Ocean Sci. Discuss., 9, C1173–C1174, 2012 www.ocean-sci-discuss.net/9/C1173/2012/ © Author(s) 2012. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribute 3.0 License.



**OSD** 

9, C1173-C1174, 2012

Interactive Comment

## Interactive comment on "Predictions for oil slicks detected from satellite images using MyOcean forecasting data" by G. Zodiatis et al.

G. Zodiatis et al.

gzodiac@ucy.ac.cy

Received and published: 19 October 2012

Third Reply to Anonymous Reviewer #1

After further discussion with my co-author Prof. R. Lardner we are modified the ms in order to use the word "hindcast" instead of the word "backtracking" suggested by the reviewer 1.

Therefore, please consider this change of the word throughout the ms based on the following explanations.

Any possible misunderstanding of our use of the term 'hindcast' is now obviated by an addition to the footnote at the beginning of Section 2. We shall continue to use this term since it is the correct one for the antithesis of 'forecast' and moreover is the one

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

**Discussion Paper** 



traditionally used in oil spill modelling.

Regarding the other points made by the reviewer: The noun 'backtracking' is a gerund so describes the ACTION of the verb 'to backtrack'. It does not describe the result. It is analogous to the noun 'forecasting', not to the noun 'forecast'. To have a noun describing the result of backtracking one would need to invent a word: the obvious choice would be 'a backtrack' but, as far as I know, this word does not currently exist in the language. In any case the phrase 'forecast and backtracking' is a juxtaposition of two unlike words through which any self-respecting editor would draw a red line.

'Backtracking' means retracing one's OWN steps, never the steps of some other creature. This is not at all analogous to retracing some physical process. Our web page was written by non-native speakers of English. Like the Queen of England we are not bound by the mistakes of our servants. Yes it would be an improvement to revise what has apparently become the jargon of oceanographers and it is hard to imagine a better place than the pages of an ocean sciences journal in which to do it.

Thanks for understanding our view.

Please also note the supplement to this comment: http://www.ocean-sci-discuss.net/9/C1173/2012/osd-9-C1173-2012-supplement.zip

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., 9, 1973, 2012.

## **OSD**

9, C1173–C1174, 2012

Interactive Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

