

## ***Interactive comment on “The role of EMODnet Chemistry in the European challenge for Good Environmental Status” by Matteo Vinci et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 17 August 2016

**Summary:** The author presents EMODNet-Chemistry, i.e., a portal that should deliver data and metadata for different chemical groups that are directly related to the Marine Strategy Framework Directive and, in particular, to the definition and monitoring of the Good Environmental Status of marine environments. The paper also provides a good and clear explanations of the main objectives of the EU in addressing maritime issues and describes relationships and roles among different European “structures” such as the MSFD, the DG-MARE, etc.

**General Comment:** The paper is well structured and it clarifies several “entities”, efforts, and tools that the EC and the EU set in order to bridge the gaps among marine science, data collection and availability, and marine policies. The reader will definitely appreciate the clear explanation of how the EMODNet-Chemistry portal (as well as similar portals) addresses the main environmental protection needs. However, there

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



are several, specific points that make the paper not suitable for a scientific audience: some parts need to be expanded (the authors may not be familiar with some definitions) and most of the figures are not well presented (see specific comments). In particular, most of the figures are not mentioned within the text.

Specific comments: Line, 9: The authors should provide a very brief explanation of the GES. . . several non-EU marine scientists will not understand what the Good Environmental Status is.

Line 27: Define here the acronyms GES

Line 28-29: This sentence is good for the abstract. Here, in Intro, the authors should spend some more words for defining and explaining the GES.

Line 35: rephrase as: “Some efforts have already been undertaken by Member States in 2012, which provided initial assessments of. . .[explain]”

Line 40: rephrase as: “As a consequence, evaluation at higher level. . .”

Line 42-43: This sentence is not clear. Please, explain better.

Line 50: A reference is needed here.

Line 65: Please, rephrase as: “Metadata, i.e., all the information needed to describe exhaustively the data, are. . .”

Line 70: Please, rephrase as: “The standardization is done at two main levels by following the interoperability principles provided by INSPIRE: ”

Line 72: Replace “thanks to” with “by means of”

Line 90: The list should end with a come, such as “seabed habitats, and physical oceanography.”

Line 100: I would write “Ocean Data View (ODV)”. Some readers may not know what ODV is.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Line 109; Rephrase as “in data collection, data analyses, validation, and creation. . .”

Line 129: Refer here to Fig. 1

Figure 1: In general all figures seem to be done in haste. In Figure 1 caption should clearly explain the meaning of colors, logos, and logo positions.

Figure 2: This figure is quite useless. It would be much more interesting to show a density map, or something similar, which might highlight the differences among sub-basins in the EMODNet-Chemistry coverage. The figure is note cited within the text.

Figure 3: The figure is not cited within the text

Table 1 and 2: They are not cited within the text. Moreover, I do not understand the text “With the following. . .” on top of these tables. It looks like that the tables want to be connected to Figure 4. This is unusual and distractive.

Line 210-213: It would be better to provide some references here. See Colella et al. (2016) [PloS one 11 (6), e0155756] and references therein.

Figure 5: Yet, this is a screen shot from the web. It would be better to show an actual figure that is downloadable from the web and then explain in the caption how that map can be obtain from the portal. The figure is not cited within the text.

Figure 6: Is this really useful? The figure is not even cited within the text. If the author believe that Fig. 5 is needed I would strongly recommend not to use a slide from power point. This is not suitable for a scientific publication.

Figure 7: I understand that here it is useful to show a screen shot. However, the caption should state this.

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2016-226, 2016.

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