



Interactive  
Comment

## ***Interactive comment on “Operational evaluation of the Mediterranean Monitoring and Forecasting Centre products: implementation and results” by M. Tonani et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 14 June 2012

Overall assessment:

This paper presents a very interesting validation system deployed for the Med Sea which is the result of a very important effort to gather observations of this area of the world (which was possible thanks to long term efforts of this team), to develop simple diagnostics (mainly differences between model and observations and their basic statistics such as bias –average- and spread –RMS-), and to routinely display the corresponding results on the web.

Going to the website, we can note that this is an impressive system as stressed by the first reviewer. However, I agree with this reviewer that the paper does not do the

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



system justice.

First, this paper does not address clearly any scientific question e.g. about the ocean or about the Med sea modeling or about the observing systems. It is more (and I agree with the first reviewer on this point) a technical description of a system deployed for operational purposes. In addition, since the scientific goal of this paper is not clearly identified, there is not really an underlying scientific methodology to reach the goals. This is really a weakness.

Moreover, this paper is full of typos, incomplete sentences ... A more precise reading of the paper before submission should have allowed to detect and correct most of them. Also the figures are mostly screenshots of the website, and for the purpose of publication, some of them should be redone (titles/axes labels not in English, too small titles –some of them almost unreadable–). This has been stressed for some cases by the first reviewer as well.

Finally, I think that even if the description of this system deserves to be published somewhere, it should not be published as a peer-reviewed scientific paper as it does not really help to improve our knowledge about scientific questions. My feeling is that this illustrate a more general question which is (to make it short) “where such technical system description should be published?”. So I suggest that this paper is not published in Ocean Science in the MyOcean special issue.

Specific comments:

I thank very much the first reviewer about the precise reading of the paper, and will not rewrite all the problems this reviewer has detected in the paper. I will only point out some of the points the first reviewer has not highlighted:

Chapter 2: you say that the OGCM config has 71 levels, other papers (and MyOcean website) say you have 72 levels, please explain.

Chapter 2 last sentence: you could refer to Fig 2 which illustrates the model coverage.

OSD

9, C583–C585, 2012

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Chapter 3.2: you talk about bi-linear interpolation, I think you mean linear interpolation instead ?

OSD

Chapter 4.1: Desaubies and not Desaubier

9, C583–C585, 2012

References #3 Drevillon et al. 2008: Laborie and not La-borie, Dombrowsky and not Dombrosky

Interactive  
Comment

Fig2: replace Blu by blue, Pink by pink (low cap)

Fig 4: poorly explained, and a good illustration of the overall quality of the figures that looks like direct screenshots of the website. What is the (almost unreadable on my screen) selector on the top left, what are all the red curves ? (I can guess they are the T(3m) timeseries from the model at the dots numbered 1 to 12 in the top/right panel, but It requires too much attention to try to guess and at the end, I'm not sure to understand what I see, a clearer caption would have helped)

---

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., 9, 1813, 2012.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

