

Interactive comment on “MEMLS3&a: Microwave Emission Model of Layered Snowpacks adapted to include backscattering” by M. Proksch et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 7 May 2015

The author provides a clear detailed review of MEMLS3&a model. The extension of including the backscattering is documented with formulation, parameters setup and validation. In general, the paper is well written and the code provided is very useful to reproduce the results in the paper. However, there are still a few elements need to be elaborated and explained.

1. Figure 13 needs more explanation. On page 2622, line21, the statement “ The effect of m is limited to small incidence angles. . .” only explains the curves of $m = 0.05$ and $m = 0.1$. When m increase to 0.25, there is a dramatically change over 30-50 degree. However, compared to the SnowScat measurement, it seems when the MEMLS model match well with small m setting. Is that mean a smooth surface is sufficient for the match-up?

C646

2. The soil backscattering contribution can be significant in the lower frequency. It will be very helpful to include a sensitivity analysis of the soil permittivity in a reasonable range for frozen ground instead of a fix number of $3.6 + 0.9i$. 3. In the model results, the v_v is always slightly higher than h_h . However, the SnowScat data shows more variability of the v_v/h_h ratio. Please provide some insights for both model results and data analysis.

4. In the figure 1, it will be more clear to mark the r_s , r_d in the plot as well as the σ_{s0} , σ_{d0} from both snow-air and snow-ground interface.

5. In the backscattering plot, figure(7-13), it's more common to use dB as the unit for backscattering. I suggest to convert the y-axis into dB scale for better illustration and cross-comparison with other papers.

6. In equation (9), what is σ_n refer to?

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 8, 2605, 2015.

C647