

Interactive comment on “The KM3NeT project: status and perspectives” by A. Margiotta

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 3 September 2012

This is a clear and timely report of the status of the KM3NeT project. The paper should be published after the author answers the question about Figure 2 and considers the optional suggestions.

Can a reference be given for the IceCube sensitivity and discovery potential in Fig. 2? Also, it would be good to give a qualitative explanation in the difference in shape of the KM3NeT curves as compared to the IceCube curves. In particular, why does the sensitivity improve near declination -90 deg for KM3NeT? Is it just a consequence of its mid-latitude location?

Here are a few stylistic suggestions: at line 5 in the abstract it would be better to write "...interdisciplinary observatory for marine sciences" (rather than "to").

Line 110 should read "...that have all been recognized as optimal sites..."

C129

Line 202: "causal" should be "causally"

In line 6 of Section 5 it would be better to "...have already proved to be fruitful." ("proved" instead of "shown")

At line 243 "represents a fundamental progress towards..." would be better as "represents a fundamental step towards..."

Interactive comment on Geosci. Instrum. Method. Data Syst. Discuss., 2, 575, 2012.

C130