

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

A K Hannides (Referee)

ahannides@dfmr.moa.gov.cy

Received and published: 24 September 2009

I am pleased to act as a reviewer of this manuscript, because I consider the topic perhaps one of the most critical ones to be discussed on the way to a global monitoring and observing system.

I would like to congratulate the authors for tackling the topic, and – to a large degree – successfully at that. The contents of the manuscript are enlightening, their discussion is thorough, and the recommendations specific. The scientific literature on this topic will be greatly complemented by such a reading, so I would like to recommend this manuscript's publication, without any changes to the technical content.

Nevertheless, some re-organization should be done before publishing:

A) The succession of the topics covered by each section (1-8) is quite logical, but I

C533

found that the first one, Introduction, suffers from a mild identity crisis. The topic of the manuscript – or the issue at hand – is in the title: the assessment of sensor performance. The introduction, correctly so, attempts to frame the problem so that the reader can understand why this is a critical topic and one that remains fairly unresolved. There are paragraphs, however, that offer solutions to different aspects of the problem: par. 4 (“The concept dictates...”), par. 6 (“SI units...”), par. 7 (“These are not...”), most of par. 8 (“The users...”), par. 9 (“This illustration...”), par. 10 (“In ocean sciences...”) and par. 11 (“In the case...”). The concepts and discussion contained in these paragraphs probably belong to subsequent sections and should be omitted from the introduction, where they cause confusion as to their purpose (I personally had to read this section three times before starting to realize what was giving me trouble, and would like to see it re-organized). The points therein are important, so they should not be lost from the manuscript but perhaps incorporated in other sections as appropriate.

B) The authors make specific recommendations throughout the manuscript: e.g., the use of GUM, the listing of TRLs when referring to a sensor (system), documentation of quality assurance procedures, etc. Most sections have at least one. I would like to suggest that they are repeated epigrammatically, e.g., in a list, in the last section that could be renamed Conclusions and Recommendations.

There are also very minor syntactical and spelling errors dispersed throughout the manuscript that I deem unnecessary to list here, since a spell-checker could easily spot them and correct them.

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

C534