**Ocean Science
Discussions**

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on "A fishery observing system for the collection of fishery and oceanographic data" *by* P. Falco et al.

I. Palomera (Referee)

isabel@icm.csic.es

Received and published: 27 July 2006

General comments

This paper presents an application of a Fishery Observing System (FOS) in the Adriatic Sea. The main goal of this approach is to nowcast/forecast fish abundance. This approach is very interesting and novel in the Mediterranean Sea. Therefore I think this work fits well with the content of Ocean Science journal and contributes widening the current topics published, combining fishery and oceanographic data.

I understand that the paper has the final goal of describing, analysing and presenting first results of the application of FOS. But to achieve this objective the manuscript has to be deeply revised considering two aspects:

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

EGU

1. Form and structure of the sections; 2. Content of methodology, results and discussion. (See below specific comments on these two points)

After revision of these aspects, paper could be accepted.

Specific comments

Title: I suggest erasing the first 'fishery' word- 'An observing system for the collection of fisheryĚ.'

1. In general terms, the paper is hard to follow because there is a lot of information that is not well structured, it is repeated in some cases or it is not correctly located in the corresponding sections. For instance:

- The order of figures doesn't fit with the order of appearance in the text.

- Some methodological parts appear in results: e.g. page 844, lines 4 and 5: If Chioggia vessel is excluded must be said in methodology. Some results appear in methodology, e.g. page 840, line 5 and 6 that correspond to a result.

- Data related with vessels, type of gear and seasonal activity is extremely extends and confuse. If the analysis ends only using data from Volante fleet, the explanations related with lampara data are not so important. I would suggest adding the temporal information of fishing activity in Table 1.

- Figure 1 is very difficult to interpret mainly due to colours overlap. Moreover, 'white' tracks are not possible to be seen and isobaths are not white, as indicate in the text (page 843, line 26). I suggest perhaps dividing this figure in two, or make a zoom of some part of the map in order to show with more definition the tracks of some of the vessels.

2. Contents of methodology, results and discussion

- In paragraph two of page 840, authors said that data from MFSTEP model are surface temperature and these data are used to compare results from In-situ (trawl) data that

come from depth. Why do not use data from ADRICOSM model that are also from depth?

- Calibration of TPs with CTD was made in a special experiment or during fishing? This should be clarified.

- On Data set (3.1.3) line 17, authors said that Giulianova vessel uses lampara from spring to late autumn; that means that they use volante only in winter. It seems to me that some contradictions exist with the paragraph in results about longest and continuous time series (Page 845, line 27-28).

- Paragraph on satellite data (page 847) do not seem to be necessary.

- Discussion is a compendium of introduction, methodology and results. I suggest to focus it on advantages and disadvantages of FOS, identified problems and novelties respect other FOS applications (which have not been mention neither; it would be interesting to cite other works were similar FOS have been implemented).

- It would be interesting to mention as well future developments of the methodology and the need to continue analysing results (taking into account seasonal -e.g. reproductive period- and long time differences).

- Related with comments in first paragraph of the Discussion, I think that is important to take into account that distribution and abundance of small pelagics can be driven by different environmental factors, not acting in the same moment. Abundance is related with recruitment, so there is a time lack with factors affecting it, as it is explained in Lloret et al. 2004. In this work the authors show how wind and river runoff was related with larval survival a year before and not with current abundance of adults. What I mean is that this methodology is adequate to analyse effects of environment on distribution of adults, and to compare differences on distribution of abundance by region in the same moment and the influence of environment on this.

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., 3, 827, 2006.