

## ***Interactive comment on “Meteorological buoy measurements in the Iceland Sea 2007–2009” by Guðrún Nína Petersen***

**I. Brooks (Referee)**

i.brooks@see.leeds.ac.uk

Received and published: 3 August 2017

This article provides an overview of the meteorological and oceanographic data from a 2-year deployment of a moored buoy in the Iceland Sea, along with brief details of data quality issues. Overall it provides a useful reference for anyone wishing to use these data, and is suitable for publication with minor revision.

I would like to see details of the instrumentation makes and models either added to table 1 or provided as a separate table. This is an essential reference for users of the data. Also, in table 1, details of the measurement uncertainty as well as resolution should be given – the uncertainty is far more important (the air temperature resolution might be 0.001 °C, but its accuracy will be nowhere near that! The resolution of the RH

C1

measurement is given as 0.01%, but I'd be surprised if its accuracy were better than ~2% at best).

The figures showing plotted data are generally OK, but I would ask that the pale grey background with white grid lines be swapped for simple black axes and grid lines. The grid lines are a little difficult to see on a print out, and while the figures look fine on my laptop screen, on my desktop display, the pale grey is lost completely, leaving plotted lines floating with a few labels around them, but no visible axes, tick marks, grid lines, etc. Tick-label font size could also do with being increased a bit.

Where there are multiple lines on a plot, please add explicit details of which colour line is which variable in the figure caption.

Page 2, line 10: ‘...and a sealed lead acid backup batteries.’ – number agreement, either ‘...and sealed...batteries’ or ‘...and a sealed...battery.’

Page 3, line 6: ‘...a list over times...’ → ‘...a list of times...’ Page 3, line 9: ‘...where appropriated’ → ‘...where appropriate’

Page 4, lines 5-7. The ‘bad’ pressure data is stated to be ‘off’ – more explicit details would be useful. Is that a mean bias, wild disagreement uncorrelated to ECMWF? I assume the bad data are omitted from the public data set not just the plot? Are they actually so bad as to be useless, or might they be useful in a relative sense (tracking high/low pressure) if not absolute? If potentially useful/correctable then publishing the data but with a quality control flag might be worth while.

Page 6, line 12: ‘...slower then the fall...’ → ‘...slower than the fall...’

Page 7, line 1-2: ‘differences between the water temperature and the air temperature ... varied between 0.5°C and 3.3°C’ – for clarity’s sake, please be explicit about the sign of this different: (Ta – SST) or (SST – Ta)

Page 8, lines 6-7: ‘All measurement have an annual variation..., as well as more variability’. First, ‘all measurement’ is potentially ambiguous, be explicit as to variables

C2

'Both wave height and wave periods have an annual...'. Second, '...as well as more variability' is ambiguous – which season is more variable (yes we can infer it from the figure, but...)

---

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2017-67>, 2017.