

Dear reviewer,

Thanks for your review and your useful suggestions. Below are addressed the changes that have been made to the new version of the manuscript, which also includes the modifications proposed by two other reviewers.

Page 1 line 27: Add some more recent studies, if there are any.

Three new references were added to the introduction related to the contrast between studies of the meteorological effects of storms, where the main interest is focused on the location of the storm strike, and the effect of the wave conditions related to a storm event, that can be observed along distant coasts, well beyond the region of wind stress (Page 1 Line 27).

Page 2 line 20: Should this reference be Appendini et al. 2014, not 2013.

The reference was corrected (page 2, line 21).

Page 2 lines 31-31: Correlation to what?

The paragraph has been rewritten (page 2, lines 32-35).

Page 3 lines 15-16: In extreme events even 50 m water depth is not deep, so one will defiantly have shallow water effects.

Certainly, according to the data a significant percentage of the storm events (Table r2.1) have T_p values associated to transitional waters. This percentage decreases when the T_p values of the entire time series associated to each event are considered. However, the sentence has been omitted from the manuscript.

Table r2.1. Percentage of the peak period associated to TC and Norte events that are not within deep water.

Node	% TC	% Norte
Matamoros	94.7	57.4
Tampico	100.0	85.1
Veracruz	87.5	81.7
Coatzacoalcos	84.2	88.9
Paraiso	89.5	94.7
Campeche	73.9	90.6
Progreso	79.3	88.8
Holbox	88.9	90.6
Cancun	9.3	0
Tulum	4.3	0

Page 4 lines 11-12: I really do not understand, what does it mean, that if the SWH is below threshold for less than 48 hours, two consecutive events are considered as one event. But what happens, when there are 3 such events?

This sentence needed to be rephrased because it was not clear enough. For consecutive events to be considered independent, the time spam between them must be larger than two days.

We consider that it is more clear in the former version of the manuscript (page 4, lines 14-19):
“Finally, in order to separate consecutive storm events and to assure that the events are statistically independent, an inter-event period of 48 hours was established (Dorsch et al., 2008). This means that consecutive events must be at least 48 hours apart to be considered as independent events, if the SWH is below the threshold for less than 48 hours, consecutive events will be considered as one event associated with a unique meteorological event.”

Figure 1: the scale is not correct, must be 100-200 km, not 1000-2000 km.

The scale has been corrected (Fig. 1).