

Interactive comment on “The ADRIREEF database: a comprehensive collection of natural/artificial reefs and wrecks in the Adriatic Sea” by Annalisa Minelli et al.

Chiara Venier (Referee)

chiara.venier@cnr.it

Received and published: 1 February 2021

I consider this article appropriate to support the publication of the dataset presented. So far, a comprehensive dataset of natural/artificial reefs and wrecks in the whole Adriatic Sea was missing. The possibility to use a complete mapping of this data is definitely important in the Adriatic Sea study area, in a context driven by the EUSAIR strategy (European Commission, 2014 - <http://www.adriatic-ionian.eu/component/edocman/34-action-plan-eusair-pdf>) and the wider Blue Growth initiative (European Commission, 2017). The importance of this study and the dataset produced, is clearly confirmed by the fact that it has been produced within the

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



ADRIREEF project, funded by the EU Interreg Italia-Croatia Programme. For these reasons, the data have potential for reuse in the future for the blue economy purposes, including the maritime spatial planning implementation. For example, the dataset can be very useful for the initial assessment and for the subsequent identification of planning measures for the sustainable development of tourism in a specific study area. Indeed, the data presented here (natural/artificial reefs and wrecks) have been already partially mapped in the Tools4MSP Data Portal (<http://data.tools4msp.eu/>) and PORTODIMARE (<https://www.portodimare.eu/>) Data Portal within the Maritime Spatial Planning framework. The datasets presented here is consistent, in terms of geographical location and other physical-ecological-economic characteristics, with the datasets present in the above-mentioned Data Portals. The methodology presented in the article, including the production and elaboration of questionnaires, is certainly an effective method to collect the most appropriate data, as well as onerous in terms of the amount of work needed for the production-identification of the addressees-the consequent data elaboration, for the creation of such a specific dataset, where the information is generally not easily reachable. The data set publication is of high quality: data are usable in the format and size provided. The most appropriate metadata have been here identified as well as described clearly and in detail. It is also clear reported where information is missing. Overall, the article is also well structured and clear, as well as language consistent and precise.

Few specific comments: 1. The methods and materials are overall described in detail in the paper. I only suggest including a clearer definition of what natural/artificial reefs and wrecks are, just at the beginning of the 2.2.1 section (before line 112). The definition of wrecks is actually included at lines 83 and 140, but a very brief introduction of the distinction of the three elements could be integrated. 2. Do you investigate also the www.relitti.it database? This database was suggested by stakeholders within the marine tourism sector (in the frame of an H2020 project) and might be compared to these wrecks data. 3. How many questionnaires were collected? only by Partners or also a wider network? This information could be included in line 152. 4. Line 183: the

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

“groups” are mentioned here for the first time after line 31 in the abstract, so a short introduction can be included.

Few minor technical corrections: Line 43: missing EU Directive 2014/89/UE reference
Line 53: missing Pivetta et al., 2012 reference
Line 60: suggestion to include the website citation of the “Reefbase project”
Line 63: please correct Tara et al. with Tora et al.
Line 87: please delete the point at the beginning of the line
Line 91: the link is not active anymore
Line 97: the website is currently unavailable
Line 150: impossible with possible?

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2020-384>, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

