

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

(1) The monitoring stations described in this work were settled in the frame of the Italian Flagship Project RITMARE. One of the major aims of the RITMARE Project was the development of an interoperable Infrastructure for marine research. However, scientists usually disregard standards such as common terms for metadata, for parameters, data formats or controlled vocabularies as we can see in this data. The idea behind RITMARE was to provide scientists with tools and applications that would help scientists to share their data with a standardized and harmonized way. Is this monitoring activity addressing the RITMARE objectives? And if yes how?

(2) Page 5, line 109: The dataset is made of text files not excel files. Please correct it. Also correct it also at the (Data citation 1).

(3) Page 6, line 199: the format description needs some improvement. Explain what the first rows are about. Explain that the data are given in tab-separated columns, having a free text labeling (as it is given in the paper)

In each data file format description, use the same line separator and not only for the first one (e.g. the semicolon ; at the first row)

(4) Page 7: section 4 title: I would rather prefer to change it as "Technical and Data Validation"

(5) Page 7, lines 173-176: Data values outside the expected broad ranges are not always wrong values. Valuable information regarding the quality water changes caused by an extreme event either natural or human induced such as an accident, can be lost when eliminating instead of flagging data beyond plausible ranges.

A common practice in marine and ocean data management is the assignment of quality flags for each measurement. There are several quality flags schemas such as SeaDataNet, Ocean Data View, OceanSites, etc. I would suggest the use of such schemes in future releases of the data sets as well as the use of a common data format with standardized terms for metadata, parameters. This would facilitate the better understanding of data and their exchange with other research groups.

(6) Page 7, lines 177-179: the data validation description is quite general. As good data depends on good quality checks, the authors could provide more information on the conducted quality control checks with some examples if possible.

(7) Page 8, line 191: average values of dissolved oxygen and chlorophyll are not shown at Fig. 6.

(8) Pages 8, 9: the legends at Figures 3 are of smaller font than the Figure 4, please homogenize.

(9) Page 10: Figure 5, there is a mismatch between y-axis label and legend (for temperature). Please correct.

Same for Figure 6, mismatches between x axis, y axis and legends. Also, correct the units of chlorophyll at the legend.

For these two figures, I would change the x-axis title. A suggestion could be: Time series of measured water temperature and salinity in July 2015. Horizontal time axis is in (month/day/year).

(10) Page 10, Authors Contributions: MM does not exist.

COMMENTS ON DATA FILES

(11) Essential metadata are missing from the data files such as the stations location (latitude and longitude) which makes impossible the geographical representation of the stations by plotting tools. I would suggest to add them, in this way the data could be easily be plotted by tools like ODV together with the geographical positions of the measuring stations.

(12) In MP-TA-01-2015-temperature.txt file: the header description (line 3) says WATER QUALITY instead of WATER TEMPERATURE.

Same for MP-TA-07-2015-temperature.txt data file. Needs correction.

(13) The MG001, 2_meteo.txt data sets do not include a relevant header description as the rest of the data sets