

Interactive comment on “Optical sampling of the flux tower footprint” by J. A. Gamon

J. Gamon

gamon@ualberta.ca

Received and published: 1 July 2015

The point regarding the importance of accurate APAR estimation is a good one, and there are several places in the manuscript that address this. The manuscript now mentions that for some vegetation types, APAR can be the dominant model term. Some confounding effects (e.g. canopy structure, background, and illumination and angular effects) are mentioned. I also discuss the importance of correction for green canopy material, and of accurate definition of terms to allow comparative studies. A full review of APAR-related issues seemed beyond the scope of this paper, but additional references have been added to direct the reader to this topic.

As for the spectral dimension, again a full discussion of possible bands and resolution requirements seemed beyond the scope of this review (given the infinitely large number of possibilities), but several other references discussing these topics have now been

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

added, along with a greater emphasis on the benefit of hyperspectral approaches (e.g. imaging spectrometers).

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 12, 4973, 2015.

BGD

12, C3266–C3267, 2015

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C3267

