

# ***Interactive comment on “The BernClim plant phenological data set from the Canton of Bern (Switzerland) 1970–2018” by This Rutishauser et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 22 July 2019

## General comments

In their Data Description paper, 'The BernClim plant phenological data set from the Canton of Bern (Switzerland) 1970–2018' Rutishauser and colleagues describe long-term phenological data from three tree species and one herb collected since 1970 (and continuing today). The data are relatively unique in having the same observers at most sites over the (long) observation period; and thus provide an important comparison for data collected by varied observers over time (which is far more common, based on my experience). The authors review some basics of the data collection, quality control on the data and provide some simple but very nice visuals of the data, including some

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



basic information on how they capture extending growing seasons with climate change. These data add to one of the better areas of the world for high-quality long-term data and are important for understanding climatic control on plant phenology in the past and what it means for plants in a future, hotter planet.

#### Specific comments

This paper is generally very well written and easy to read, but I was confused about a few things that I think minor re-structuring could address.

(1) Given that non-first dates were flagged in quality control I think the data collection must have been focused on first events. However this was not clearly stated (at least not clearly enough for me). If the data are focused on first events, please state it more clearly. If not it would be helpful to know why non-first dates were flagged. (2) I would have appreciated a little info on who the observers were and how they were found and enlisted in the project. (3) Somewhat related to (2) I would move up the Jeanneret & Rutishauser 2012 ... For example, an overview of what you will cover in the 'observation network and data' could be followed by 'more details, such as on how observers were located, trained and details on [insert a few more important details covered in other paper] are given in Jeanneret & Rutishauser 2012. (4) I additionally wondered if the trees were in forests, cultivated systems, clonal gardens or what?

Technical comments - If possible with the journal's style guidelines it would be nice to see the species names italicized in the abstract. - I would have liked a quick explanation of what regime shift was referenced in the abstract. For example, instead of 'the regime shift in the late 1980s,' it could read 'a regime shift in the late 1980s observed across numerous other phenological and meteorological datasets.' - Given the focus on 'first dates' I would reword line 74 "First observations were performed in 1970' to 'Observations began in 1970.' - Exposition is often called 'aspect' in my world, I might mention this once in the abstract and once in the main text: exposition (aspect) .... - Line 103: 123 500 data collected over what period of years? The number isn't that

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



## Interactive comment

meaningful without a time-window. - Robert Brugger is an expert in what? - Line 106: extra period at end of sentence - day of year is in inconsistently spelled (day-of-year, Days of Year etc.) throughout manuscript; whichever seems find to me so long as it is consistent. - Line 137-8 and 160 - 'the beech' and 'the Apple tree' sounds a bit odd, it should be apple, not Apple I believe and I think 'the' may not be needed. I suggest instead "...leaf colouring of beech and 22.7% concerned flowering of apple." - Figure 6: The colored versus black lines are not well explained (I assume black means something different? As 5 colored lines are mentioned in the caption and the black line is a 6th line, I believe), nor is there information on the red dashed line. I would also mention the data gap in the figure. - Figure 7: For consistency I think it should be 'hazel' and not 'hazelnut.'

---

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-101>, 2019.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

