

***Interactive comment on “Technical Note:
Comparing and ranking soil-moisture indices
performance over Europe, through
remote-sensing of vegetation” by E. Peled et al.***

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 17 November 2009

In general the structure of the paper is organized, although at some point the author needs to consider a more detailed division. Mainly the ‘3 Results and discussion’ part needs more structure. The author draw conclusions (Page 6254, line 5) in this part, this needs to be shifted to the ‘4 Conclusions’ part of the paper.

1) The title of this paper suggests a main focus on the vegetated areas in Europe, while in fact the main part of the results and conclusions are based upon semi-arid areas around Europe. With this title one would expect main results and conclusions in vegetated areas in Europe itself, like Scandinavia, Central Europe and so forth. These

C2653

areas are distinct in the results (Fig. 1) but do not come back in the discussion and/or conclusion. It would add value to discuss these results more detailed.

2) Using the term ‘validation’ in the introduction is not appropriate in this research paper

3) Instantaneous correlation between soil moisture indices and vegetation dynamics are performed. To my understanding there would be a time lag between these to be at its optimal. In other word; it takes time for the vegetation to take up the moisture and use it for its growth. Would it be interesting to find this optimum in (maybe limit your research for the spring period) for Europe? Or suggest this option for future research.

4) Please include average fall and winter calculations or at least mention the reason why it is not been done. Otherwise the suggestion to include the analyzed seasons (spring and summer in this case) somewhere in the title should be done.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 6, 6247, 2009.

C2654