**Ocean Science
Discussions**

# *Interactive comment on* "Ecological niche of three teuthophageous odontocetes in the northwestern Mediterranean Sea" *by* E. Praca and A. Gannier

**Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 16 November 2007

Review of : Ecological niche of three teuthophageous odontocetes in the northwestern Mediterranean Sea

Overall interpretation:

The authors present the results of a numerical study of the habitat characteristics of three odontocete species in the NM Mediterranean Sea. The survey data is extensive, covering 10 years and much of the region. The quantitative methods are rigorous and clearly identify different ecological niches for the sperm whale, pilot whale, and Risso's dolphin. Many of the results do not different significantly from those of previous studies, and may be well predicted by the known diet of each species. Although the methods and results are sound, the manuscript offers suffers from poorly written sentences,

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

EGU

confusing turn of phrase, and grammatical problems. I would recommend that serious attention to improving the written English should be undertaken prior to final publication of the manuscript.

General comments:

Methods:

-Some of the choices of analytical methods need to be described in more detail. For example, the models were validated using "k-fold cross-validation, evaluated by a continuous Boyce index." The Boyce index is not described in detail, nor its usefulness in evaluating model fit. It would be good to include further explanation about these indices in the Methods section.

Results:

-Individual species habitat results are often referred to by the their variable name , i.e. B, HS, rather than by a meaningful quantity. I would recommend re-writing some of the results to clearly indicate the meaning of the numerical result, then refer to the numerical result in a Table or place it in parentheses within the text. Further, statements like, "From these curves, the habitat suitability threshold between predicted absence and presence was estimated to 56" are quite difficult to interpret. What is "habitat suitability threshold" and what does a quantity like "56" mean?

Discussion:

-Much of this section suffers from poorly written sentences, including some that are incomplete and some that should be split into 2, if not 3 separate sentences. There are several grammatical errors. I found it hard to concentrate on the actual interpretation as I struggled to muddle through the writing.

Technical Comments:

-There are misplaced commas and other punctuation throughout the entire manuscript.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

EGU

There are also several typos or grammatical errors.

-Much of the writing is either 1) confusing, or 2) colloquial. Colloquial writing has no place in scientific publications.

-Articles, 'a', and 'the' are occasionally missing throughout.

-There are many run-on sentences, particularly within the Discussion.

P. 786, lines 20-21: This sentence is colloquial and needs to be re-written.

P. 790, Paragraph beginning line 11- grammatically awkward, please re-write

P.795, line 10-12- poorly written, re-write.

P. 797, line 14, what are "important chlorophyll concentrations"?

Throughout- "Indexes" should be replaces with "indices"

---

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., 4, 785, 2007.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

EGU