

Interactive comment on “Linking canopy reflectance to crop structure and photosynthesis to capture and interpret spatiotemporal dimensions of per-field photosynthetic productivity” by Wei Xue et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 20 December 2016

General comments

I have reviewed the manuscript “Linking canopy reflectance to crop structure and photosynthesis to capture and interpret spatiotemporal dimensions of per-field photosynthetic productivity” (file: bg-2016-492-manuscript-version2.pdf) and find it suitable for publication in Biogeosciences. The presented research is interesting and relevant to the readership of Biogeosciences. The measurements and analyses appear to be sound. However, I would recommend thorough language editing as the manuscript contains grammatical errors and, occasionally, uncommon phrasings that make it a

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



bit difficult to understand the content at times. Apart from that, there are only some technical corrections to do, from my point of view.

Specific comments

P11, L9-10: “They imply that. . .”, this sentence contains interpretations of the results, which I would rather avoid in the results chapter. The same applies to: P11, L18-19; P11, L 27-28; P13, L6; P13, L17-18.

Technical corrections

P9, L30: I would recommend to use the word “dramatically” here.

P11, L 2: “predicated” should read “predicted”, I suppose.

Fig. 3: it would be helpful to add a legend of treatment symbols. In the y-axis labels, “umol” should read “ μmol ”, I think. In the caption, it should read “gross primary productivity”, in my understanding.

Fig. 4: add legend of treatment symbols.

Fig. 5: In the caption, it should read “gross primary productivity”, “stages” (instead of “stags”) and “are” (instead of “ere”).

Fig. 6: “stages”.

Fig. 7: item (d) is missing in the caption.

Fig. 8: x-axis label is missing.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., doi:10.5194/bg-2016-492, 2016.