

Interactive comment on “Sensors for observing ecosystem status” by S. Kröger et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 29 April 2009

I found this well written paper. It takes on the difficult task of providing an introduction to those sensors which are currently available and have the ability to provide information on ecosystem status. The authors have the advantage of coming from a laboratory where the assessment of ecosystem status is a key part of its work. The paper is well structured. It does not get bogged down in trying to define what eco-system status might mean and just refers to the key bit of European legislation that require the approach to be taken. The introduction puts the work successfully into context. The review section is by no means exhaustive but it does provide coverage of key areas including an introductory section on remote sensing. Table 2 should be up dated. Specific comments 1. Page 771, 1st para I would have liked to have seen specific references to the other Ocean Sensors'08 papers at this stage. 2. Line 23, “it's” should be “its” 3. Page 772, lines 3-9 references to one or more papers would be appropriate here. I feel referring to specifically a Skalar auto(n)alyser (spelling mistake) is

C73

appropriate. It would be better to refer to chemical methods used on an autoanalyser. 4. Page 773, some mention to should also be give to the new Seabird oxygen sensors which have along side the optodes done much to revolutionise marine oxygen surveys. It was good have water column and sediment measurements discussed in the same section too often the worlds are separated. 5. Page 775, line 26 “be” should be “by”. 6. Page 777, lines 20 to 26. This paragraph should include references 7. Page 778, line 9 insert “they” after the comma 8. Page 779, lines17-21. The paper shows its CEFAS based limitations here. Here would have been good to have had reference to the work of the Scott Polar Institute and BAS using the Valeport CTDs attached to large marine mammals. 9. Page 780 I think it would improve the paper if Table 2 could be up dated. 10. Page 780, lines 14-20 This paragraph should include references. 11. Page 781, line Capitals missing from assessment and strategy.

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., 6, 765, 2009.

C74