

Dear Dr. Björkqvist,

I am pleased to inform you that your manuscript has been accepted for publication in SP, subject to technical corrections. Please consider the relevant suggestions in the two referee reports.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you again for your support and cooperation.

Please note that all Referee and Editor reports, the author's response, as well as the different manuscript versions of the peer-review completion (post-discussion review of revised submission) will be published if the paper will be accepted for final publication in SP.

Kind regards,
Joanna Staneva

Report#1

The following basically technical corrections:

Line 80: "the" or "three"?

Our response: Thank you, we meant three. This has been corrected.

Line 115: consider saying that wave conditions in the Baltic Sea exhibit strong seasonal variations as the wording "The wave conditions in the Baltic Sea are seasonal" is quite jargon-like.

Our response: Thank you for your suggestion. Nonetheless, we have decided to keep this sentence as it is. Our motivation for doing so is that while the word "seasonal" in itself might not carry the information that there is variations to all readers, this is evident by the second part of the sentence. Also, saying that the variations are "strong" is in itself a bit vague when not quantified. Thirdly, we have tried to use the active voice in this text, and we feel there is not sufficient reason to depart from that choice here.

Line 226: I still have the opinion that the sentence "The number of 2.5 m and 4 m wave events were seasonal" is not really comprehensible for some readers and is hard to grasp grammatically. Consider saying, e.g., "The number of 2.5 m and 4 m wave events has strong seasonal variation" or similar.

Our response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have changed this sentence to read "The number of 2.5 m and 4 m wave events varied by the season." This should be easier to grasp, while still being in the active voice and avoiding quantifying the variations as "strong".

Report#2

General Comments

The manuscript provides a more detailed statistical analysis for the wave height duration and frequency in the Baltic Sea. The authors use three thresholds of significant wave height in the analysis, based on fish farms related works.

The MS presents good information include new aspects. Additionally, the authors have address previous comment and suggestions, and in my opinion only a couple of extra point can may be corrected/reconsidered before publication.

I listed my requested corrections below, by line where relevant.

Specific comments:

Line 47: "are not so great" - please rephrase

Our response: We have changed to “are weaker”

#Line 80: I believe you mean three and not thee

Our response: Thank you, we did indeed mean three. This has been corrected.

#Line 154: "...weaker.." there is an extra dot after weaker

Our response: Thank you for catching this. It has been removed.

#Line 185: "A certain amount of hours", maybe "...number of hours" is better?

Our response: Thank you, we have changed this in accordance with your suggestion.

#Line 215: "Also" misses a comma after it

Our response: We assume that line 213 (start of paragraph) was meant here. The comma has been added.

Figure 2: Is not particularly difficult, but I think the colours of the symbols do not help on this colourmap, so maybe consider changing them (or the colormap)?

Our response: This figure has been updated to use different colours for the symbols.

Other changes:

We have also added the citation to the code and data that is in the FMI data repository and modified the code and data availability statement.

We have corrected a few minor errors in the references.