
B. W. Mota et al.

Received and published: 23 December 2005

We thank the referee for his kind remarks and useful comments.

1. The geolocation errors during and after 2001 certainly led to a reduction in accuracy of our screening procedure based on a land cover filter. Nevertheless, and given the magnitude of the errors, we believe it would be excessive to exclude the 2001 data from the analysis.

2. We believe the linear and regular geometric shapes we detected are not prescribed fires, based on their location, size and time of occurrence. In some cases they cross sections of the ocean. We have included a new figure, illustrating some of these errors. We’re not even sure they all have a common cause, but corrupted telemetry is likely to...
explain some of the linear artefacts.

3. Figure 1 clearly shows that gas flares are acknowledged as fires, and are not labelled as false alarms. We designate them as non-vegetation fires, i.e. fires that are not fuelled by vegetation.

4. We agree that it is considerably circular to state that commission errors are highly clustered, since these are the easy ones to detect. Sprinkles of single pixel errors are virtually undetectable in a global dataset covering a 6-year period. Or, at least, the effort to ascertain their true status would be unwieldy. We will modify our text to incorporate this comment.

5. The technical corrections recommended will be performed.
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