

## ***Interactive comment on “SeaConditions: a web and mobile service for safer professional and recreational activities in the Mediterranean Sea” by G. Coppini et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 5 August 2016

General comments: The system presented by the authors combines in-situ data and forecasts and makes such information accessible to users to plan marine operations and activities that can be hazardous periodically. It is based on the best understanding of such hazards and can be considered state of the art.

Scientific Quality: In general, the scientific and technical approach is clear with some small exceptions. This reviewer’s main concern is the extent to which the work presented herein overlaps with the previous publication by Lecci et al (2015). As this reference is not openly available it is difficult for this reviewer to assess the extent of an overlap in content (if any). The editor should satisfy themselves that the overlap is minimised. The reviewer welcomes the authors intent to publish the results to the wider

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



community.

Presentation Quality: Overall, the manuscript is well presented. Specific comments on language, figures etc are included later in this review.

Specific comments: This reviewer does not propose suggested changes to grammar, syntax etc but hopes that this will be picked up in the editing/proof reading process in more detail.

Page 2, line 6: “industry sector” should be replaced with “marine/maritime sector(s)”. Line 11: not sure if “competitor” products should be mentioned. Editor should clarify journal policy in that respect. Line 35: “This activity. . .”. Sentence is incomplete.

Page 3: Figure 1: USAM is not defined in the text or in the figure caption. Line 14: The nature/role of “LINKS” should be defined e.g. SME, research institute.

Page 4: Lines 2-35: A figure or table summarising the model extents and attributes would better serve the manuscript rather than the lengthy definition(s) provided. Line 20: A reference to or description of how river run-off is implemented would be helpful. Line 39: “Okeanos” is not defined

Page 5: Line 33: “channels” should be changed to “mechanisms” or “platforms”.

Page 6: Line 14: “ for days and a half” should be changed to “4.5 days”. Line 32: “on the base of..” should be changed to “depending on the. . .”

Page 7: Line 6: “high” should be changed to “height”.

Page 9: Figure 7: The intent is to show bathymetry. Suggest that temperature layer is removed to emphasise the bathymetry layer, hard to discern otherwise.

Page 10: Lines 9-12: The meaning of the first two bullet points are not clear and should be clarified. Figure 8: The images should be flattened and expanded to enhance readability.

Page 11: Lines 11 and 12: should be amended to “subscribing to” on both lines

Page 12: Line 6: “ to provide a service that” should be changed to “the provision of. . .”

Line 16: “living labs” should be explained or a reference provided Line 18: “experimentation” should be changed to “testing”

Page 13: Figure 11: The labels are difficult to read, this should be resolved before final publication.

Page 14: Many grammatical and spelling errors in “5. Conclusions and outlook”

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2016-176, 2016.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

