

## ***Interactive comment on “Brief Communication: Freak wave occurrences in 2013” by P. C. Liu***

**Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 9 December 2014

Review of Brief communication: "Freak wave occurrences in 2013"

a paper by Paul Liu

This submission is exactly what one might expect from the title: a brief inventory and discussion of freak/rogue waves occurring (and reported) in 2013. I believe that it is worth publication, since it can be a useful reference for those who are dealing with this topic. I also appreciate that the paper does not pretend to be anything other than what it is, and it is simple and concise, without fluff.

My comments are mostly editorial in nature:

Title: Use of the unusual spelling "freak" should be explained. I think there must be some distinction between "freak" and "freak" but I don't know what it is. Also the author might consider whether this usage will result in fewer "hits" from web searches

C2709

(I don't know). Also note that usage on 7-18 "study of freaks is still.." (without word "wave") is unusual even if spelling is changed.

2-8 and 2-26 "all occurrences" ==> "all reported occurrences"

2-11 "one may assume". I do not understand how this follows.

2-15 "no one knows where, when" This is strange since of course, people know after it happens. Need to clarify

Too much common text between abstract and intro, like copy and past. Some on same page.

3-12 "has been particularly useful". If this is the author's website, and if all (or a large majority) of the posts on said website are by the author, it is a bit dodgy to reference it as useful. If the author wants to plug his website, a better method would be to reference it at the end of the paper (or other suitable place) "for more information, see the author's...", assuming the editor is OK with this.

5-7 typo "Approaching"

5-20 typo "whenthey"

6-3 "were still missing" Need to clarify. Should be "were still missing when news article was published"? Any updates?

6-8 and one of the tables: "nearshore" as separate from "beach area and rocky shores" could be confusing. How about "coastal ocean" instead of "nearshore"?

page 7 is written too informally. Too many paragraphs, too many "!", and general writing style.

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, 7017, 2014.