

Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., referee comment RC1
<https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2022-223-RC1>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on nhess-2022-223

Anonymous Referee #1

Referee comment on "Improvements to the detection and analysis of external surges in the North Sea" by Alexander Müller et al., Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2022-223-RC1>, 2022

These notes are only to be used as a supplement to the detached .pdf, detailed commentary is included there.

- Does the paper address relevant scientific and/or technical questions within the scope of NHESS?
yes
- Does the paper present new data and/or novel concepts, ideas, tools, methods or results?
yes
- Are these up to international standards?
yes
- Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and outlined clearly?
The methodology as a whole should be described in a little more detail, also the distinction Dataset1 and Dataset2
- Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and the conclusions?
yes
- Does the author reach substantial conclusions?
yes
- Is the description of the data used, the methods used, the experiments and calculations made, and the results obtained sufficiently complete and accurate to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)?
see no 4
- Does the title clearly and unambiguously reflect the contents of the paper?
yes
- Does the abstract provide a concise, complete and unambiguous summary of the work done and the results obtained?
yes
- Are the title and the abstract pertinent, and easy to understand to a wide and diversified audience?
yes
- Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations and units correctly defined and used? If the formulae, symbols or abbreviations are numerous, are there tables or appendixes listing them?

- yes
- Is the size, quality and readability of each figure adequate to the type and quantity of data presented?
yes
- Does the author give proper credit to previous and/or related work, and does he/she indicate clearly his/her own contribution?
yes
- Are the number and quality of the references appropriate?
yes
- Are the references accessible by fellow scientists?
yes
- Is the overall presentation well structured, clear and easy to understand by a wide and general audience?
Largely, for elements to be corrected see pdf
- Is the length of the paper adequate, too long or too short?
adequate
- Is there any part of the paper (title, abstract, main text, formulae, symbols, figures and their captions, tables, list of references, appendixes) that needs to be clarified, reduced, added, combined, or eliminated?
see point 4
- Is the technical language precise and understandable by fellow scientists?
yes
- Is the English language of good quality, fluent, simple and easy to read and understand by a wide and diversified audience?
yes
- Is the amount and quality of supplementary material (if any) appropriate?
yes

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://nhess.copernicus.org/preprints/nhess-2022-223/nhess-2022-223-RC1-supplement.pdf>