**Ocean Science
Discussions**

Interactive comment on "Operational ocean models in the Adriatic Sea: a skill assessment" *by* J. Chiggiato and P. Oddo

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 19 January 2007

Review of the manuscript: Operational ocean models in the Adriatic sea: a skill assessment J. Chiggiato, P.Oddo Submitted for publication on Ocean Sciences Ref: 2006-0088. The manuscript focuses on the assessment of the operational skill of two Adriatic sea operational modelling systems (AREG and AdriaROMS), comparing the related results with observational data, remotely sensed (AVHRR) surface temperature (SST) and with results from a Mediterranean Sea operational forecasting systems (MFS). The skill assessment is done at the statistical level. The argument treated is very interesting and important and the operational systems are state of the art. However, I do not think that the manuscript can be published as it stands now and that a major revision effort (along the lines defined by the itemised list below) is needed in order make the results and findings more reliable, clear and (not less importantly)

EGU

readable. The revised manuscript will need a second round of reviewing.

General Comments

1. The Skill assessment is done at the level of the modelling system (Numerical model+ forcing functions) as a whole (and this should be stated more clearly in the text). However, it is recommended to investigate better the role of the different surface forcing functions in improving/worsening the skill of the model. The basic question is: if the two numerical models (POM and ROMS) were forced with exactly the same forcing functions, their behaviour should be more coherent among each other or not?

2. The data used to carry out the assessment are not entirely coherent among each other also because AREG derived analyses and Adria ROMS derived forecast were used. The possible limitation imposed by this on the assessment should be better investigated.

3. The paper structure is very confused and this make the manuscript (together with other formal aspects) very, very difficult to be read. Sentences in the various sub chapters are very often unrelated (or poorly related). Concepts are very often expressed with a very contorted sentence structure. A total revision of the paper structure is absolutely needed in order to improve clarity and readability. The Authors should ask themselves what is the message they want to pass at the reader. By reading the manuscript in the present form one gets the opinion that the Authors had not clear in mind the shape and structure they would give to the paper.

Specific Comments

4. Section 2.2 Very scanty information about the surface forcing functions used by AREG is given.

5. Page 2094. Please expand the consideration about the possible model drift. What could be the consequences on the skill assessment?

Editorial Comments

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

EGU

6.Beyond the structural problems the Authors should give attention also to wording punctuation, grammar and Synthaxis. In particular they should try to avoid the use of colloquial sentences.

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., 3, 2087, 2006.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

EGU