

Interactive comment on “Webcam network and image database for studies of phenological changes of vegetation and snow cover in Finland, image time series from 2014–2016” by Mikko Peltoniemi et al.

Mikko Peltoniemi et al.

mikko.peltoniemi@luke.fi

Received and published: 6 November 2017

Dear Anonymous Referee #2,

We thank for your positive comments. Please find below our replies to referee criticism.

Referee raised criticism about our sentence stating that image time series could be used as ‘ground truths to earth observations’.

We do agree that this is not the case, and we will reformulate this sentence. Cameras

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



indeed do not provide exact ground truths but rather timing information about phenomena, which can facilitate/supplement EO analyses.

Replies to minor comments:

Page 4, line 12: We will specify this can add information about camera resolution to the datasheet.

Page 4, line 12: We will also add information about quality setting to the datasheet of the cameras, and reformulate text.

Page 7, line 28: yes, will be corrected.

Page 9, line 8-9: Based on our experience use of average, median or some other percentile does not cause big difference in relative seasonal development of GCC. Here we chose median as it generally is the most robust estimator, given there may be occasional outliers in the observations.

Page 9 line 21: Yes, we do mean classes 1 and 2. We will correct this.

We will additionally proof read and correct grammatical mistakes in the manuscript with English native.

best regards, Mikko Peltoniemi et al.

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2017-62>, 2017.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

