

Interactive comment on “A computational method for determining XBT depths” by J. Stark et al.

J. Stark et al.

jpabraham@stthomas.edu

Received and published: 15 August 2011

We have reviewed the reviewers comments and we are deeply appreciative of them. We have taken aim to incorporate the suggestions into a revised version of the paper and we believe the quality of the paper is substantially improved. Here are the specific actions taken in response to the review.

1. We have added “flow” as suggested
2. We have inserted the word “estimation” as suggested.
3. The reviewer is correct, we have fixed the error in the equation.
4. We have inserted the word “between” as suggested by the reviewer.
5. We have removed the superscript “old” from Eq. (7).

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



6. We have added a referencing sentence to clarify the origination of the adjunct function.

7. We have removed the “a” as suggested by the reviewer.

8. Change made as suggested by the reviewer.

9. “Using” has been changed to “used”

10. Change made to caption as suggested by the reviewer.

11. Change made to caption as suggested by the reviewer.

13. Change made to caption as suggested by the reviewer.

14. The abscissa has been changed, this graph was mislabeled

15. Change made to caption as suggested by the reviewer.

16. Change made to caption as suggested by the reviewer.

17. The reviewer makes a valid point here and we have added a sentence to indicate this point.

18. We have added a few sentences to quantify the mesh independency study.

19. The entirety of the probe was modeled. A sentence discussing this has been added to section 2.

21. We have removed the redundant sentence.

22. We have added a statement about the time-step size used in the forward integration.

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., 8, 1777, 2011.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

