Interactive comment on “Technical Note: Field experiences using UV/VIS sensors for high-resolution monitoring of nitrate in groundwater” by M. Huebsch et al.

J. Rozemeijer (Referee)
joachim.rozemeijer@deltares.nl

Received and published: 30 November 2014

This manuscript contains valuable information for a growing number of scientists, applied researchers, and water managers that apply continuous monitoring of NO3. The technical background, advantages and disadvantages, and possible field problems of the two mostly used sensors are described in a very accessible way. I acknowledge the authors for sharing this useful information with the community and I am in favor of publication in HESS.

Just some minor comments: # 12293_8: Is ‘breaching’ common here? ‘Exceeding’ maybe better # 12293_9: Please add that this is the MAC for drinking water # 12293_21-23: Specify why these two sensors were tested. Are they the only systems using spectrophotometry available? # 12293_23: For comparison purposes, it seems more reasonable to apply both sensors at both locations. Please explain why one sensor was tested in Ireland and the other in Jordan. # Introduction: You may want to add info on what was already known about the performance of the sensors from the providers and from previous applications. And specify what you add to this existing knowledge.

# 12296_14-16: Why does the manufacturer advise this? # 12299_7-11: The setup was already described before. # 12299_14&16 and further: What is ‘mains’? # paragraph 3.3: Were the interfering substances not measured? What interfering substance caused the offset? Do you have info to quantify the interference by different substances? # 12300_19-20: consider rephrasing ‘calibration intervals can be performed on a long term basis’, eg: x month calibration intervals are sufficient’ # 12300_26: precicion→precision # 12302_20: “water with salt content”->“water with high a salt content” # 12303_8: remove comma after although