

Interactive comment on “A bio-optical model for remote sensing of Lena water” by H. Örek et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 21 May 2013

A previous reviewer has made a very thorough check of the manuscript and made many comments/questions/suggestions. Therefore, I have just one general comment. At the moment the manuscript is kind of technical report of a field trip with a misleading title not a scientific paper.

The title starts with “A bio-optical model” while no model is discussed in the manuscript. If someone works on a bio-optical model for remote sensing purposes then one of the main results should be how well the model is describing the reality. The model as such is not described in the manuscript (just the parameters are given in the Appendix) and no comparisons have been made between model reflectance and field reflectance. Consequently the title of the manuscript cannot be “A bio-optical model ...”

The manuscript contains rather unique optical data from hardly accessible but a very important (from global carbon cycle point of view) place on Earth. I am in favour of

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



publishing just bio-optical data from different parts of the world. Such data is very much needed for cal/val of satellite algorithms, for example in studies trying to produce global carbon estimates in coastal waters. If publishing just data is not against the policy of the BGD, then the manuscript could be published after changing the title. Otherwise, the Authors must work a little bit on the manuscript to change it from a fieldwork report to a proper scientific paper.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 10, 4887, 2013.

BGD

10, C2050–C2051, 2013

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

