**Article choosen : Maelle Humblet \_ The salinity signature of Agulhas mesoscale eddies**

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

The purpose of this study was to characterize the properties of eddies in the area of Agulhas current. For that, temperature and salinity from SMAP/SMOS data were used. After that, eddies were separated in several classes: monopolar or dipolar and cyclonic or anti-cyclonic. Cyclonics and anti-cyclonics eddies are well distributed in the two areas (Subtropical front and Agulhas current).

**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?**

The overall purpose of this study is well explained in the introduction.

**2. Does the interpretation of the findings answer the overall question of the**

**paper?**

The table 1 at the end of the article answers to the overall question.

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

**question?**

Paragraph in the introduction doesn't answer very well to the overall question which is not the case for the rest of the article !

**If no, point to some examples:**

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

No

**If yes, point to some examples:**

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

No it wasn't very clear

**Suggestions for improvement:** Maybe space out more several paragraphs

**Individual sections:**

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

Yes, it does

**Suggestions for improvement:**

**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)?**

Here, the abstract doesn't give the conclusion and the main results obtain.

**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 introduction gives explications on the formation of eddies and the oceanographic context of the area. It's useful to understand the following.

**4. Does this paper put the progress it reports in the context of existing**

**published work? Is there adequate referencing and introductory discussion?**

Any context of previews study about the same subject is enounced here.

**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?**

We don't really know which software was used for that.

**6. Is the results sections(s) clearly and concisely written? Are there logical and**

**smooth transitions between sections, subsections and between paragraphs?**

The results are well explained, even if the table could have been inserted on the previous page. It would have been clearer.

**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?**

The conclusion explain well the results obtain from the SMOS/SWAP data and the eddies characteristics.

**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?**

The methodology used is logical to answer to the overall question.

**9. Are all parts of the text, references, graphics and tables necessary for the new**

**results and main points to be understood?**

Yes, but it would have been great to put and satellite image of the Agulhas current and the detached eddies in this area.

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

Yes, they are.

**• Sentences and Wording**

**1. Can you find grammatical mistakes?**

"present" instead of "present" (page 2)

**2. Can you point to sentences that loose you (too long/complex) and do you**

**have suggestions for improvement?**

"We found that the anticyclonic eddies in the Agulhas current show almost the same proportions of monopolar and dipolar structures in salinity, while in the subtropical front they have exactly the same proportions."

Correction: Concerning anticyclonic eddies in Agulhas current, the proportion of monopolar/dipolar structures in salinity anticyclonic eddies is equivalent. In the subtropical front, the proportion is exactly the same.

**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?**

"We **first** wanted" or "We **then** wanted": the order of words is not correct

**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?**

The writing is cohesive and we understand well the logic used by the author.

**5. Are the paragraphs coherent? Do the first and last sentences of paragraphs**

**match? Can you find counter-examples?**

The paragraphs are coherent.

**6. Is there an abusive use of passive voice?**

The author use a lot the direct voice using "we" all the time.

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

No, I did not find any

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

No, everything was clear and well explained.

**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 it is

**• Other comments?**

It would have been easier to understand the article in putting the title of each part. Too much direct voice is used