

Interactive comment on “VISIR: Technological infrastructure of an operational service for safe and efficient navigation in the Mediterranean Sea” by G. Mannarini et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 20 April 2016

I have just finished reviewing the manuscript titled “VISIR: Technological infrastructure of an operational service for safe and efficient navigation in the Mediterranean Sea”, submitted for publication in NHESS. The authors present the software and operational architecture of a DSS for safe and efficient navigation. There is no doubt that the work is of high standard and involves large-scale operational modeling of several physical parameters, combined with a multi layer interface for post-processing and visualization. I also found that the online platform is of good quality and rather intuitive. Finally the paper is well written, but I am afraid I cannot recommend publication without major changes. My main concern is about the content of the paper, and the selection of the journal, even though it is submitted as part of a special issue on situational sea

C1

awareness. The paper is focusing on the software platforms and technology used to calculate and visualize optimal routes. Therefore it feels more like a technical report or manual written by a software developer and not like a manuscript prepared for a natural hazards journal. No natural processes are mentioned, while there is no theory, no initial hypothesis, no analysis and no results. The manuscript mentions some technical aspects of a web application and even though I lack the expertise to follow and evaluate the system architecture, the description looks rather vague so it doesn't really provide the reader with a clear idea of how the system was built. The examples provided in the end are the most relevant part of the paper to the scope of the journal and the special issue, but no background on the route evaluation method is provided and my final impression was that the work was submitted to the wrong journal. Starting from the title, I see a weak link between 'safe and efficient navigation' and natural hazards. Acknowledging that the title is relevant to the special issue, I find that the authors should move the software aspects to the supplementary material and focus more on the natural processes involved, as well as on the best route calculation methodology. The title of the special issue is also the only reason I didn't recommend to reject the manuscript, but it is clear that as a coastal oceanographer I don't have the right background to review the work, therefore I would prefer not to review the revision. Finally, the best route functionality is not available in the free version of the online system, therefore I would recommend that reviewers should be provided with free online access to the full system.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2016-32, 2016.

C2