

Interactive comment on “Predicting carbon dioxide and energy fluxes across global FLUXNET sites with regression algorithms” by Gianluca Tramontana et al.

Anonymous Referee #4

Received and published: 11 April 2016

General comments: 1) Good paper, but English can significantly be improved. I added the reviewed manuscript with a lot of examples for improvement. Please take care of this action. 2) Use the present tense wherever possible. 3) Scientifically I have no comments on this paper. Its thesis is sound and the argumentation as well.

Specific comments: 1) Page 5 line 83-84: According to me, VI's are only partially descriptive for vegetation state! Please comment and discuss on my statement. 2) Page 8, line 138: Give references for the QA/QC standard procedure for flux post-processing. 3) Page 8, line 178: FPAR is an erroneous acronym for fAPAR. Please correct in the manuscript. 4) Page 9, line 189: Why was the Maximum Value Composite criterion (MVC) not used? Please explain. 5) Page 9, line 192-193: A

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



16 days composite? What criterion was used for this multitemporal composite? 6) Page 9, line 199: VPD? Define VPD please. How was it calculated? 7) Page 9, line 201-202: ERA-Interim dataset? Give references for this dataset. 8) Page 17, line 387: predictive skill. This is a rather nonsensical expression, rather use predictive capacity or capability. 9) Page 18, Line 411: Individual ML methods also exhibited higher skill than... What does skill mean here? Unclear to me.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/bg-2015-661/bg-2015-661-RC3-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., doi:10.5194/bg-2015-661, 2016.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

