On “ Seasonal Lagrangian study of eddies produced at the cape of kamchatka” (Alexandrer l’Her)

Summarize the main results of the article in a few sentences:

The Lagrangian particles moves mostly southwestward. These particles go further in winter than in summer because the EKC is stronger in winter. In summer there is an eddy called KE and it advects other eddies. We can see that because the trajectory of the particles change in summer, and even sometimes the particles stay trapped in the KE.

Answer the following questions about the structure of the paper:

Overall content:

1. Is the overall purpose of the study and /or central question clear?

   Yes : find out if the eddies formed at the capes of Kamchatka are the ones merging with the Kamchatka eddy

2. Does the interpretation of the findings answer the overall question of the paper?

   Yes : he shows that the change in trajectories during summer proved the KE advects particles and so eddies

3. Is every paragraph and sentence in the paper relevant to the overall question?

   Yes

4. Are there portions of the text that could be omitted?

   No

5. Is the overall organization of the paper clear and effective?

   Yes :

   Introduction

   Methods

   Results

   - In winter
   - In summer

- Velocities

Suggestions for improvement:

maybe the sentence about the focus on anticyclonic eddies in the first paragraph of the introduction should be put later (after the context for example)

maybe you could detail a little more the paragraph on the creation of anticyclonic eddies?

Individual sections:

1. Does the title adequately represent the content of the paper?

   Yes

   Suggestions for improvement:

   maybe state the main result in a title like : the southwestward drift of particles/eddies along Kamchatka ?

2. Does the abstract clearly and concisely summarize the paper and state the main results? Does is contain all needed information (context, need, task, object, findings and conclusion)?

   The abstract presents the area of study and the main results and how they proceeded

3. Does the introduction provide enough context to the readers? Does it state the need for the work? Does it state clearly what has been done to address it?

   The context is very clear, with the importance of eddies and then the presentation of the area of study
   It states clearly the focus of the work (anticyclonic eddies and more particularly the KE) and the question
   need?
   The task is clear (seed Lagrangian particles to get the trajectories)

4. Does this paper put the progress it reports in the context of existing published work? Is there adequate referencing and introductory discussion?

   Yes

5. Are the material and methods used in the study clearly explained? Can you point out what is special, unexpected, or different in the approach compared to existing published work? Does it contain too many technical details?

   The method is short but clear, there is not too technical details
   It states which data are used, which interpolation he performed and he states clearly the choice of parameters

6. Is the results sections(s) clearly and concisely written? Are there logical and smooth transitions between sections, subsections and between paragraphs?

   Yes
   separated in sections, one for each specific result (in winter, in summer, velocities)
   transitions ok

7. Does the conclusion clearly state the most important outcome of the work? Does it address the questions stated in the Introduction? Does the conclusion just summarize the results or does it interpret the findings and explain what they mean?

   Most important outcome of the work : the eddies merging with the KE are coming from the capes (address the question)
   interpretation of the results

8. Are the interpretations and conclusions adequately supported by the evidence presented? That is, are the assumptions valid, is the methodology sound, is the evidence adequate, and do the conclusions logically follow?

   Yes

9. Are all parts of the text, references, graphics and tables necessary for the new results and main points to be understood?

   Yes

10. Are the graphics and tables clear and their captions self-explanatory?

    The figures and tables are clear and necessary
    good captions

! Sentences and Wording

1. Can you find grammatical mistakes?

   'There are' instead of 'they are' in paragraph 4 of the winter results

2. Can you point to sentences that loose you (too long/complex) and do you have suggestions for improvement?

   The fourth paragraph in the section velocities : not very clear on the first reading, maybe adding a small sentence to recall that KE is strong in summer when EKC is weak would allow a better understanding

   I don't understand why a small difference in maximum velocities during winter and summer means that eddies are more important than KE ? (paragraph 5 of velocities)

3. Are generally the action in verbs, characters in subjects and subjects near verbs? Can you find counter-examples? Can you point out misused nominalizations?

   Yes
   I don't find misused nominalizatons

4. Is the writing cohesive? Does it flow well? Is the part of the sentence that links to the previous sentence at the beginning or the end?

   Yes it is easy to read and to understand

5. Are the paragraphs coherent? Do the first and last sentences of paragraphs match? Can you find counter-examples?

   Yes, one paragraph is for one idea

6. Is there an abusive use of passive voice?

   No

7. Can you find a lot of useless words/phrases?

   No

8. Can you find complex words that could be replaced by simpler ones?

   No

9. Can you find too complex subjects?

   No

10. Can you find inadequately used adverbs/ repetition/ excessive hedging?

    No

11. Is the use of tenses (past/present/future) adequate?

    Yes

! Other comments?