

## ***Interactive comment on “Assessment of sensor performance” by C. Waldmann et al.***

### **R. Person (Referee)**

roland.person@ifremer.fr

Received and published: 24 September 2009

### GENERAL COMMENTS

The topic presented in this contribution is one of the most critical point to solve in the development of global observation systems. It is essential to reach consensus of assessment of the quality of collected data. Many scientists are not again aware of this aspect, as up to now data were mainly used for scientific purposes for local studies. The text would be shortened by using a more concise style and avoiding repetitions. I suggest to split the (too long) introduction in two parts: a first part to frame the problem in its general aspect and a second one giving some examples, as ARGO float program. It seems to me interesting to detail this example and underline difficulties encountered with the oxygen sensors. Authors are willing to convince the reader of the interest of assessment of sensor performance: one way would be to develop at the end of the

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



---

Interactive  
Comment

introduction an example showing the problems presently encountered. The conclusion would be how the ideas expressed in the contributions solved these problems. The need of assessment of sensor performance is not only revealed by global observation systems but also by long term archiving of data from different origins at the same geographical location. **SPECIFIC COMMENTS** I agree with all the comments of J. Cisneros-Aguirre. I would like add a 1) Page. 1689, (line 12) a fifth case: the willingness of some scientists to keep data to themselves. 2) Page. 1695 take an example, for example a temperature sensor to start and then generalize and give definitions of GUM. 3) Page 1696 (line15) example of sensor, transducer and detector would clarify the text. The example of the ADCP could be used for example for each definition. **TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS** Other referees pointed already very minor syntactical and spelling errors dispersed throughout the manuscript

---

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., 6, 1687, 2009.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper