

Barboni et al. 2022, Review by A. Capet

Comment from 1st round : (Sect 2.1): Mention here already the multi-platform nature of the datasets (Argo, XBT, gliders, etc ..). It would then be relevant to provide the relative abundance of profiles obtained from each platform type. Also mention here explicitly, although briefly, that DT profiles are favored in case of spotted duplicates with NRT datasets.

Answer from authors : “We were indeed quite brief on the dataset description, as it was intended to be published separately in a data paper, in order to analyze with more details the mean eddy impact on climatology. The following figures should answer this question :”

Comment from 2nd round : The figures indeed answers the question for me, but it does not answer it for the readers, as no corresponding edit has been made. I believe this can be addressed with one or two additional sentences in (now) Sect. 2.2.

2nd answer from author : 2 sentences were added in Sect.2.2 to describe dataset multi-platform distribution and briefly comment their temporal availability :

‘These datasets are multi-platform, gathering in situ vertical measurements from CTDs, XBTs (mostly before 2008), Argo floats (mostly after 2005, with a strong increase after 2012) and gliders (mostly after 2008), enabling an average 10000 profiles available per year from 2011 onwards’

And at the end of the section :

‘Complete database then accounts for 157053 profiles in total, with the following platform distribution : 8596 CTDs, 11375 XBTs, 60019 Argo, 76967 glider profiles and 96 unspecified.’

Also note that platform distribution is slightly different than what was displayed in the 1st review. It is due to the fact that some CTD and XBT profiles were not listed as such, because the type of file digram can be different from ‘CT’ or ‘XB’. At last few profiles remain with an unknown type (for more details, the reader is referred to CMEMS Product User Manual 013-001-B)