

Interactive comment on “Automated classification of the atmospheric circulation patterns that drive regional wave climates” by J. Pringle et al.

J. Pringle et al.

stretchd@ukzn.ac.za

Received and published: 16 March 2014

RESPONSE TO REFEREE 2

We thank the anonymous referee for the comments.

The referee seems to have misinterpreted the focus of our investigation. Our analysis is not concerned with individual "rogue" or "freak" waves but rather focuses on storm or wave events for which the significant wave height (a statistical metric) is above a specified threshold (3.5m in this case) for durations that may extend for many hours. There are typically hundreds of individual waves comprising these storm events, including some that may qualify as "freak" waves depending on the definition used. Table 3 does not list a sample of 6 "freak" waves. Rather, as stated in the caption, this is a sample

C176

of the 6 most severe wave events on record based on their (daily) maximum H_s values. There are about 150 such storm events in our 17-yr wave record.

We believe this issue is adequately explained in section 2.3 of our paper. However we have slightly modified the caption of Table 3 and added a sentence in sections 1 (line 10) and 2.3.1 in order to make the point more clearly.

The two locations of the wave-rider buoys are indicated in Fig 1 with details given in a cited reference. This can/should be clarified in final revisions of the paper.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, 1127, 2014.