

Interactive comment on “Improved light and temperature responses for light use efficiency based GPP models” by I. McCallum et al.

I. McCallum et al.

mccallum@iiasa.ac.at

Received and published: 23 July 2013

We very much appreciate the reviewer taking the time to review our paper and are glad that they find it worthy of publication.

The reviewer correctly points out that the paper is more about model performance comparison than presenting new methods for doing so. We will attempt to clarify this. Additionally, we will improve the explanation of the methods in the revised manuscript.

Furthermore, we agree that the background information could be expanded. Additionally we will improve the linkage to related studies. Several were mentioned but more could be added.

While it is true that 14 EC sites exist across Russia, at the time we received this data
C3694

through official channels (several years ago), only 7 sites were provided. Of these, 3 were grassland sites which are likely to be water limited. As none of the models account for water limitation, we decided to focus on just the four sites that were not water limited. In the meantime we have obtained additional sites directly from the PIs and may be able to include additional sites if granted permission (time permitting). We chose the three years 2002-2004 as most sites had complete data for these years. Time permitting we could add additional years. In any case, we will explain why certain towers and years were chosen in the paper.

A table showing major meteorological parameters would help the reader – we agree. We will also add an uncertainty paragraph.

All technical comments will be addressed in the revised paper.

Thankyou

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 10, 8919, 2013.