SOIL
Discussions

Open Access

Interactive comment on "Precision agriculture suitability to improve vineyard terroir management" *by* J. M. Terrón et al.

N. Puletti

nicola.puletti@gmail.com

Received and published: 11 January 2015

In my opinion, this work should be published after a major revision. The paper is well-structured, English requires minor revision, like e.g. at page 953, rows 18-23, particularly: "(i) it was acquired . . . (ii) it was done. . ."; and at page 953 row 25; page 954, row 2/3: "The pixel size chosen in this case it was. . .").

Here some concerns: 1) I'm not convinced that the comparison between just two years (2012 and 2013) can address to the first research question i.e., the impact of different irrigation treatments. Probably, for a more accurate analysis, more than 5 years are needed, in order to consider climate effects. 2) Section 3.2 "Geostatistical and statistical data processing" shows a need for further clarifications. Particularly, description

C431

at rows 6-13 is not quite clear, resulting in a lack of comprehension in the use of PCA. Probably a flowchart (in "Figures" section) could help. 3) The benefit of fig. 7 is quite obscure. Is the PCA the best tool with just few (i.e. 5) images?

Finally, some advices: (abstract) pag. 948, row 6: the definition of ATV is here needed. page 953, row 11: Principal Component Analysis. Change "(ACP)" with "(PCA)". page 954, row 2: change "The pixel size chosen. . ." with "The chosen geometric resolution was of 4 m". table 2: the column "Range" is not a range, but it indicates the difference between max and min values. Please, remove this column or add integration in caption, indicating what "Range" means. table 2: at each date, the addition of a new row under "Non-watered", indicating the mean values of mean, SD, min, max, can be useful to immediately see the differences between dates.

Interactive comment on SOIL Discuss., 1, 947, 2014.