

Interactive comment on “Development of a standard database of reference sites for validating global burned area products” by Magí Franquesa et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 4 August 2020

General Comments

This manuscript describes the availability of a new dataset comprising a compilation of reference burned area data, which can be used for the validation of burned area products. The short description paper outlines the methods used to standardise a number of different datasets into a common format, and a more detailed description on each one. It also gives an overview of why validation is necessary but not always readily available, which provides useful context.

Validation of burned area products is definitely lacking in the field, and this is a welcome contribution to the research area. I think it will be useful for many researchers working

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



on fire and burned area. The methods are well-referenced, and are mostly clearly described, with the exception of a few points as outlined below.

The data is readily available via the link provided in the text, and can be accessed immediately after completing a short form. The data appears complete.

Specific comments

Section 2.1 Selection of validation sites: This section comes across as a literature review of different methods, and I'm not sure what is actually being implemented in this paper from reading this section. Can you clarify in the paragraph (e.g. does each dataset use a different method?)

At the end of the Introduction, the overview of the paper is a bit vague. I think this would benefit from a clearer outline of the structure, and a list of the datasets that are considered in this paper to give a better overview up front.

Line 220 – only data in June to October is considered for this dataset. This covers the main fire season in this region, but how are the fires outside of the fire season dealt with?

Presumably the temporal length of the reference files is such that it covers multi-day burning. It is worth pointing this out in the text explicitly.

It would be useful to include some text describing how one might use all these different reference datasets in practise. Should they all be used together, and if so how should the range be accounted for?

How were these datasets selected? Are there any other datasets available that are not included here, or are these the only ones available? I suggest including some explanation of this in the text.

Are all the datasets related to FireCCI? It seems so from the description of the data via the link, but not in the paper.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

Most modellers use NetCDF, if it would be nice if this format was considered for future releases.

Technical corrections

References to figures (“Fig.”) throughout the text is sometimes with a space and sometimes without

Line 49 – change to “acquired in the year 2000”

Line 182 - “consists of”

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2020-74>, 2020.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

