

Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., referee comment RC1
<https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2021-311-RC1>, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on **essd-2021-311**

Anonymous Referee #1

Referee comment on "Application of a new net primary production methodology: a daily to annual-scale data set for the North Sea, derived from autonomous underwater gliders and satellite Earth observation" by Benjamin R. Loveday et al., Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2021-311-RC1>, 2021

The paper presents a data set of net primary production (PP) concentrated in an area of 2 degrees lat x 2 degrees lon, with data also from a wider 4 degrees lat x 5 degrees lon area, in North Sea covering a period of 19 months from November 2017 to May 2019. The data derive from the integration of in situ, satellite and glider observations. Therefore the calibrated data derive from the single point measurements along the oblique glider trajectories, which is what is normally done using glider data. The procedure for obtaining depth integrated primary production values, which is one of the final products, is similar to that by Hemsley et al, 2015, cited by the authors, which is turn based on different bio-optical models to obtain: E_d^+ , $E_d(z,\lambda)$, and PP itself.

So far I could not access to the data base, because I always got 'service unavailable', therefore I don't know if any technical annex is available. It would be useful to add some technical details, such as the descent angle and the depth range of glider oscillation. I assumed a descent angle of 28° which, for a 0-1000 m excursion, would mean a spatial span of ~400 m for each down-up trajectory. I am a little perplex, not having any spectral data, of using a spectral model for PP. I am aware that it was used also by Hemsley et al, but it looks like a sort of vicious circle. I am wondering if, considering the errors inherent in each of the used models, how the results would compare with those of a simpler, non-spectral model. However the effort may pave the way to the use of spectral sensor which might be available soon on ARGO profilers. Another possible analysis would be to compare their PP results with the backscattering derived POM, for the gliders that are equipped with the sensor.

My other perplexity is about publishing this data set on ESSD. Not too much for the limited spatio-temporal span but because it seems to me that the main contribution of the study is that of having implemented a flexible, automatic procedure which may be used in many other contexts. This procedure, for what I read is made available by the authors. A Journal like Environmental Science and Technology could be, in my opinion, more appropriate. However, I think that this is mostly an editorial choice.

