

Interactive comment on “Remote sensing of plant trait responses to field-based plant-soil feedback using UAV-based optical sensors” by Bob van der Meij et al.

M. Tuohy (Referee)

M.Tuohy@massey.ac.nz

Received and published: 19 December 2016

The authors have carried out a detailed study and presented a well written report on the outcome. Previous research has been thoroughly reviewed and the methods used have been well described. The conclusion that UAV-mounted hyperspectral sensors can adequately quantify plant traits may be a leap of faith considering that the best R2 values for fresh biomass and N content were only 0.56 and 0.68 respectively. The PSF results could have been explained better; it is not clear what a good F6,21 value is and the range varies from around 11 to almost 27. It could be argued that reflectance is not a good proxy for plant height and will never be, but it might well be expected to provide some measure of nutrient concentration. With the obvious importance of the

C1

NIR wavelengths, perhaps more attention should be paid to this region of the spectrum rather than waste processing time on PLS analysis of all the bands.

Grammatical corrections. 3/32 replace good with well; delete remote based 4/12 of the field's 4/36 weighing not weighting 4/37 change to once in each plot. 5/1 ground not grinded; change to weighed in tin cups and then. . . 5/17 found to be inadequate 5/32 replace conflicting with conflict 6/31 replace was with were; change 'and using' to and a non-parametric. . . 9/6 replace till with to 11/23 use a more extensive. . . Colours in figs 5 and 6 should match those of the spectra in fig 4 Fig 6: small letters above each bar are not explained.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., doi:10.5194/bg-2016-452, 2016.

C2