

Interactive comment on “A generic pixel-to-point comparison for simulated large-scale ecosystem properties and ground-based observations: an example from the Amazon region” by Anja Rammig et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 28 September 2018

The present paper addresses an important problem in model data comparisons, namely how to compare measurements at the plot scale with pixel level model predictions, given the well known spatial heterogeneity in the measured variables. The authors propose a straightforward statistical framework that can take into account within pixel variations. The authors exemplify the use of this model using above-ground biomass(AGB) measurements and model predictions in the Amazon region. They show that by using the new metric for data variation it is easier to show whether the model predictions match the observed variability.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



This core part of the paper is very clear and, in my opinion, very valuable for future modelling studies. The paper in general is very well written.

There are however some parts of the paper that are not so well developed, in particular the model comparison with the other datasets. In my opinion, the authors can go one of two ways: either cut down to the core of their method and the AGB data, or extend the less well developed and explained parts of their paper.

Detailed comments

Description of observed data (section 2.2.1) I find the data description in the main text of the paper extremely short. While the concept of AGB might be widely used and easily understandable, woody productivity and woody loss are not and a brief definition and description of how these were measured/calculated would greatly help the reader understand the subsequent analyses.

Analysis of the woody productivity and loss. The AGB data and model predictions are analysed in detail and presented in four different figures, while the other two datasets have one figure each and one joint table. I would find it interesting to see a bit more detail about these observations too, especially since one of the strong discussion points (section 4.3) revolves around the model's inability to predict productivity and loss.

Different allometric models. While I fundamentally understand why the choice of allometric model is important for estimates of AGB, it does not feel like this additional dimension adds to the central message of the study. Most of the detail for the allometric models is buried in the supplementary material and, as far as I understand, the majority of the analysis has been done with only one of the allometric equations.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2018-182>, 2018.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

