

Interactive comment on “Assessment of sensor performance” by C. Waldmann et al.

J. Cisneros-Aguirre (Referee)

jesus.cisneros@magisacque.it

Received and published: 11 August 2009

Dear Authors, I am a little bit lost, in this new interactive revision. Sorry if I make something wrong. I have several small comments about your article, that I hope could help you to improve it. 1) Page. 1689, (line 12) I will suggest you to include the fourth case iiiii) the lack of communication between the manufacturers and the marine instrumentation user. 2) Page. 1689, line 23, 24. I would change the word scientist by marine user, and science mission by mission. Currently the scientist measure is a small part of the measurements carry out by the marine users, we (the scientist) need to understand this. 3) Page. 1690, line 15. This is the most important lacks that we have in marine sciences. I would emphasize more. 4) Page. 1695, I would suggest you to rewrite the example, because it is not very clear. 5) Page 1698, within the paragraph 3, I would include the example of the ADCP, because is very illustrative. A single principle of measurement, the variation of the frequency in the sound signal, becomes

C330

a very complicated process to obtain the final value of velocity. There are several mathematical and statistical processes to define the final velocity value, impossible to follow by the marine user. There is sensor configurations, environmental situations, mode to instrumental deploy that gives you not consistent data. This could be the best example to demonstrate the necessity of very highly specialized third-party test organizations, as ACT. Best regards Jesus

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., 6, 1687, 2009.