

## ***Interactive comment on “Remote sensing of sea ice: advances during the DAMOCLES project” by G. Heygster et al.***

**K. Dethloff (Editor)**

Klaus.Dethloff@awi.de

Received and published: 3 April 2012

Dear authors,

I received three referee reports on your manuscript and I would like to thank the reviewers for their valuable reviews.

Reviewer 1 suggests that the presented new scientific results can be considered as important contributions to the research field, which could be publishable if their description with respect to missing details is improved. He is not satisfied with the quality of the review part of your manuscript.

Reviewer 2 does not see any problems in summarizing and evaluating previously published and presenting new results, but suggests also some major comments for revisions.

C234

sions.

Reviewer 3 argues that the scientific content is of great importance for the science community but does not meet the high evaluation standards of the journal. He suggests to distinguish previously published from new results and to clarify the new results better. His argumentation follows partly reviewer 1.

In summary all reviewers ask for major revisions and some suggestions are common to all three reviews. Reviewer 1 and 3 asked for a stronger focus on presenting the new results. I agree with that view and encourage the authors to submit a revised manuscript version as original research article.

kind regards

Klaus Dethloff

---

Interactive comment on The Cryosphere Discuss., 6, 37, 2012.