

Interactive comment on “Retrieval and validation of forest background reflectivity from daily MODIS bidirectional reflectance distribution function (BRDF) data across European forests” by Jan Pisek et al.

Jan Pisek et al.

janpisek@gmail.com

Received and published: 8 January 2021

Below we provide our replies to the requested edits. We thank the reviewer for his/her constructive comments that help to improve our original submission. The instructions for our final response state that revised manuscript should not be prepared/provided at this stage. For clarity, in our replies we provide the intended revised versions of the individual sentences following the reviewer’s suggestions.

Responses to Reviewer #1 Pisek et al. provides the description and validation for their

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



method for retrieving understory NDVI values for a variety of forest types and seasons from MODIS BRDF data. They found that their method produces good estimates for open canopies, but that it had limited performance for closed canopies and that MODIS data quality and spatial heterogeneity impact the performance. Overall, I found the study and manuscript straight-forward, concise, and with a high potential to be impactful. Thus, I do not have any major comments and most of the several instances where making the language more consistent would help. Specifically, I would choose to refer to the canopy by the openness or the foliage coverage instead of switching between the two, which can be confusing or at least requires a little extra thought. Figure 5 shows the data in terms of openness, but the main text often refers to it as foliage coverage. This became an issue in the sentence on line 300-301 where I believe there is a mismatch between this assertion that FR-FBn has high openness (and low FC) and the low openness value that is shown in Figure 5.

REPLY: Accepted. We stick with the foliage coverage term throughout the whole text now. Overstory foliage cover will be plotted in Figure 5 instead of canopy openness.

Specific comments: Line 155: the ending of the sentence was cut off

REPLY: Accepted. We apologize for the omission. Here is the full sentence with the missing part added: When a tuning parameter (called “structuring element” in image processing) was set so that “large” gaps only occurred between individual tree crowns (Korhonen and Heikkinen, 2009), the proportions of gaps inside and between individual crowns could be calculated.

Line 211: missing spaces between values and “nm” units

REPLY: Accepted. The missing spaces will be added to the revised manuscript.

Line 242: missing space between 0.5 and “km” unit

REPLY: Accepted. The missing spaces will be added to the revised manuscript.

Figure 3: Font needs to be bigger especially in panels b and d.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

Reply: Accepted. We increase the figures and fonts to correspond to the layout and design to match the one in the original work by Roman et al. (2009, RSE; Fig, 7). Please see we have a limited budget to cover the APCs and so have to try to make our manuscript as compact as possible. Thank you for understanding.

Figure 5: It took me a bit to understand what many of the individual parts of the figure indicated and I do not think it is self-explanatory enough as a figure and caption. I found most of the caption initially confusing, specifically the concept of “understory NDVI ranges.” (1) I think it should be explicitly stated that the understory NDVI ranges are what you predicted/estimated and that these are for selected days (the ones you measured). I would consider changing the caption to be closer to “estimated understory NDVI ranges for selected days are given in blue bars for sites that were well represented and orange bars for sites that were poorly represented. . .”

REPLY Accepted. We change the caption to state this explicitly as suggested by the reviewer: ‘Estimated understory NDVI (NDVI_u) ranges for selected days (see Section 2. 3 how the ranges are obtained; blue bars for site representative retrievals; orange bars for possible non site representative retrievals).

(2) I do not think that green squares should be used for the computed nadir NDVI values because this makes it look like they are intervals (like the “ranges”) when they only represent point values. They have no uncertainty associated with them based on my understanding and, thus, another shape should be selected. Additionally, it was initially not clear to me what these values were and I think it should be clarified in the caption that these are the total NDVI values, which is how you refer to them in the text.

Reply: Accepted. Good point. We change the symbol (cross instead of square) and expand the description in the caption as well: computed nadir total (understory+overstory) NDVI values from MODIS BRDF/albedo data (green crosses).

(3) You reference section 2.2 for how the ranges were obtained, but I think you meant to reference 2.3 as 2.2 does not include a description of the estimated ranges (only the

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

in situ measured ones).

REPLY: Accepted. Yes, the reviewer is correct: Section 2.3 should have been referred. We correct it.

(4) Further description of how the in situ measurements are displayed is required, specifically what the point (mean or median?) and bars (I think the +/- 1 standard deviation based on the text) indicate.

REPLY: Accepted. We provide the further description in the caption: in situ measurements (mean +/- 1 standard deviation shown in purple).

(5) I would consider reordering the rows/sites. Currently it is ordered by increasing in situ measurements, but the text does not include a discussion around this. Instead I would consider ordering based on the canopy openness because this would help illustrate your result in line 297-298 that the retrieval of understory signal is not accurate if foliage cover exceeds 85%. This is only a suggestion though.

REPLY: Accepted. Following the reviewer's suggestion, we reorder the sites by decreasing overstory foliage cover.

Figure 6: I have the same comment has in Figure 5 around making the labels in the caption more explicit.

REPLY: Accepted. We agree to make the caption description more explicit.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2020-360>, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

