

Interactive comment on “Black Sea coastal forecasting systems” by A. I. Kubryakov et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 5 January 2012

The manuscript aims for the description of the actual status of the Black Sea coastal forecasting systems. These systems were further developed within the frame of the EU FP 6 supported project ECOOP. While the subject of coastal now- and forecasting is a burning issue in the operational oceanography environment, the manuscript lacks a more dedicated general and referenced description of the actual needs for such a system. A more comprehensive description of the state of the art in the coastal forecasting system is desirable. Furthermore, I miss detailed descriptions of important features of the forecasting system, i.e. the description of the ecosystem part as well as there are parts of the manuscript that are unclearly written. Some figures should be combined (i.e. Fig 1 and Fig 2) and points of interest in these figures should be more clearly marked. Additionally, it would be of great value to include a paragraph of the main oceanographic/hydrographic features of the area of interest for a reader which is not that familiar with the Black Sea region.

C861

I recommend despite of the general negative impression the publication of the manuscript after MAJOR revisions.

Below, I will give some detailed comments that should be considered for the revision of the manuscript.

1. In the introduction the state of the art in coastal forecasting systems should be described more detailed by referencing the important efforts undertaken by others.
2. The simulated regions in Figure 1 are described within the Kubryakov et al paper from 2006 and no results are presented here, so that should only be referenced or if wished to be included in the actual manuscript incorporated in Fig 2. The regions referenced in the text should be clearly marked in the specific figures, otherwise it is difficult to identify the specific region. That would improve also the identification of areas in the validation part of the manuscript
3. While the POM model (original citation should be incorporated) is well known and therefore the description provided is sufficient, the model developed by the Institute of Geophysics in Georgia is less well known and at least its principles should be introduced by at least a short paragraph or an appropriate citation should be included.
4. The basic principles for the Ecosystem part used within this study are not sufficiently described. Here either appropriate citations or a comprehensive description is necessary to include.
5. All claims named in the text must be proved by references
6. It is named that all the models are carefully calibrated against observations, but no description/referencing of this data that is available for that effort and that is seen as of crucial importance to be provided prior to final publication. Another question is the period used for calibration.
7. All Abbreviations used within the text and figures, should be explained resp data sets should be referenced correctly (EuroMISS, NOAA etc.)

C862

8. Inconsistencies between the forecast description (one day hindcast and three day forecasts) compared to the products description (four days forecasts) must be avoided!
9. The quality of the product example figures is very low. Prior to the final publication all the important features must be clearly seeable and labels must be readable for all the figures
10. Inconsistencies between figures and description of figures must be avoided!
11. By reading this manuscript separated from the rest of the special issue that ECOOP is aiming for, it appears to be desirable to include at least a short general description of the concerted validation approach applied within the ECOOP project. It would be valuable to discuss the application of common tools for the validation and publication of the validation results.

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., 8, 1055, 2011.