

Interactive comment on “The PROFOUND database for evaluating vegetation models and simulating climate impacts on forests” by Christopher P. O. Reyer et al.

David Carlson (Editor)

ipy.djc@gmail.com

Received and published: 7 May 2020

Please can the authors ensure that they respond thoroughly to reviewer comments?

In particular, one reviewer asks that authors include - and perhaps expand on - the points and text they used in one of their reviewer responses. I quote the text below:

Reviewer question: "How does this dataset differentiate from other datasets of its kind for DGVM evaluation, such as ILAMB (Collier et al. 2018)?"

Author's Reply: "This is an interesting point. Actually, in terms of the scope - providing data for thorough model evaluation ready to be used by modellers alongside a software

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



packet etc - it is very similar. However, the crucial difference is that our dataset is focussing on the forest stand scale and hence aims at presenting most data at that scale while ILAMB and related databases and tools are global in scope. Additionally, we provide long-term and detailed measurements of forest stand structure which is not available in global datasets."

Assuming authors stand behind such a response, I join the reviewer in asking them to ensure inclusion of this exact or closely related text as part of their introduction and justification.

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2019-220>,
2019.

Interactive
comment

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

