Interactive comment on "A long term (1965–2015) ecological marine database from the LTER-Italy site Northern Adriatic Sea: plankton and oceanographic observations" *by* Francesco Acri et al.

Diego Fontaneto (Referee)

diego.fontaneto@cnr.it

Received and published: 2 August 2019

The datapaper is surely of great interest. Its positive sides are the presence of biotic and abiotic variables, the long-term coverage, and the detailed description of the rationale and the history of the data collection.

I think it will be highly relevant, even if it deals with a rather restricted area: the Northern Adriatic is one of the most studied seas of the world, due to the problems of Venice and high waters. Thus, the geographically restricted focus of the dataset is a positive

aspect, given the high scientific and political interest on the area.

I have only one major suggestion: at the moment, the manuscript does not describe in details the columns of the dataset. For example, the reader has to (easily) guess that Temp means temperature and Sal means salinity, but for other variables, such as Bot., Din, Si, Pheo, Alky, etc., it is not so easy and unambiguous to understand their meaning. It would be good to have the manuscript listing the headings of all the 43 columns of the dataset, and clearly explain what they are. For example, Table 2 could have an additional column unambiguously reporting the name of the column in the dataset for each of the variables. Such addition would make the dataset more relevant for more users.

Other minor issues that need to be addressed are:

Acronyms are not always explained: NAS in the abstract is not unambiguously reported, CTD on line 121, O&M on line 264, RDF on line 268, etc.

Figure 1 has lines in the water that are not explained in the figure caption (also in figure 3). Moreover, there is ambiguity between TeleSenigallia (in the figure) and Senigallia (in the caption).

Table 2 should explain the difference between "dimensionless" for salinity and "-" for pH.

Figure 4 does not contain exactly what is mentioned on line 215-221: only one column is present for "station", whereas line 217 states "Original station name and updated name", for which two different columns are expected from the reader; actually, the dataset has those two columns, but the figure does not have them. Both "sampling depth" on line 216 and "water column depth" on line 220 are mentioned in the text, but only one column with "depth" is present in figure 4.

There are some minor issues with the English language. Fore example the ambiguity between the terms "factor" and "parameter"; "applying of"; "much lowest"; "which" and

"that" not used consistently for restrictive and non-restrictive clauses (e.g. "which" on line 133 and 137, but "that" on line 305 and 307); "allow to" followed by a verb without a noun; etc.

C3