

The authors have made substantial changes to the manuscript so it has improved its clarity. However, I think there are still several minor changes that must be considered. My specific edits/comments are below (lines refer to manuscript version 3).

Line 31. Remove “also”

Line 33. Add “:” after ...properties were....

Line 34 Remove “,” After GPP

Line 35 Specify which blue wavelengths

Lines 36-37 Review the use of commas

Lines 45-46 Avoid repetition (properties)

Lines 49-50 “For example” between commas

Line 67 “at the present state” between commas

Lines 100-102. These effects have been also explored from multiangular data sets acquired from tower based sensor such as the AMSPEC (see Hilker, T., Coops, N.C., Hall, F.G., Black, T.A., Wulder, M.A., Nesic, Z., & Krishnan, P. (2008). Separating physiologically and directionally induced changes in PRI using BRDF models. Remote Sensing of Environment, 112, 2777-2788)

Lines 127-128. Avoid repetition (dominate)

Lines 146-147 In order to avoid repetition (and) I suggest to divide this sentence in two: .....USA). Data were sampled every 30 s and stored.....

Line 183 Spelling error (dominant)

Line 237 Filtered means removed? If not please, specify how the data was filtered

Line 247 UTC times? Please specify here and throughout the text when time references are included

I have an additional question regarding this analysis on the effect of solar zenith angles in the NDSI. Taking into account that the range of measurements includes acquisitions from early in the morning to late afternoon, is it possible that the differences in the COV are not only due to the sensitivity of the indices to the solar angles but also to their sensitivity to the diurnal changes on vegetation status (i.e. water content)?

Lines 275-276 Avoid repetition (thereby)

Line 281 The ANIF threshold (s)?

Lines 294-295. Avoid repetition (hyperspectral HCRF). I suggest: .....to clearly illustrate these seasonal dynamics, the ratio.....

Line 311 But were these water absorption bands not previously removed?

Line 328 This correlation is opposite to expected (if related with water absorption) so I am not sure if the reference to Thenkabail et al 2012 is appropriate here.

Lines 378-379 simplify the sentence. I suggest: .....with large differences in effects of variable solar zenith angles (Fig. 6 in Huber et al. 2014) and variable view zenith angles.....

Line 380 ....in the case (of)?...

Lines 373-784. I think it would be necessary to discuss here the results found in comparison with other authors that have analyzed this sun-sensor geometry using spectral indices. For example by comparing with the results found by Huber et al 2014 (section 3.4) with NDVI and SWISI. Have other authors reported larger effects in low index values? And in NIR/SWIR indices compared with VIS/NIR?

Lines 406-411. This results are not only interesting but surprising so I think more elaboration on a possible explanation is needed

Line 740 (table 1) I suggest replace "information about the sensor set-up" by "information about the instrumental set-up"

I would also suggest to add a column with information on the time period of each dataset

Line 747 to 751 (table 2). I would suggest adding the Relative Root Mean Square Error (RRMSE) as it facilitates the comparison between variables with different ranges.( see Richter, K., Atzberger, C., Hank, T. B., and Mauser, W.: Derivation of biophysical variables 16 from Earth observation data: validation and statistical measures, APPRES, 6, 063557-063551-17 063557-063523, 10.1117/1.jrs.6.063557, 2012.)

Figure 2 In figure 2a the a) overlaps the info, maybe can be moved

Figures 3, 4 and 6. If the spectral bands between 350-390 and 1300-1500 have been removed shouldn't be included in these graphs. Again it is not clear to me if this information was removed (as in figure 5) or filtered.