

Interactive comment on “Australian vegetation phenology: new insights from satellite remote sensing and digital repeat photography” by Caitlin E. Moore et al.

M. Migliavacca (Editor)

mmiglia@bgc-jena.mpg.de

Received and published: 6 July 2016

Dear Authors,

based on the comments posted by the referees and your reply I invite you to submit a properly revised version of the manuscript.

In particular the referees pointed out some abbreviations and acronyms not properly defined and also an improvement of the figures and coherence between figures is needed.

The referee #2 also highlights the need of a more quantitative analysis to compare the EVI trajectories and some works should be done in this direction.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Regarding the answer n 8 to the reviewer 2, I guess the authors refer to daytime averages of the indices and not daily averages. Otherwise the results can be seasonally biased by variations in day-length.

Another important point raised by the referees for the comparison of phenocam and MODIS in Savannahs is the role of fractional cover and understory phenology, and I would add the spatial heterogeneity within the MODIS pixel and representativity of the field of view of the camera. I guess in your sites is not a big issue but more detailed discussion is needed. Looking forward to hearing from you. Best regards

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., doi:10.5194/bg-2016-175, 2016.

BGD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

