

Review of the article titled “Monitoring the record-breaking wave event in Melilla harbour (SW Mediterranean Sea)” by Lorente, P., et al. 2023

Upon reviewing the revised version of your manuscript, it is evident that the quality has significantly improved due to several key revisions. The inclusion of new tables detailing the characteristics of the different datasets used is particularly noteworthy, enhancing the manuscript’s clarity and the reader’s ability to understand the scope of your analysis.

Furthermore, the rewrite of the abstract provides a clearer and more impactful summary of the research findings. The reorganization of the data section enhances the manuscript’s logical flow, facilitating a better understanding of the methodologies employed. Additionally, the introduction of new figures offers a concise visual summary of the data, further elevating the manuscript’s quality.

However, there is a specific aspect that requires attention to prevent potential misinterpretation. In Figure 2d, the presentation of event numbers near to the legend could be mistakenly interpreted as representing event durations. It is also unclear whether the percentage of time exceeding the 99th percentile is calculated considering the duration of each event. To clarify this, I recommend revising the figure’s labeling or the x-axis configuration. Options for addressing the labeling issue include labeling the x-axis with actual time units (e.g., years) or adjusting the axis label to "Events," depending on which approach better suits the data’s representation. The decision on how to implement this change is left to the authors’ discretion. Furthermore, please specify in the figure caption whether the percentage of time exceeding the 99th percentile is based on the duration of each event.

These revisions have collectively contributed to a substantial enhancement of the manuscript’s overall quality, making it suitable for publication.