

Interactive comment on “Tree canopy and snow depth relationships at fine scales with terrestrial laser scanning” by Ahmad Hojatimalekshah et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 28 November 2020

General comments

In this work, the authors focus on quantifying the roles of tree structure (and wind and topographic characteristics such as slope and aspect) in controlling snow depth variations using terrestrial laser scanning (TLS). The authors found that vegetation structural metrics (foliage height diversity) and wind are highly influential on spatial variability of snow depth. They also highlighted that windward slopes have greater impact on snow accumulation than vegetation features.

Overall, I enjoyed reading this manuscript. The authors identified interesting research questions and attempted to leverage the strength of the TLS data to fill in the scientific gaps. However, the current version of this work needs to be improved upon before publication in The Cryosphere is warranted. Major concerns are given below. I would

recommend that this paper be returned for major revisions and specifically request inclusions of additional analysis with appropriate interpretations and reorganizing the structures of the manuscript for the Cryosphere community.

Major comments:

1. A major concern is that the methodology used to derive the conclusion in this study is entirely based on correlation coefficient in a linear regression without investigating inter-dependency among the physical variables. I do not think if the linear correlation-based approach is enough to identify and to conclude the relationship between snow depth and the tree variables. For example, the snow depth with the distance from the canopy edge is not linear (see Figure 2 in Hardy Albert, 1995). A potential approach I would suggest can be regression tree or multivariable analysis (e.g. multiple linear/logistic regression analysis with the standardized coefficient) to quantify relative contribution of the vegetation metrics along with wind, topographic features (Molotch et al., 2005; Schneider et al., 2020). Also, it would be beneficial to provide variation in snow depth, key vegetation characteristics, and elevation, etc along representative transects for the sites. Please refer to Sturm Fig.2 in Sturm et al. (2001).

- Molotch, N. P., Colee, M. T., Bales, R. C. Dozier, J. 2005. Estimating the spatial distribution of snow water equivalent in an alpine basin using binary regression tree models: the impact of digital elevation data and independent variable selection. *Hydrological Processes* 19 (7), 1459–1479. doi:10. 1002/hyp.5586

- Schneider, D., Molotch, N. P., Deems, J. S., Painter, T. H. (2020). Analysis of topographic controls on depletion curves derived from airborne lidar snow depth data. *Hydrology Research*.

- Hardy, J. P., Albert, M. R. (1995). Snow-induced thermal variations around a single conifer tree. *Hydrological processes*, 9(8), 923-933.

- Sturm, M., Holmgren, J., McFadden, J. P., Liston, G. E., Chapin III, F. S., Racine,

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



C. H. (2001). Snow–shrub interactions in Arctic tundra: a hypothesis with climatic implications. *Journal of Climate*, 14(3), 336-344.

2. Regarding the comment above, another concern is the interpretation of the correlation coefficient values from the linear regressions in the result sections. For example, the authors state that “slope explained 44

3. I think the TLS data’s reliability should be verified. How accurate is TLS-based snow depth, especially under the tree canopy? Many previous studies found that there were issues in ALS, TLS, structure-from-motion photogrammetry (SfM) with observation gaps in forested regions. The return density under or near canopy can be extremely low that may not be adequate to observe spatial variations of snow depth. In Figure B1, the snow depth maps the authors provided seem to be very limited to areas near forest and under the trees. Thus, I would recommend that the author quantify the accuracy of the snow depth measurements especially under/near canopy. Have you seen comparison results with independent snow depth measurements? I know the validation work is out of scope in this study, but it would be helpful for readers to be able to have a sense of how accurate the TSL technique is, particularly in these sites. I believe there are various available ground-based (or other techniques) snow depth measurements because this work was part of the NASA-led SnowEx 2017 campaign. If they are not available, the authors should provide at least general uncertainties in TLS-based snow depth from previous findings, particularly under/near canopy.

4. There are a few comments in terms of structure of the paper. (1) Given the three research questions in L74-78, it would be best to either rearrange the results (discussion) to better address the three questions or increase the number of questions to better reflect the structure that the results are provided. Too many subsections exist in the result section. I would recommend combining the subsections based upon the questions. Also please consider to combine “Results” and “Discussion” (because some descriptions in the both sections are duplicated). (2) I would strongly suggest reorganizing the figures and tables in the main body and the supplementary. I think

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

some figures and tables (e.g. Figure 4 and Table 2) in the main body would be better to be included in the supplementary. Similarly, some figures and tables in the supplementary should be moved into the main body (Figure B1). (3) Some sections should be renamed and relocated. For example, “2.1 Study area” should not be under “2. Method”. “2.2 TLS” and “2.3 TLS Data Processing” should be combined which may be under “Data and preprocessing”. Also, I think contents in some subsections are too short to comprise an individual subsection (e.g. Section 3.6 and 3.7). It would be good to combine similar subsections into one.

Specific comments

L41 Please add citations

L58 Please provide a range of the snow depth quantitatively (e.g. snow depth > XX mm) with general forest information (e.g. dominant types).

L63-64 Would you check the reference again? Schirmer et al. (2011) do not provide the relationship between vegetation or canopy characteristics and wind effect and snow depth variations.

L200 Can you quantify what “mid-to-high correlation” mean? Also I would recommend providing correlation matrixes between vegetation metrics and snow depth for each site to identify intercorrelation among the vegetation metrics.

L203 two distributions -> two peaks of the FHD distribution

L204 0.35-0.75 -> -0.35 to -0.75; throughout the manuscript

L222 Remove “we propose”

L304-205 This is identical to the sentence above. Rephrase “more evenly spaced along an individual tree”

L273-274 Rephrase the sentence.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

L292-294 This should be in data or methodology sections.

Table 1 In Median Absolute Deviation, what is the constant number “1.4826”?

Table A2 Please add the units. I think boxplots would be more suitable to present the dataset. For example, 3x6 boxplots with three different colors for canopy, transition, and open areas.

Figure 4 It would be fine to move into Appendix.

Figure B9 In the figure, site O has random distribution. But in the caption “Only site N has a random distribution pattern of trees”. Please double check. And I do not think the six distributions are needed in this figure even in supplementary info – all distributions are the same. A table including nearest neighbor values only would be more appropriate than the figure.

Interactive comment on The Cryosphere Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-2020-277>, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

