

Interactive comment on “A survey of proximal methods for monitoring leaf phenology in temperate deciduous forests” by Kamel Soudani et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 9 January 2021

General comment:

The study is designed carefully, and has an exhaustive discussion covering a range of relevant previous studies. There are no major concerns from my side, except a few specific comments listed below.

Line comments:

L9-10: But there have been some (e.g., PhenoCam network; Milliman et al. 2019).

L25-26: There are ongoing debates on how such a temperature-driven control has been changed, and about other factors controlling vegetation phenology like photope-

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



riod and chilling requirements.

L34: How about satellite-based observations? Now their spatial coverages span 3 to 500 meters, and some of them have over 20 to 40 year-long records covering the entire globe.

L100-104: The dates derived from the extrema of the third derivative are quite comparable with the dates from amplitude thresholds. However, these are not identical, and their relationships depend on the rate of increase/decrease in vegetation index during growing/senescence phase.

L343: For Fig. S5, could it be possible to show the relationships of OBS with others? That would be interesting.

References

Milliman, T., Seyednasrollah, B., Young, A.M., Hufkens, K., Friedl, M.A., Froking, S., Richardson, A.D., Abraha, M., Allen, D.W., Apple, M. and Arain, M.A., 2019. Pheno-Cam Dataset v2. 0: Digital Camera Imagery from the PhenoCam Network, 2000–2018. ORNL Distributed Active Archive Center.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2020-389>, 2020.

BGD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

