Ocean Sci. Discuss., 3, S392–S394, 2006 www.ocean-sci-discuss.net/3/S392/2006/ © Author(s) 2006. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons License.



OSD

3, S392–S394, 2006

Interactive Comment

Interactive comment on "Design of an automatic multiple launcher for expendable probes" by G. Zappalà et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 6 September 2006

General comment:

Following the title, the authors want to describe the design of a new XBT-system for multiple launching. In fact only 1/4 of the paper is dealing with the design.

It should be made clear within the title, whether the paper will give a technical description of the system or wants to present the role and results of the Mediterranean SOOP.

An estimate of the advantages of the system vs. existing multiple launching systems should be mentioned. A comparison between the hand launcher or existing multiple launching systems like the TSKA and the system presented here should be mentioned in more detail.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

FGU

The detailed description of the standard XBT is unnecessary and published enough.

Although the paper presents a "Design ...", results of field experiments could demonstrate the value of the system only.

Maybe, it is too early to publish the paper, it definitely needs focussing and adding results from onboard use.

Specific comment:

- Part 1 to 3 are describing SOOP in the Mediterranean, the quality checks applied, the data management, a typical XBT-description and the standard instrumental apparatus used in MFSTEP.
- In fact, only part 4 is describing the new system. Looking at the title I would like to see a more detailed description of the system, the use in rough sea, results from one or two sections, quality checks, esp. with CTD.
- A sketch outline of the system onboard must be included.
- It would be particularly advantageous to add a photo showing the installation onboard a ship.
- A detailed description of the advantages of the system would improve the paper.
- Some remarks on onboard maintenance should be included.
- acc. "conclusions": Why is the improvement evident?
- No description of operation or results from the short test cruises are given.
- What are the shipboard requirements space, positioning onboard?

Looking at Fig.1 the system needs some space. Can it be installed on all VOS? Is the system easier to handle and the maintenance more cost effective compared to conventional systems?

OSD

3, S392-S394, 2006

Interactive Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

EGU

Technical comment:

Typing: Part 3, sentence 24 -> ASCII

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., 3, 997, 2006.

OSD

3, S392-S394, 2006

Interactive Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

EGU