**Ocean Science
Discussions**

Interactive comment on "A study on distribution of chlorophyll-$\vec{a}$ in the coastal waters of Anzali Port, south Caspian Sea" *by* S. Jamshidi and N. Bin Abu Bakar

J. M. Huthnance (Editor)

jmh@noc.ac.uk

Received and published: 2 June 2011

If the authors intend to continue to submission to Ocean Science, they should

1) Respond to the reviewers' comments indicating how any revised submission would deal with each comment. Nowadays this is a normal accompaniment to a revised submission; it is especially relevant to the content in Ocean Science Discussions where at present we have unanswered comments.

2) Attend in any revised submission to all the comments made by the reviewers and others in the Discussion. In my opinion all these comments have merit – and many are common to both reviewers.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

3) Refer in any revised submission to Jamshidi et al. (2009) "A study on concentrations of dissolved oxygen and chlorophyll-a in the coastal waters of Babolsar".

4) Make some advance on methodology, understanding or theory already published. Ocean Science is not the place for one of multiple reports on Iranian waters in the Caspian. Indeed a set of reports on different areas of Iranian waters would be best as a collection in one journal (perhaps AJAS because Jamshidi et al. (2009) is there).

5) Add some guiding structure. In my opinion paragraphs should have fewer than 200 words. At their present length, the Results and Discussion sections would benefit from sub-headings. If no sub-headings, then at least each paragraph should begin with a sentence that clearly indicates its topic.

6) Remove from the text, detail that is clear in the figures. Nevertheless, statements in the text do need to say how they are justified by data in the figures.

It is likely that editing for improved English would be recommended.

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., 8, 435, 2011.