

Interactive comment on “Wave run-up prediction and observation in a micro-tidal beach” by Diana Di Luccio et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 17 October 2017

MAIN COMMENTS

The topic of the proposed work is interesting although the paper has a series of weak points and a very careful revision should be required in order to operate some corrections and make the paper appropriate for publication. The paper needs a major revision.

Some SPECIFIC COMMENTS, observations and suggestions are given next.

Some figures are too small and it is difficult to understand the text and lines. Figure 4 is too small and the WW3 domain and resolution (0.03°) are not correlated with the text (Pag 5, Line 15).

In-text citations have extra parenthesis. Check the style used by NHESS!

C1

At Pag 5, Line 15, the limits of the computational domain of the WW3 model are wrong. It is probably a mistake!

Please give more explanations regarding the WW3 model implementation. Does the model implementation is made only in the domain presented in Figure 4? If this is the case, please explain the boundary conditions imposed on west and south!

The sections 5 - discussion and 6 - conclusions are too short (only few lines). They need to be expanded with: more discussions about the results obtained from various wave run-up models; what is the best option; how the system implemented with wave run-up prediction can help the authorities for coastal protection; etc.

A review of the text is necessary; there are a lot of errors!

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2017-252>, 2017.

C2