Ocean Sci. Discuss.,
doi:10.5194/os-2016-47-SC1, 2016

Ocean Science Discussions
Open Access
EGU

Interactive comment on "Evaluation of Peaks-Over-Threshold Method" *by* Soheil Saeed Far and Ahmad Khairi Abd. Wahab

S. Saeed Far

soheilsaeedfar@gmail.com

Received and published: 1 September 2016

Dear Dr. Sterl,

Thanks for your letter dated, Aug 31, 2016.

I regret to inform you that I do not agree with the two reviewers' comments on which your decision was based due to the following reasons:

First, I declare that the reason of writing this letter is to respond the comments and misunderstanding about our manuscript, and we respect your decision as the Topic Editor of the journal Ocean Science.

There are some key points that help to understand our study. However, I am wonder why they are ignored. For instance in the methodology section, we separated the two

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

models into two subsections and both models have their separate references (Goda, 2010) and (Coles, 2001). However, the reviewers continuously mixed the models with each other.

The use of FT-I (Gumbel), FT-II (Frechet) and Weibull distributions and using fixed shape parameter are the process of Goda model (Please see our second reply). We improved the POT (Goda) model. I have not yet seen any question about the manuscript's objectives or conclusions! It is not very difficult to google the method and figure out something about the POT (Goda) model.

About the data:

I think, we should first settle in the matter of existing the POT (Goda) model, and then we can talk about the data. This method exists with or without the reviewers' acknowledgement.

In your letter, you mentioned that, 'Reviewer #1 points out that there are suspiciously many data points close to 4.4 m (Fig.8), but your answer fails to adequately explain this occurrence. Your answer that the GEV method has not been employed is off the point'.

The reviewer's comment – regard to his/her previous words – has another question in the connotation of his/her comment. I am sure the reviewer #1 has got his/her answer from my response; the reviewer #1 wanted to know about the group of data close to the highest data (4.25 m) in the sample of statistics, which are considered in the block-maxima used by the GEV model. My response was an attempt to terminate the assumption of using GEV in the manuscript. Nevertheless, in the reply letter, I rejected the use of many data around 4.25 m (the response in reply 1: The majority of the observed data are in the range of 2 to 3.5 m. However, around 4.25 m less data were recorded.).

Ultimately, you quoted one of my responses (in my second reply) about the unavailability of data for publication and distribution, and then you explained that the whole work

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

is under the question if the data were not available.

Dear Editor, you are an experienced and academic person, who dedicated many years of his life in the academic atmosphere. Regard to this background, during the study of your letter, first, I thought you were probably very busy, so you trusted the reviewers' opinions. However, terminating your letter with discussion about the availability of data, and ignoring all our reasonable responses, as well as ignoring the gap of reviewers' knowledge about the POT (Goda) model, and then dragging the manuscript down to a low level and beating it with experience by talking about an ambiguous question about the suspicious data (!) was not my expectation from an academic person.

You are well aware that there are several ways to distribute such dataset similar to our case. However, when there is no any sign of understanding the study, it would not be a reasonable decision to manage all the eggs in one basket.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Best Regards,

Soheil Saeed Far

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/os-2016-47, 2016.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper