

Interactive comment on “Evaluating the suitability of the consumer low-cost Parrot Flower Power soil moisture sensor for scientific environmental applications” by Angelika Xaver et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 19 December 2019

General comment The manuscript is well written and scientifically solid. The research is of interest and highlights potential applications for both in situ soil monitoring and satellite validation for large scale analysis. To my view the manuscript can be accepted after minor revisions, here listed.

Specific comments: 1) Page 2, line 37. Replace “Ochsner et al. (2013)” with “(Ochsner et al., 2013)”. 2) Page 7, Line 143. Maybe “where not considered” is “where considered” instead 3) Page 8, lines 188-189. The sentence is redundant as respect to line 138, page 6. 4) Page 13, line 311. “Despite the much smaller range of incoming shortwave radiation observed by the FP sensors...” It seems that Figure 6 represents only the

C1

incoming shortwave radiation from CNR4, while light level is represented by the FP sensor. 5) Page 14, Figure 7 and lines 313-314. The authors should avoid to calculate the bias or deviations of two different variables characterized by different measurement units. Remove the bias value from the Figure 7. Just a comment on the fact that the deviation cannot be calculated because of the different measurement units is fine. 6) Page 16, Figure 9. A bar plot of the rainfall in the same graph of the soil moisture measurements can be useful to see if the higher noise of FP sensor is related always to rainfall impulses. This can be also better justify the sentence in lines 339-341. 7) Page 18, Lines 415-417. The author should test the significance of the correlation coefficients using the critical values related to the sample size or the p-value test. Same for table 4, on the validation of the ASCAT product.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Instrum. Method. Data Syst. Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/gi-2019-38, 2019.

C2