

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

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 24 January 2007

Review of the manuscript: “Operational ocean models in the Adriatic sea: a skill assessment”, by J. Chiggiato and P. Oddo. The submitted manuscript describes a skill-assessment study for two pre-operational regional ocean forecasting systems (AREG and AdriaROMS) developed for the Adriatic Sea. The assessment, based on statistical methods, is done against in-situ (temperature, salinity) and remote sensing (temperature) data. Comparison is also done against the basin scale operational forecasting system of the Mediterranean Sea (MFS). Overall, the paper deals with an interesting topic and the presented methodology can be a good reference for future works (skill assessment of ocean forecasting systems).

However, the paper would benefit from an extensive editorial work that will:

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

- improve the presentation of results in section 3. There is a lot of information provided but with a rather unstructured way. It is really difficult for the reader to depict the main messages-conclusions of this section. Furthermore, some statements need further justification or explanation (e.g. second paragraph of page 2095 starting at line 7; last paragraph, line 29 of the same page; in both cases the authors should better explain “why”)

- extend and improve the content of section 5 (summary and conclusions). This section should really summarize all the major conclusions of the paper with short and concise statements. Currently, this section contains only a short summary and 2-3 conclusions poorly described and supported

Minor comments: Page 2088, lines 6-9. Its better to avoid references in the Abstract section

Page 2088, line 17. “... to be colder and fresher than observations.”. This sentence is also repeated elsewhere in the text. It would be better to rephrase or explain at least once what you mean (i.e. “simulated temperature and salinities are lower than observations”)

Page 2090, line 3. “aim of this work is” instead “aims of this work are”

Page 2091, line 1. I am not sure its useful to include papers under preparation as reference, even in footnotes

Page 2091, line 3. Insert “levels” after “z-coordinate”

Page 2092, line 20. Explain (or remove) abbreviations M.E., T.G.

Page 2092, line 23. Remove sentence in parenthesis: “(by the way Ę)”

Page 2101, line 20. Replace “has” by “have”

Page 2101, line 24. Replace “tends” by “tend”

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

Page 2102, line 3. Sentence too long; should be revised.

Page 2102, line 10. What are these “insights” ? please specify them

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

OSD

3, S802–S804, 2007

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper