

Interactive comment on “Technical Note: Algal Pigment Index 2 in the Atlantic off the Southwest Iberian Peninsula: standard and regional algorithms” by Priscila Costa Goela et al.

V. Suslin (Referee)

slava.suslin@gmail.com

Received and published: 9 August 2016

Questions

- page 3 line 30: you write “ .. when η is below the threshold $\eta=1$ ”. Why $\eta < 1$ but more or less 1?
- What the satellite data selection criteria you used in this study to analyze the quality of the Algal Pigment Index 2 in Sagres? It is clear that all was done 99 series * 3 (A, B, C) = 297 ground truth measurements, and the main factor is cloudy. What have any other criteria (except cloud) been used?
- Page 12: Fig. 1(c,f): Are you sure that in these figures $N = 297$? I think $N = 54$. Check

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



please!

- Page 13: In Fig. 2(b) I believe that you had the opportunity to show all measurements $N = 297$, not only $N = 54$!

General comments

This research is actual. The regional bio-optical algorithms demand for more reliable results by using satellite ocean color data. This study is a continuation of the work of these authors (eg, IEEE GEOSCIENCE AND REMOTE SENSING LETTERS, Digital Object Identifier 10.1109 / LGRS.2016.2529182) for the development of a regional satellite algorithm in the Atlantic off the southwestern Iberian Peninsula.

Specific comments

- in “Introduction” issue: To outline a significance of your research to add reference/references to other regional algorithms (for example, for the Mediterranean Sea) GREGG , W.W. and CASEY , H.W., 2004, Global and regional evaluation of the SeaWiFS chlorophyll data set. Remote Sensing of Environment, 15 December, 93, Iss. 4, pp. 463–479, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2003.12.012.

- Statistics of in situ measurements by seasons is missed (among $N=54/297$ for stations A, B and C separately). In particular, it could be useful in connection with Fig. 2b.

- Warning: “Tchl_a (Ref, ABS)” can not be equated with the concentration of chlorophyll *a* in Sagres, we can only speak of in situ *aph* (442). Do you agree?

Technical corrections

Page 3 line 2: “Total chlorophyll *a* (Tchl_a) ..” repeat reference. The first reference to “Tchl_a” was on page 1 line 16 in Abstract.

Page 3 line 8: instead “ .. neural nets NN” stay “ .. neural nets” or “ .. NN”. The first reference to “NN” was on page 2 line 14

Page 3 line 8: “BOA“ The first reference to “BOA” was on page 2 line 6

Page 3 line 16: <http://ocportugal.org/sites/default/files/api2Sgr.pdf> - Page not found

Page 3 line 7: remove “:” in “2.2.1 MERIS Standard algorithm API2:”. The same for “2.2.1 Regional MLP NN algorithm:” on page 3 line 13

Page 4 line 1: “2.1 In situ reference data” move before issue “2.2.1 MERIS Standard algorithm API2”.

Page 12: In Figure 1(a), a caption of the X axis can be seen partially

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/os-2016-41, 2016.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

