

## ***Interactive comment on “A validation of an operational wave and surge prediction system for the Dutch Coast” by L. Sembiring et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 23 November 2014

This is a review of "A validation of an operational wave and surge prediction system for the Dutch Coast".

Overall, this was a well written paper, with a strong structure and a good presentation of the results.

The item I would like to see more of is the context within the results can be placed and in particular, how the model results can be reconciled with uncertainties (in the inputs to the model and the model results themselves).

In terms of 'minor' items, I would suggest the following: (a) There are a large number of acronyms and variables. Perhaps a separate table for each of these (the variable table can include 'units'), would help the reader?

C2539

(b) Fonts size in figures (particularly graphs). In many places this could be larger.

(c) Colour for lines in figures. Where lines (e.g., red, blue) do not have symbols, should one of the lines become dashed? Otherwise, it becomes difficult for colour blind people to see the differentiation.

(d) Figure legends. Although it is good to state what the colours are (in the figure caption) many graphs would benefit by having a legend, so the reader can more easily see the line differentiation.

(e) [Very minor] Axes of graphs. You different ways of doing the precision. Some of them are 0, 0.5, 1, 1.5. Others are 0.00, 0.05, 0.10, 0.15, 0.20. Another goes 0.00, 0.50, 1.00, etc. I recommend 0.0, 0.5, 1.0, 1.5; 0.00, 0.05, 0.10, 0.15; 0.0, 0.4, 1.0.

(f) Figure captions. In many cases, more details could be added. So for example, in Fig. 5, the reader needs to go to the text to know what EUR, HvH, ..., are and what is meant by M2, S2, M4, ...

(g) Size of figures. Some of the figures become very small. I'd recommend that, for instance, Figure 9 becomes a above and b below, allowing for larger space on the page.

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, 3251, 2014.