

Interactive comment on “Identification of soil-cooling rains in southern France from soil temperature and soil moisture observations” by S. Zhang et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 31 December 2018

General comments

The paper presents a study, based on in situ observations of soil temperature and soil moisture, that investigates the cooling effect of rainfall on soil water. In specific conditions, the paper also proposes a method to infer rainfall temperature from variations of soil temperature and soil moisture. The analysis relies on 9 years of 12-min time step data of soil temperature and soil water content (complemented by in situ climatic data from standard meteorological stations), collected in 21 stations of the southern part of France, encompassing various climatic conditions from oceanic to Mediterranean climates. The length of the time series is long enough to get sufficiently robust con-

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



clusions. As underlined by the authors themselves, data on rainfall temperature are rare – if not inexistent. The impact of potential differences between rainfall, air and soil temperature is generally not considered in atmospheric and climatic models, but it is worth trying to quantify if it is really negligible, or in which conditions it may be important to take into account this effect on the surface energy balance. Although the rainfall temperature estimation proposed in the paper is indirect and relies on hypotheses that are clearly stated by the authors, it can provide a first guess on rainfall temperature estimation to explore more in depth its impact on the surface energy balance. Besides its interest in documenting rainfall temperature, the paper also provides an interesting climatology of soil moisture and temperature changes when it rains. There is also an interesting approach for selecting and characterizing rainfall events, based on high temporal resolution data. Data presentation and analyses are clear and carefully performed, with a level of details that is suitable, although the presentation could sometimes be shortened (see details below). There is one point that is however not clear for me. The authors presents some simulations based on the ISBA land surface model, that does not include a representation of heat exchanges due to water mass movement, to show that it is not able to reproduce the observed change in soil temperature. To perform these simulations, the authors use the SAFRAN reanalysis that has a low temporal resolution for rainfall (hourly) and a spatial resolution of 8x8 km². This resolution may not allow the forcing to capture very localized rainfall events. If in situ meteorological data are available, why didn't the authors use them?

Specific comments 1/ p.4, lines 10-14; p.8 lines 10-16: why do you use SAFRAN reanalysis and not the in situ collected meteorological data? The low resolution of SAFRAN is probably not adapted to capture the high spatial and temporal variability of rainfall that is relevant if you want to relate the forcing to temperature and soil moisture local variations. 2/ Section 3.3: the location of this section is strange. Why didn't you put it in an appendix? 3/ Section 4.2: this section is very detailed. It could be shortened. Fig. 9 could also be put in the supplementary materials. 4/ Section 5.2. This section is somehow frustrating: the authors have gathered all the data to test to impact of

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

cold rainfall temperature on the soil temperature and water content and the reader is expecting to see such a simulation using the ISBA model. Adding a representation of heat exchanges due to water mass movement into the model could be done in order to complement the paper. It would also give more strength to the conclusions on whether rainfall cooling matters or not.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2018-929>, 2018.

ACPD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

