Ocean Sci. Discuss.,
doi:10.5194/os-2016-22-RC2, 2016

Ocean Science
Discussions
Open Access
EGU

Interactive comment on "Seabirds as samplers of the marine environment – a case study in Northern Gannets" *by* Stefan Garthe et al.

M. Frederiksen (Referee)

mfr@bios.au.dk

Received and published: 3 October 2016

This brief manuscript presents some results from one season of tracking of Northern Gannets at a German colony. These results are interesting and nicely presented. However, I'm not sure I fully understand exactly what the authors are trying to do here – what is the aim of the manuscript, and which questions are the authors trying to answer? The manuscript seems to simply be a case study of what can be learned about seabird foraging behavior through biologging. I guess the lack of a broader context and clear aims is related to the fact that the manuscript forms part of a special issue, and that the authors are trying to show how seabirds can play a part in an ocean observation network. However, in my opinion the manuscript should also be accessible and interesting to readers who're unfamiliar with COSYNA, and this will require a bit more context, more clearly defined aims, and a discussion of the pros and cons of the

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

chosen approach in terms of reaching those aims.

It is difficult to come up with more specific comments. The examples chosen are neatly presented, and the methodology appears to be up to date, although perhaps not innovative. The authors could without doubt have chosen to present other interesting results, I imagine some of these will be presented in other contexts. The results on dive behavior are based on a minuscule sample size (4 individuals), and this should be kept in mind when interpreting the results (e.g. differences in dive depth relative to other studies).

Minor comments: - P- 2, l. 15: 'have a strong influence on . . .' or similar. - P. 3, l. 28: perhaps more informative to say 'central' tail feathers. - P. 6, l. 21: the reference here should be to Fig. 7. - Fig. 7: please add at least a time axis. I guess the acceleration axis is difficult to label informatively.

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/os-2016-22, 2016.