Natural Hazards
and Earth System
Sciences

Open Access

Discussions

NHESSD

Interactive comment

Interactive comment on "Assessment of reliability of extreme wave height prediction models" *by* Satish Samayam et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 14 January 2017

General comments

The paper provides a useful tutorial on the statistical analyses of extreme events. Different techniques are systematically introduced and explained. The prediction of key statistics is compared with buoy data and the effectiveness of the techniques is discussed.

1. Significant comment

The authors speculate that the under-prediction of the buoy data is because the ECMWF data do not capture cyclone events. Is there any way they could test (or even suggest a test) of this hypothesis? For example, could one window the buoy data to eliminate time windows known to contain cyclones, and repeat the analysis? If their hypothesis is correct, such artificial windowing would lead to an improved comparison.

Of course, in practice one wants to correctly model all extremes including cyclones, but it may be possible to quantify the effect of the cyclones.

2. Minor comments

p11, line 296: Please provide a reference for "It has been experimentally prove[d->n] that ..."

3. Minor clarifications needed

p6 line 183: Is it clearer to write "should not be correlated with one another and should be identically distributed"?

p9 line 240: Presumably this should read "If X is distributed according to the GPD"

p10 line 287: It is not clear what is meant by "P-" approximation; "P" it is not defined as "polymonial" until section 4.3.

p17, line 497 and p19, line 542: do the authors mean "shortcome", not "shortage"?

4. Minor presentation notes

p1 line 24: "The Indian Ocean with ..."

p2 line 60: "these models consist of"

p3 line 67: "give a closed form"

p3 line 94: "extrapolation of a polynomial "

p3 line 108: "for the Indian"

p4 line 122: the acronym RON is only defined (Rete Ondametrica Nazionale) on the next page; please define when first used.

p7 line 201: [missed space] "respectively and"

p7 line 211: "the GPD"

p8 line 213: "to amount to"

p9 line 248: "does not"

p10 line 268: "... of degree n; it is considered that the value of n may vary."

p10 line 278: "Another principal feature of the ... is the standard deviation ..."

p10 line 281: "Obviously, the lesser delta, the higher"

p10 line 288: "statistical equivalence"

p11, line 297: "aspects, it emerges"

p11, line 302: "to the equivalent"

p12, line 330: "despite being very simple"

p12, line 336: "This means that the calculation"; line 337 "this means that"

p12, line 343: "a three-parameter Weibull"

p13, line 360: "and resulting parameters"; line 362 "a Frech\'et"

p13, line 374: "The lower the value of RMSE, i.e. near to zero, the better the fit"

p14, line 385: "result in a less"

p15, line 429: "the standard deviation"

Equations: Presumably the journal will understand that the functions ln and log should be typeset in normal (Roman) font not mathematical font, but it is worth changing now to ensure there is no typesetting error. Equation (13) is already correct, but the earlier equations need this adjustment.

p15, lines 431-2: "The lower the value of delta, i.e., the nearer to zero, indicates a better fit between the actual tail of the provisional function and the Polynomial approximation with tail fitted.

C3

p15, lines 431-2: "resulting standard deviation" [not standard error, presumably]

p16, line 466: "at a certain location in the Arabian Sea"

p17, line 492: "The GEV and GPD methods show"

p17, line 505: "recommended always applying"

p19, line 538: "the ETS method"; line 539 "the provision function"

p19, line 550: "these vary"