

***Interactive comment on* “Statistical trend analysis and extreme distribution of significant wave height from 1958 to 1999 – an application to the Italian Seas” by G. Martucci et al.**

s. carniel

sandro.carniel@ismar.cnr.it

Received and published: 30 October 2009

On the comment on the correlation less than 0.1, at the end of Section 2. —————
————— We thanks the reviewer and agree that
the text shold have been clearer, and we will certainly act iso in the revised version.
The following text should better explain the procedure we followed:

The autocorrelation coefficient accounts for the degree of correlation amongst data belonging to the same timeseries. In our case, data are separated by 3-hours lag, and our routines seek for the minimum temporal distance (lag) between two data points for which the autocorrelation coefficient is less than 0.1, a value that was considered to

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



ensure the independency among the events.

On the comment on the correlation coefficient, in Section 3. _____
_____ Again, we apologize with the Reviewer for not having made the text clear. A possible version in the revised version could be the following:

"Each of the three F(Hs) distribution –described in the following Section 3.4- is fitted to the two datasets obtained using POT and rmax criteria: two sets of correlation coefficients are then obtained, one for the F(Hs) distributions applied to the POT dataset, and one for the F(Hs) distribution applied to the rmax dataset. The highest correlation coefficient out of the 6 computed determines the choice of the corresponding distribution F_best(Hs) and of the dataset (POT or rmax)."

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., 6, 2005, 2009.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

