

Interactive comment on "Assimilation of Himawari-8 Imager Radiance Data with the WRF-3DVAR system for the prediction of Typhoon Soulder" by Dongmei Xu et al.

Dongmei Xu et al.

aqshu@nuist.edu.cn

Received and published: 21 July 2020

Reply to reviewer 1

General comments, This study implemented the assimilation of JMA himawari-8 AHI radiance with the framework of the mesoscale numerical model WRF and its three dimensional variational assimilation system (3DVAR) for the analysis and prediction of typhoon "Soudelor". The results are impressive in terms of the AHI radiance simulation and the forecast skill of the tropical cyclone for both the track and intensity. This action is meaningful, when geostationary meteorological satellite radiances provide valuable information of the weather systems with high spatial and temporal resolutions. How-

C1

ever, there are several issues to be fixed to better clarify the methodologies and results. Specific comments, 1) section 4.1 Please explain why there is some oscillation in the variation of the gradient with increasing iteration?

Reply:3DVAR works by minimizing the cost function through iterations, which will not guarantee the decrease for the gradient for each step monotonously. The similar oscillation in the gradient can be also found in Wang and Liu (2019). Reference: Wang, S. and Z. Liu, 2019: A radar reflectivity operator with ice-phase hydrometeors for variational data assimilation (version 1.0) and its evaluation with real radar data, Geosci. Model Dev., 12, 4031–4051.

3) Please point out the reason channel 10 yield smaller RMSE? -

———— Reply: It is found from Fig. 8g that the simulated brightness temperature for assimilated pixels fit best with the observation compared to other two channels, which is likely related to strict cloud detection scheme for channel 10 with rather lower detecting peak. The authors have plotted the weighting function for the three water

vapor channels. Thus, the manuscript is revised as "Among them the RMSE of channel 10 is smallest as 0.234 K in Fig. 8i, which is likely related to strict cloud detection scheme for channel 10 with rather lower detecting peak (Wang et al., 2018)."

Technical corrections 1) L35 use accurate instead of exact — Reply: Thanks for the helpful advice. Corrected at line 43

2) L39 together with the microphysics and .. — Reply: Thanks. Added.

4) L104 positive impact — Reply: Thanks for pointing it out. Corrected.

5) L106 Please reorganize the sentence "Wang, et al (2018). . . "and check this kind of problem thoroughly for the whole manuscript — Reply: Thanks for the helpful advice. The sentence is reorganized and the language is further edited by an English native speaker for the whole manuscript.

7) L147 This work focuses. . . Please check this problem for the whole manuscript — Reply: Corrected. We also improved these expressions with active words to an objective statement. Revisions can be found by tracks in detail.

8) L243 Please change the word rarefy — Reply: Thanks for the helpful advice. We use thin to replace rarefy at line 283, now the sentence is "20 km is chosen to make thinning of AHI radiance data".

9) L261 Fig. 6a shows or provides. Please fix this problem for the whole manuscript ______ Reply: Thanks. corrected.

10) L262 of channel 8 — Reply: corrected.

C3

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2020-120, 2020.