

Interactive comment on “M3A system (2000–2005) – operation and maintenance” by G. Petihakis et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 8 July 2006

This paper is a straightforward account of the issues associated with deployment of the M3A buoy off the Cretan coast. It is informative regarding the problems encountered in mooring design and sensor behaviour. I have no criticism of the results presented and think they provide a valuable summary of the buoy's performance.

The paper is overly long, mostly because of the rather pedantic English, where descriptive dialogue could easily be replaced by more succinct statements. In some sections (e.g. section 4.1) the text reads like an extract from the ship's log; the paper would benefit from editing by a native English speaker, it could be 20% shorter.

Some specific points:

1) There is reference to 3 different ships used to carry out maintenance; a brief descrip-

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

tion of their characteristics and limitations would be useful. 2) One of the tenets of the paper is the 'relatively low cost' of the mooring approach. No financial figures are presented to support this. It would be highly valuable to know broad costings (e.g. initial capital costs, subsequent capital costs, maintenance costs, calibration costs, communication costs) against other measurement method costings, to allow the reader (who may have similar mooring aspirations) to judge the statement. 3) Page 168, line 11: not sure of the units used to define geographic position 4) Pages 169 & 177: some confusion about the role of the Nireus PC, p 169 says CTD data transferred to Nireus, p 177 says data from CTDs and Nireus downloaded into a PC. 5) Page 171, line 10: define 'top' (Target Operational Period?) 6) Page 177, line 13: 'Although the deployment area Ė' should read 'Although the sea bed in the deployment area Ė' 7) Page 181, line 5: The differences between phase 1 and 2 seen in the temperature (100-500m, fig 7) are ascribed to two possible reasons, it would be helpful if some more positive statement could be made as to which process was dominant, and when. 8) Page 182, line 11: some evidence of this interesting phenomenon would be of interest. 9) Page 183, line 1: please give some examples of the 'minor problems' which could be solved by the two-way communications 10) Page 189, table 1: I don't think this table is necessary, a sentence or two in the text giving examples of scheduled and emergency visits will suffice. 11) Page 196, figure 6: 6b and 6c can be removed as they are not discussed in the text.

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., 3, 165, 2006.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper