were re-run with a slightly improved version of the model and the re-analysis was different, the case study part of the manuscript is quite different.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

C948

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive  
Comment

C949

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive  
Comment

**Table 4.** Hydrological characteristics tested for green roof calibration exercise.

Characteristics (unit)	Value	Method (Source)
SUBSTRATE	Porosity ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}$ )	<b>0.674</b> <b>0.411</b> Supplier information (Falienor 2010) Measured (Bouzouidja 2012)
	Saturated hydraulic conductivity ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ )	<b><math>1.073 \cdot 10^{-3}</math></b> <b><math>2.162 \cdot 10^{-3}</math></b> Supplier information (Falienor 2010) Measured (Bouzouidja 2012)
	Matrix potential at saturation (m)	<b>-0.10</b> Value fitted on observed water retention curves (Appendix A)
	b-coefficient for water retention curve (-)	<b>2.9</b> Deducted from water retention curve (Figure A1) porosity of 0.674 and matrix potential of -0.10 <b>3.9</b> Deducted from water retention curve (Figure A2) with porosity of 0.411 and matrix potential of -0.10
	Water content at field capacity	<b>0.37</b> Deducted from observations
	Water content at wilting point ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}$ )	<b>0.15</b> Deducted from observations
	Porosity ( $\text{m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}$ )	<b>0.553</b> <b>0.9</b> Deducted from supplier density data (Table 3) Literature (Ochs et al. 2006) & manufacturer information (Argex 2012)
	Saturated hydraulic conductivity ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ )	<b><math>3.32 \cdot 10^{-3}</math></b> <b><math>1 \cdot 10^{-2}</math></b> (Bouzouidja 2012) Technical specification (Leca® 2012)
	Matrix potential at saturation (m)	<b>-0.010</b> Values for organic matter
	b-coefficient for water retention curve (-)	<b>2.7</b> (Lawrence and Slater 2008)
DRAINAGE	Matrix potential at saturation (m)	<b>-0.121</b> Values for sand in ISBA
	b-coefficient for water retention curve (-)	<b>4.05</b> (Clapp and Hornberger 1978)
	Matrix potential at saturation (m)	<b>-0.405</b> Values for clay in ISBA
	b-coefficient for water retention curve (-)	<b>11.4</b> (Clapp and Hornberger 1978)

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



**Fig. 1.**

**Table 5.** Statistical scores for the simulations of the OM ensemble over the evaluation time period (R the correlation coefficient , RMSE the Root Mean Square Error, MBE the Mean Bias Error, PBE the Mean Bias Error expressed in percentages, CBE the Bias Error estimated on the variable accumulated over the period, and SD the Standard Deviation). Score units depend on the variable analysed.

	SUBS. WATER CONTENT				OUTLET DRAINAGE				SUBS. TEMPERATURE				DRAIN. LAYER TEMPERATURE			
SCORES	R	RMSE	MBE	SD	R	RMSE	PBE	CBE	R	RMSE	MBE	SD	R	RMSE	MBE	SD
UNIT	-	$\text{m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}$	-	$\text{m}^3 \text{ day}^{-1}$	%	$\text{m}^3$	-	-	$^{\circ}\text{C}$	-	-	$^{\circ}\text{C}$	-	-	-	-
<b>OM mean</b>	0.86	0.11	- 0.10	0.04	0.81	0.06	126.7	3.3	0.91	4.32	2.68	6.92	0.89	3.69	1.10	6.73
<b>OM min</b>	0.50	0.04	- 0.01	0.02	0.48	0.05	32.2	1.9	0.88	3.59	2.25	6.35	0.85	2.90	0.69	6.16
<b>OM max</b>	0.87	0.18	- 0.18	0.06	0.88	0.08	246.1	5.0	0.92	5.29	3.23	7.63	0.92	4.74	1.64	7.49
<b>S1 mean</b>	0.71	0.16	- 0.16	0.02	0.83	0.06	192.4	4.2	0.90	4.85	2.99	7.31	0.87	4.25	1.39	7.13
<b>S2 mean</b>	0.86	0.06	- 0.05	0.05	0.66	0.07	61.0	2.3	0.92	3.81	2.37	6.53	0.91	3.15	0.81	6.36
<b>OBS</b>			0.02							4.54					4.25	

**Fig. 2.**[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

Interactive  
Comment




Fig. 3.





Interactive  
Comment

Fig. 4.

C953

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

## Interactive Comment



**Fig. 5.**


[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)




[Discussion Paper](#)

Interactive  
Comment



**Fig. 6.**

Interactive  
Comment

**OM****SAND****CLAY**

<b>OM</b>	<b>min</b>	<b>max</b>	<b>mean</b>
R	0.609	0.792	<b>0.767</b>
RMSE	0.089	0.201	<b>0.105</b>
PBE	47.5	226.8	<b>121.1</b>
CBE	0.5	2.6	<b>1.4</b>

<b>SAND</b>	<b>min</b>	<b>max</b>	<b>mean</b>
R	0.633	0.704	<b>0.676</b>
RMSE	0.172	0.253	<b>0.233</b>
PBE	204.1	343.0	<b>310.4</b>
CBE	2.3	3.9	<b>3.5</b>

<b>CLAY</b>	<b>min</b>	<b>max</b>	<b>mean</b>
R	0.599	0.690	<b>0.653</b>
RMSE	0.253	0.271	<b>0.258</b>
PBE	330.6	344.3	<b>337.0</b>
CBE	3.7	3.9	<b>3.8</b>

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive  
Comment






Fig. 8.

[Interactive Comment](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)**Fig. 9.**