

Response to the reviewer comments

Reviewer #2

This work introduces a new product to support ice cover research in the north. It also presents a novel method that can be used in other regions to monitor ice cover fraction. This will be highly beneficial for those working in northern areas. The writing is clear and well-structured, and the data is easily accessible and well-labelled for the most part. I have only a few minor suggestions to improve clarity for the reader or user.

Thank you for your thorough evaluation and your valuable suggestions. We have revised the manuscript accordingly.

‘small water bodies’, to me, refers to lakes, rather than rivers – so the validation sites being rivers seemed to come out of the blue while reading. The authors should consider clarifying in the abstract that they are referring to lakes and rivers as small water bodies.

Thank you for the suggestion. We have clarified the scope of “small water bodies” in the revised abstract.

Line 15-17: Here, we developed an ice fraction dataset for small water bodies (ponds, lakes and rivers; 900 m² to 25 km²) across the Arctic Coastal Plain of Alaska (ACP) from 2017 through 2023, using Sentinel-1 Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) imagery, texture features, and Daymet air temperature data.

While I understood the product had 2 bands of data, it wasn’t clear to me that each image did not cover the entire study area, so some clarification on that could be added to the text.

Thank you for the suggestion. We have added this clarification in Section 6 (Data availability) of the manuscript and in the product’s README.md file.

README.md file & Manuscript Section 6 (Data availability), Line 446-447:

The spatial coverage of each product image is consistent with the corresponding Sentinel-1 acquisition, which may not fully cover the entire study area.

Overall model performance shows many pixels in the moderate-to-large error category (section starting around line 304). Given the data limitations, I agree that this is still a very useful product. The per-pixel quality product, however, could use some clarification. The text lists the values as percentages, but the product loads with a scale of 0 – 153.8. What is the link between uncertainty and the RRMSE values in the quality file? Perhaps even just in the .md file, some explanation of what exactly the RRMSE in the tif are in terms of uncertainty would be helpful.

Thank you for the comment. In the quality file ‘grid_rrmse_quality_layer.tif’, the value of each 1-km grid cell represents the RRMSE calculated from all same-day paired S1 and DW ice-fraction observations for that grid cell during the study period. The RRMSE values in ‘grid_rrmse_quality_layer.tif’ are expressed in percentage (%), so a range of 0–153.8 corresponds to 0%–153.8%.

We have added this clarification in Section 3.7 (Uncertainty assessment), Section 6 (Data availability) and in the README.md file.

Section 3.7 Uncertainty assessment, Line 276-284:

To assess the S1 ice fraction data uncertainty, we collected all paired DW and S1 ice fraction observations on the same dates from 2017 through 2023 for each grid cell. Subsequently, the RMSE of S1 and DW ice fractions was calculated for each grid cell and normalized by the average DW ice fraction of that grid cell across all temporally matched observations, to derive the RRMSE, expressed in percentage. The RRMSE for each grid cell is calculated as follows:

$$RRMSE = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (S1_i - DW_i)^2}}{\overline{DW}} \times 100\% \quad (3)$$

where $S1_i$ and DW_i denote the S1 and DW ice fraction of the same 1 km grid cell at the i -th temporally matched observation, respectively; n is the number of temporally matched observations available for that grid cell; and \overline{DW} represents the mean DW ice fraction of that grid cell across all n temporally matched observations. The resulting RRMSE map serves as a quality flag layer for the ice fraction product and will be released alongside the final dataset (Fig. S2, Section 6).

Manuscript Section 6 (Data availability), Line 449-451: *The quality flag information was also provided in the data product in GeoTIFF format, with the band named “RRMSE” expressed in percentage (%) and representing the RRMSE between S1 and DW ice fraction values for each 1-km grid cell, calculated using all temporally matched observations over the study period.*

README.md file: *In the quality file 'grid_rrmse_quality_layer.tif', the value of each 1-km grid cell represents the Relative Root Mean Square Error (RRMSE), expressed in percentage (%), calculated from all same-day paired S1 and DW ice-fraction observations for that grid cell during the study period. Specifically, we collected all paired DW and S1 ice fraction observations on the same dates from 2017 through 2023 for each grid cell. Subsequently, the RMSE of S1 and DW ice fractions was calculated for each grid cell and normalized by the average DW ice fraction of that grid cell across all temporally matched observations, to derive the RRMSE.*

Also, can the user be given some cautions to watch for regarding reasons for high RRMSE? e.g., some of the larger errors occur in these regions (it did not appear to me to be particularly spatially based, from a brief review of the data product), or on this size or type of water body, etc.? or is there no discernable set of reasons? With the understanding that this is a data paper and not the venue for a deep exploration of the reasons, a brief comment or two to help the user would be beneficial.

Thank you for this suggestion. We have added a quick view of the quality layer (Fig. S2) to the Supplementary Materials. We found that high errors primarily occur in areas of braided rivers and smaller lakes and ponds, where mixed land and water/ice conditions are likely found in S1 observations.

Accordingly, the following discussions were added in the revised manuscript:

Line 321-325: *Relatively high errors were mainly found along rivers as well as in very small water bodies, where mixed land and water/ice conditions are likely found in S1 observations (Fig. S2). For example, among the 1-km grid cells with RRMSE greater than 60%, 46.7% areas are distributed in river areas determined by a 1 km buffer around the river centerlines. Contaminations in S1 observations from the surrounding land areas of the elongated or very small water bodies likely led to the large classification uncertainties.*




Figure S2

The quality layer of the S1 ice fraction product in this study shows that the areas with larger errors are mainly located along rivers and their surrounding regions, as well as in very small lakes and ponds within the study area. The quality layer provides an evaluation of the ice fraction quality for each 1-km grid cell, where each cell's value represents the Relative Root Mean Square Error (RRMSE) between all same-day Sentinel-1 and Dynamic World ice fraction data pairs during the study period (2017–2023), expressed in percentage (%) .

A few minor things to note:

Figure 1: The map should include a panel with an overview of the site's location for context. Even just an outline of Alaska would help to see where it is situated.

Thanks for the suggestion! We have accordingly added an overview panel in Figure 1 to show the location of the study area (below).




Figure 1. Numerous small water bodies are distributed across the study area. a, Small water bodies (blue) investigated within the ACP, locations of observed ice phenology records (green triangles), and the three selected regions for ice

phenology analysis (orange circles). b–d, Enlarged views of the three selected regions, with orange borders indicating 5×5 km areas. Panels b–d use basemaps from Esri World Imagery.

Line 193: The authors explain that ascending and descending are processed separately, but don't mention why. For clarity, it might be helpful to mention here for those less familiar with radar and the orbital times. (I fully agree with the methods used and the separate processing; this is just a clarification.)

Thanks for the suggestion. We added the following in the revised manuscript:

Line 228-230: Considering the different passing time, S1 ascending (6 PM local time) and descending (6 AM local time) observations were processed separately.

Figure 2: b) Constructing the dataset using the 4 types of input data is clear. In panel C, then, the data set goes through the RF model, and it appears that two of the original datasets are then used again to generate the ice cover maps. The text makes it clear that the RF model was applied to S1 to generate the 10m map. Perhaps the authors could make panel C clearer for workflow, but this might just be a matter of my interpretation.

Thank you for the comment. Figure 2b involves pairing same-day S1, S2, DW, and Daymet data to create the S1-S2-DW-Daymet dataset. The purpose of this dataset is to collect training and testing sample points. Due to the same-day pairing, the S1-S2-DW-Daymet dataset does not include all S1 images. In Figure 2c, we applied the trained classifier to every S1 image during the study period, and therefore, we did not use the paired S1-S2-DW-Daymet dataset from Figure 2b. We have also adjusted the direction of the arrows between the “Processed S1 SAR data” and “Processed Daymet data” boxes in Figure 2c for clarity. The revised Figure 2 is shown below.




Figure 2. Workflow for generating ice fraction dataset, comparing S1 and DW ice fraction, and analyzing ice phenology.

Line 344: “This discrepancy may result from a mismatch between the observed freeze-up phase and the phase captured by remote sensing,” can the authors clarify what they mean here?

The S1-based ice fraction data captured the ice phenology within 1-km grid cells, whereas the in-situ data set were from eye-based visual observations. Therefore, the two phenology measurements may differ due to mismatches in spatial extent and time of observation.

We have revised the sentence for clarity:

Line 358-360: *The S1-based ice fraction data captured the ice phenology within 1-km grid cells, whereas the in-situ data set were from eye-based visual observations. Therefore, the two phenology measurements may differ due to mismatches in spatial extent and time of observation.*