Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 1, C763–C769, 2013
www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/1/C763/2013/

Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences
Open Access
Discussions

Interactive comment on "Pre-, co-, and post-rockslide analysis with ALOS/PALSAR imagery: a case study of the Jiweishan rockslide, China" *by* C. Zhao et al.

C. Zhao et al.

zhaochaoying@163.com

Received and published: 6 August 2013

We thank you very much for the careful review comments and constructive suggestions, which make our manuscript greatly improved. We have revised the manuscript in details. The following are the detailed responses and revision according to review comments.

==========

Reviewer #2:

SUMMARY General Comments Zhao et al. discuss the usefulness of L-band SAR

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

for the study of rockslide in steep and vegetated mountainous areas. The result of the analysis of images before the rockslide is very interesting. Fig.5 is very impressive, since the pre-event deformation is of a rigid block type. I think this is an important result for the understanding of the mechanism of rockslide and the mitigation of landslide disasters.

»"Thank you for the positive comments on our manuscript."

==========

1) InSAR analysis before the rockslide

1-1) DEM Zhao et al. detected deformation in 2007 using a SBAS InSAR technique. The SBAS InSAR technique is already established and widely used in several geophysical applications. I wonder if the resolution of SRTM3 DEM is enough for SBAS analysis. SRTM3 DEM has a resolution of _90m. They processed ALOS/PALSAR images with 1 x 2 looks, which means about _7.5m spatial resolution for SAR images. We process images with 10 looks or so (i.e. >50m spatial resolution) in InSAR analysis for deformation study. Therefore we do not have to care much about the resolution of DEM. In our experience, resolution of DEM should be higher than that of SAR images and we must oversample DEM. If we use SRTM3, we should oversample DEM more than 10 times to meet this condition. I wonder if the accuracy of oversampled DEM is enough for InSAR analysis. Furthermore, the original SRTM3 occasionally has a big hole in mountain regions. I do not know if the present target site has a hole in DEM, but possible. Therefore most people, including present authors, use a gap-filled SRTM3 using some interpolation algorithm. I wonder how accurate it is. Is it suitable for high-resolution InSAR processing? Recently, we use DEM with higher spatial resolution such as ASTER-GDEM whose resolution is 1 arc-second. I recommend that the authors should check their results with such a higher resolution DEM.

»"This is a good point. Indeed, before we carried out the SBAS analysis to inveistage the pre-slide deformation, we have taken careful consideration of DEMs used. Some

NHESSD

1, C763–C769, 2013

researchers have analyzed the performance of SRTM DEM and ASTER GDEM. Particularly, Li et al. (2013) analyzed the absolute vertical accuracies of ASTER GDEM and CGIAR-CSI SRTM (Version 4.1) over China using highly accurate GPS data sets. It has shown that, among the 5 different research regions, the GDEM has higher accuracy in two regions, but lower accuracy in other three (Li et al., 2013). The authors suggest that the SRTM has a slightly better RMSE (Root Mean Square Error) value and a relatively lower mean difference than those of ASTER GDEM; the overall absolute vertical accuracy of ASTER GDEM is 26.3 m and that of SRTM is 22.8 m (Li et al., 2013). Therefore, we selected SRTM DEM for this research.

DEM errors will propogate errors in deformation measurements (Massonnet and Feigl, 1998). As perpendicular baseline for pre-slide interferograms are less than 800 m, the DEM-induced error in deformation intererograms should be less than 0.8 cm.

Acturally, we have comparied two DEMs over this research region. The difference between GDEM and SRTM DEM is shown in Fig. S1, and the DEM differences over two profiles used in Fig.5 and Fig. 9 are drawn in Fig. S2 and Fig. S3, respectively. We can see that the maximum difference between two DEMs is less than 30 meter.

Reference:

"Peng Li, Chuang Shi, Zhenhong Li, Jan-Peter Muller, Jane Drummond, Xiuyang Li, Tao Li, Yingbing Li & Jingnan Liu (2013): Evaluation of ASTER GDEM using GPS benchmarks and SRTM in China, International Journal of Remote Sensing, 34:5, 1744-1771"

1-2) Number of SAR images Zhao et al. use only 5 images before the rockslide. Theoretically it is OK to obtain deformation with a small number of images. However, L-band SAR is often affected by ionospheric disturbances, especially in summer for ascending images. The acquisition by ALOS/PALSAR was made at _22:30 (local time) on the ascending orbit. Travelling ionospheric disturbances are active during night. The maximum amplitude sometimes exceeds 50 cm in LOS direction in an image. Therefore

people must carefully check if such disturbances appear in their interferograms. If such disturbances are dominant and number of images is small, the resultant velocity may be largely biased. Taking a look at Fig.4, I guess such an effect is properly removed or none. The authors, however, do not show all interferograms they processed. Furthermore, they show interferograms only in target area, though one ALOS/PALSAR image covers ∼70 km x 70 km area. For the evaluation of analysis, the authors should show interferograms of the whole area that PALSAR image covers.

»"Based on 5 scenes of ALOS PALSAR images and the thresholds for temporal and spatical baslines, we selected 7 good-quality interferograms. It is worthy mentioning that, before our analysis of the Jiweishan rocklide area, the whole scene of ALOS data was processed and band-pass filter was applied to mitigate the long wavelength errors such as tropospheric, ionospheric and baseline artifacts. Fig. S4 shows one of the interferogram for the whole PALSAR scene coverage. The inset in Fig. S4 represents the cropped area of Jiweishan rockslide where localized deformation can be obviously detected.

1-3) Accuracy of deformation According to eqs. (5) – (7) and geometric parameters of SAR and slope, the resultant deformation in the slope direction may be about 5 times as large as LOS displacement. This is mainly due to the fact that the direction of the slope is nearly parallel to the flight direction. Therefore the third term is the most dominant in eq. (7). The incidence angle is varied from near to far range. 38.5 degree may be that at the center of image. In ALOS/PALSAR's case, it varies by up to 5 degree. This may cause up to 5% error in the estimate of deformation in the slope direction. We do not know where the target area is in the whole PALSAR image and cannot evaluate the accuracy. Again, the authors should show the entire image. Of course, I must ask if the assumption that the deformation is only in the direction of slope is OK. Slope may not be uniform and varied locally. The average azimuth and slope angle that they show in the text have some errors. The discussion including such errors is desired.

»"Thank you for the careful review. The incidence angle in this rockslide region is

40.12 degree, so we have corrected it in the main text in line 24 of Page 1807. The two dominant parameters of a given slide are the slope angle above the horizontal surface and the slope azimuth (aspect) angle. We calculated the ratio between deformation measurements in the slope direction and the LOS. Originally, the ratio was 2.36 if the incidence angle was 38.75 degree. If the incidence angle is 40.12 degree, the ratio becomes 2.38. Due to small size of the landslide area (∼200 m in range direction), the change in radar incidence angle can be neglected. Lack of knowledge regarding the variations of slope and azimuth angles of Jiweishan landslide prevents us from applying spatially varied parameters.

2) Interpretation of pre-rockslide interferograms. The authors say that the deformed zone can be divided into two blocks: driving and resisting blocks. The former has a rectangular shape, while the latter is triangle. Taking a look at Figs. 5 and 6, we can notice that the northern part has the largest displacement of ∼30 cm. If the northern part is resisting block, deformation should be decelerated in this block. Are there any blocks that resist sliding in the shadow of SAR?

»Yes. You are correct. We have revised Figs. 5 and 6. They now precisely show the landslide geometry: the resisting key block is to the north of the driving block and is located in the decorrelated region.

3) Comparison of intensity images before and after the rockslide. The authors show intensity images acquired before and after the rockslide with their differences in Fig.7. Actually, it is not easy to assess the Fig.7, since the size of (a), (b) and (c) is different. Even referring to the superimposed polygon, it is hard to make sure the changed areas. White and black areas in Fig.7(c) may indicate zones of intensity decrease and increase, respectively, but it is not easy to discriminate from the gray background. They should use color composite and make all figures in the same size.

»We have re-generated Fig. 7, where three sub-figures have same size and three zones are highlighted with colors (see revised Fig.7).

4) Accuracy of height after the rockslide The authors obtained height changes after the rockslide, but it is not clear what the reference is. If they refer to SRTM3 DEM as the topography before the rockslide, they must take care about the accuracy and resolution of SRTM3.

»In this research, we took SRTM3 DEM as the reference. However, we did consider the accuracy of available DEMs (i.e., SRTM3 DEM and GDEM) over this study area. See our above responses to Question 1-1.

Technical Corrections There are several points to be corrected. P.1803 L.7) The name of ALOS is “Advanced Land Observing Satellite”. P.1803 L.7) .This is the first appearance of PALSAR. Therefore full name “Phased Array type L-band SAR” should be given here. P.1806 L.2) “line-of-light” should be read “line-of-sight”. P.1806 L.10) “covered by” should be read “covered with”. P.1809 L.6) “35 cm” may be read “30 cm”, since I cannot read 35 cm in Fig. 6.

»Thanks for your careful reading of our manuscript.

Line 7, Paper 1803. we have corrected and added the full terminology of ALOS and PALSAR.

Line 2, Page 1806. "Line-of-light” has been revised as “line-of-sight”.

Line10, Page 1807. "covered by” bas been revised as “covered with”.

Line 6, Page 1809. “35 cm” has been revised as “30 cm”. This is the maximum value along the profile.

In addtion, a PDF file of the revised manuscript (with changes tracked) is attached, and 4 new figures are provided as suppliments.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:
http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/1/C763/2013/nhessd-1-C763-2013-supplement.zip

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 1, 1799, 2013.