

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

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



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

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

‘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.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

