



Supplement of

Better Baltic Sea wave forecasts: improving resolution or introducing ensembles?

Torben Schmith et al.

Correspondence to: Torben Schmith (ts@dmi.dk)

The copyright of individual parts of the supplement might differ from the CC BY 4.0 License.



Figure S1 Observation series of SWH used in the study.





Figure S2 RMSE for selected forecast ranges for all stations for LOW, LOWENSMEAN and HIGH forecasts. Error bars show 5/95% confidence bands calculated by bootstrapping





Figure S3 RMSE as function of SWH for all stations for LOW, LOWENSMEAN and HIGH forecasts and forecast range 24 h. Error bars show 5/95% confidence bands calculated by bootstrapping. No confidence band is given when too few data points are available.



Figure S4 As Figure S3 but for 48 h forecast range.







Figure S5 Bias as function of SWH for all stations for LOW, LOWENSMEAN and HIGH forecasts and forecast range 24 h. Error bars show 5/95% confidence bands calculated by bootstrapping. No confidence band is given when too few data points are available.



Figure S6 As Figure S5 but for forecast range 48 h.







Figure S7 CRPS for selected forecast ranges for all stations for LOW, LOWENSMEAN, LOW and HIGH forecasts. Error bars show 5/95% confidence bands calculated by bootstrapping.



Figure S8 Brier score for different thresholds for all stations for LOW, LOWENSMEAN, LOW and HIGH and forecast range 24 hrs.





Figure S9 As Figure S8 but for forecast range 48 hrs.



Figure S10 Rank histograms for different thresholds for all stations for LOW, LOWENSMEAN, LOW and HIGH and forecast range 24 hrs.



Figure S11 As Figure S10 but for forecast range 48 hrs.





Figure S12 The average ice cover for February: a) 2015, b) 2016, c) 2017 and d) average 2010-2018.