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Dear authors,

There is no doubt about the value of multiangular field data (we did many campaigns ourselves and know that it is hard work).

The main issue of this publication are not the data, but their preprocessing, analysis and presentation (just to mention one obvious out of many issues: why are the graphs based on the reflectance in blue (lowest SNR due to large atmospheric signal) and far NIR (1200-1300nm) while most scientists involved in vegetation analysis are interested in the spectral ranges of the NDVI (i.e., red (around 650nm) and NIR (around 800-
900nm) - indicator for greenness/photosynthesis) - or did you effectively want to show the anisotropy in water absorption bands?

The main value of the publication remaining is the communication that such measurements do exist, while the presented results do not reveal any new information (yes, natural surfaces are anisotropic, soils and snow behave differently than vegetation, the reflectance in bands with multiple scattering are more isotropic, solar principle plane shows highest anisotropy - we have seen this in many publications) and are not consistent (the careful analysis of the presented graphs and pictures speaks for itself).

Probably it is very useful to first publish the basic paper on the instrumentation and preprocessing which the authors mention before publishing the data. This will help to standardize measurements, analysis and the resulting data base, and increase the usefulness of the data.

With best regards,
Gabriela Schaepman-Strub
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