

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

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 11 September 2016

Review of the manuscript: The role of EMODnet chemistry in the European challenge for good environmental status. M. Vinci, A.Giorgetti, M. Lipizer Submitted to Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences. REF: NHESS226-2016.

The paper describes the effort carried out by the EMODnet Chemistry community to make available, to the marine sciences audience, a reliable and effectively usable dataset for chemical and biogeochemical properties for the European Seas, aiming to contribute the information and knowledge base necessary for the EU-MSFD objective of “good environmental status” for the European Seas.

It is an important and highly valuable effort. The present manuscript does not attempt to extract scientific information from the data collected, but tries to provide a description of the structure and the quality of the data that EMODnet chemistry is going to make

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



available to the marine scientists communities.

Therefore, the manuscript, even if it cannot precisely be considered as a scientific paper providing original findings, deserves (in principle) publication. Unfortunately due to a series of formal problems it cannot be published in the present form, as it looks like hastily written, without taking much care in clarity and ordered structure.

A revision of the formal structure of the manuscript is absolutely mandatory.

Many concepts and information are taken for granted and a general reader might therefore find the manuscript rather confusing.

Figures (see below) are not correctly referenced in the text and often the relative captions are very, very sloppy.

Below some specific remarks that I hope might help the Authors to improve the manuscript.

Line 50: please explain better how a data management system could achieve interoperability and resilience. The explanations given are still a bit "obscure".

Line 111: MSFD and not MSDF

Line 163. explain better the criteria for data restriction

Line 195 and followings. Explain better (for the general reader) the meaning of codes such as P01 vocabulary and P35 vocabulary.

Section 6. Spend more words to illustrate the procedure for data mapping (DIVA protocol)!!!!

Section 6 Validation loop must be described better. Just putting a (not referenced) figure with a sloppy caption is not enough!!!!!!

Figures and tables are not correctly referenced in the text. Please reference them correctly. Just writing (for instance) "with the following data policy distribution" and

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



putting below a figure (or a table) is not OK. Moreover figure captions need to be rewritten in order to be more consistent with the pertinent text and with the figures themselves

In particular:

Figs 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 are not referenced in the text Tab 1. Is not referenced in the text and the caption needs rewriting Fig. 4 needs a better caption.

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

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

