

## ***Interactive comment on “Seasonal variability of upwelling radiance polarization over the Southern Baltic surface” by Włodzimierz Freda***

**W. Freda**

wlodzimierz.freda@wp.pl

Received and published: 16 April 2018

The comments of the reviewer are quoted below, the replies are given under each comment.

Q1: Although the addressed topic of polarization of upwelling radiance just below and just above the sea surface has scientific merit and significance, in my opinion this manuscript requires extensive major improvements in language and presentation of scientific content to make it suitable for a review process. In addition to numerous problems related to language, there are also various problems associated with unmet standards of scientific writing, such as the lack of precision in writing, the use of mental shortcuts, unclear formulation of scientific messages, inadequate preparation of fig-

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



ures (e.g., the lack of labels a,b, ... for the specific figure panels), and unsatisfactory figure captions that should be self-explanatory.

Reply I am grateful that the reviewer appreciates the importance of this topic. I hope that the following amendments will make the article meet the correct form and standard for publication. I decided to publish in Ocean Science because Copernicus Publications applies typesetting and language copy-editing during production. Figure captions and labels are corrected.

Q2 For example, in Abstract that should be self-explanatory, the term "inherent optical properties" is used without indicating that it relates to seawater (and not to the atmosphere which could potentially be also relevant in the context of Abstract), the term "wavelength" is used without indicating that it relates to light (and not, for example, to sea surface waves which could also be potentially relevant in the context of Abstract because sea surface is mentioned a few times), and the term "Monte Carlo simulations" is used without indicating what is actually being simulated (it should be specifically indicated that these simulations are for radiative transfer in the atmosphere-ocean system).

Reply Thank you very much for these comments. I think that all of them are right and I have made a correct amendment to the final version of the article. See the abstract: lines 7, 8, 10 and 13.

Q3 It appears that a preparation of improved manuscript would benefit from involvement of an English language expert in scientific writing who can help achieve correct and improved language and meet the standards of scientific writing and presentation.

Reply I tried to prepare the article as best as possible, but I agree that an English language expert in scientific writing will help in obtaining a higher standard of the paper. That is why I give my permission for the language copy-editing before the final publication.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.ocean-sci-discuss.net/os-2017-97/os-2017-97-AC1-supplement.pdf>

---

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/os-2017-97>, 2017.

**OSD**

---

Interactive  
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

