



Interactive comment on “Vegetation height products between 60deg; S and 60deg; N from ICESat GLAS data” by S. O. Los et al.

M. Lefsky

lefsky@gmail.com

Received and published: 2 December 2011

While I want to submit a full review of this paper in the near future, I will make the following two points now:

1) You say "We agree that a spatial comparison with Lefsky's data would be useful and interesting. The comparison with Lefsky's data is limited in our paper, because his data are not publicly available". Links to the data are provide in the paper itself! The last lines of the paper are:

Full resolution images of the two canopy height maps can be downloaded at http://dl.dropbox.com/u/2104132/p_080809_global.img and http://dl.dropbox.com/u/2104132/x2_080809_global.img

C1140

Could I (yes, this is Lefsky) have made it more "publicly available"?

2) Your state that "Lefsky's estimates are too low" and therefore your product is better. Have you made the effort to calculate a 90th percentile height for all forests within my patches? Estimates are low because they don't reflect just mature forest but all forests regardless of condition. Of course there are taller forests, but not all forests are that tall. And no, the average 90th percentile height need not be the same as the mean height of the same areas.

From points (1) and (2) alone, it is clear that you weren't paying much attention to the paper you criticize.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 4, 2327, 2011.