Biogeosciences
Discussions

Open Access

EGU

Interactive comment on "Mapping trends in woody cover throughout Namibian savanna with MODIS seasonal phenological metrics and field inventory data" *by* Vladimir R. Wingate et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 20 March 2019

I think this is an interesting topic but the current weak structure, somewhat sloppy writing and lacking information makes the reporting of the study weak, even if it may be OK when done. In general consider the following points for major revisions before it can be reconsidered.

* Don't write longer than needed. Keep it precise, clear and brief.

* Make sure the methods are described in such detail that an informed colleague can repeat the study based on the information provided in the met-section. This is not the case at the moment.

* Use SI units

* Better illustrations and captions needed. The reader should be able to get the context by looking at the figure and reading the caption, with no need to consult the bulk text. Examples: Figure 3. Explain abbreviations used in figures (DSINT etc.) Figure 4. Replace x and Y with real variables and units. Confidence interval for the regression line? Figure 5. Percentage tree cover range from 0-0.8% i.e. very low. Should be 0-80%? Figure 6. Add units to the colour bars (Slope%, woody cover %) Figure 7. Unclear content and message

* Let each section (Methodology, results etc.) contain information related to that section only, i.e. don't mix methods and background etc.

* Provide some justification for using NDVI and what it measure, Saturation effects due to higher LAI etc. Why not EVI or PPI?

Some additional comments in attached PDF

Please also note the supplement to this comment:
https://www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/bg-2019-28/bg-2019-28-RC1-supplement.pdf

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2019-28, 2019.