

Interactive comment on “Heuristic Approach to Multidimensional Temporal Assignment of Spatial Grid Points for Effective Vegetation Monitoring and Land Use in East Africa” by Virginia M. Miori et al.

D. J. Carlson (Editor)

ipy.djc@gmail.com

Received and published: 14 September 2018

After conveying comments from the second reviewer, I read again both comments and the manuscript as submitted. Unfortunately I must agree with most comments from both reviews. As one reviewer points out and as the authors intend, improved 2-D discrimination of landscape features (including vegetation) should enhance our ability to monitor, quantify and perhaps predict landscape change, but the authors have failed to demonstrate that their mathematical approach produces realistic tools for landscape mapping. I resonate with cautions about quantitative applications of NDVI: one might

C1

end with such correlations out of necessity for the region and the application but one should not start from such assumptions without substantial demonstration, exploration and validation for other regions where one in fact knows the landscape features and the record of change.

If this manuscript goes to a final decision, we will definitely reject for good abundant well-documented reasons; the reviews seem very clear in this regard.

For the authors I consult the alternate option of withdrawal. With sufficient motivation, time and resources they might follow the validation recipe suggested by one review. Or they might present the mapping algorithm itself to a technical remote sensing conference, to gain community feedback? Of course they have these and perhaps other options regardless, whether they withdraw the manuscript or the journal rejects it. I wonder if a withdraw action makes more sense in this case? I do not want to encourage a revision with reviews so seriously negative.

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2018-18>, 2018.

C2