

Interactive comment on “Optical remote sensing of the Gulf of Gabès – relation between turbidity, Secchi depth and total suspended matter” by R. Katlane Essersi et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 12 January 2011

As a follow up to the last review the paper has improved, this review is on the supplement <http://www.ocean-sci-discuss.net/7/C647/2011/osd-7-C647-2011-supplement.pdf>.

- use of citation managers could be very useful see Journal guidelines
- bibliography needs to be validated with the manuscript citations and if paper is another language besides english please indicate this as suggested in the last review.
- use of space between operator and units and numerical values

Specific comment (1) please check your referencing with Journal guidelines, in this manuscript for an article with more than two authors its cited as e.g. Buroillet and al

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



- (1979) which should be Burollet et al. (1979)
- (2) the references made in the manuscript do not match those in the bibliography e.g. Morel and Gordon, 1980 and Sogreha, 2002
- (3) on page 1, line 35, why but?(4) line 39, 'in addition...' not clear
- (5)line 41, do you mean illustrated?
- (6) Page 2, line 5, relationships with what?
- (7) line 7, where is the citation in the bibliography?
- (8) line 9-11, which previous studies are being referenced here?
- (9)line 12 - systematic use of capitals in the sensor MODIS
- (10) where is the citation for Mueller et al. 2004?
- (11)last paragraph of introduction line 22-26, what are the implications for improvements? To simply apply method a, at site b, is not very innovative, maybe add something
- (12) in line 36 do you mean Level 1 and Atmosphere Archive and Distribution System (LAADS)?
- (13)line 42 add described by (Nechad, XXXX) and check referencing guidelines
- (14) is it 667 nm or 667 μm ? see introduction page 2 line 15, 19
- (15) page 3 line 27 did you mean 'test' instead of 'tried'?
- (16)Equation 1, 2 suggest that TSM and TU are both based on R_RS 667 alone is this true?if so then correlation is expected
- (17) section 2.1.1 can be combined with section 2.1 as both pertain to MODIS
- (18)page 3 line 22 to 24 'For example...' you can show it or maybe delete the statement

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

(19)line 28 'If...' what is the relevance to this study?

(20)line 39 given the maximum observed value of 3.88NTU this looks like a large interval. Please provide the accuracy of measurement/event,line 42 quite a lot isn't it 19% and 29%? maybe explain why? line 44 it not necessary to give reference to inventor (Secchi) and you need to provide the disc specification, diameter and quote a procedure.

(21) page 4- line 2 do you mean pre-washed? or does it mean combustion of organic material? again reference style here –(Tilstone et al., 2002) check!

(22)line 18 to 20, so what does that mean ? connection of this sentence to the previous? please explain

(23) line 33, what units represent the AOT 0.142?? line 6 page 5 better quantify '...majority...' since Table 1 gives insitu statistics maybe better to give also for satellite data used

(24)suggest 'seaborne' instead of 'sea borne'

(25) 'Conclusions' instead of 'Summary and Recommendation'

(26)In this paper a critical discussion is missing i.e. few reference is made along the lines 'This corresponds to measurements by...' or 'our findings agree well with' (27) Yes this is right – line 5 -6 on page 6 —————

Technical corrections (1) In this paper, is R^2 different from correlation coefficient and regression coefficient? if so please be uniform throughout the manuscript

(2) space between numerical values and units or operators e.g. 2m is better presented as 2 m.

(3) combine paragraphs to limit number of paragraphs in the whole manuscript

(4) R_{RS} the RS in caps and italics

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

Interactive
Comment

- (5) page 3 equation 1 and 2 too many brackets check this
- (6) page 3 line 34 , please be consistent 5th or 5th ?
- (7) page 4 line 22 to line 42 check for spaces between units and numeral and also on line 28 add : after (Fig. 3.b) and better 'contains' not 'contain'
- (8) equations are better placed in a new line and follow the guidelines of journal
- (9) Figures need to be resized they are just too small
- (10) the plots need to have the outer borderlines removed, and add top and right axis resize to fit page see guidelines of the journal

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., 7, 1767, 2010.

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