## **General Comments:**

The paper describes a new data set of 2D wave fields derived from the analysis of in-situ measurements collected from an ADCP mounted on a subsurface deep mooring deployed for first time at the Eastern Mediterranean, 50km of the Israeli coast, west of Haifa, for the period 2016-2022. The methods used for the processing, correction, and analysis of the data are analytically described. The in-situ observations were evaluated by comparison with the outputs of the Copernicus Marine Environment Monitoring Service (CMEMS) wave (WAM) model.

Such a time series of wave data is very important for the area and the Eastern Mediterranean in general as it is a region of increased scientific and economic interest.

The paper can be accepted for publishing, below are some issues to be addressed before the publication.

## Comment on the data availability:

The paper states that the data are freely available through SEANOE repository (<u>https://doi.org/10.17882/96904</u>). However, currently the access is not open and an embargo period is set until 1-11-2025, which is in contrast with the paper. I would suggest authors remove the "freely" from the data availability section, add that an embargo period exists and explain why.

## Specific comments:

(lines numbering corresponds to the Author's tracked changes file)

- Line 114: sentence is not clear to me, "Soffer et al. (2020)" is repeated twice. A suggestion could be: In a recent study, Soffer et al. (2020) compared wave parameters from the DeepLev's first deployment with simultaneous measurements from a bottom-mounted ADCP located 48.5 km away at a depth of 26 meters.
- line 137: Although I am not a native English speaker, I would suggest this sentence as: "In practice, the appropriate values for the water properties ..."
- Table 2 caption: I would change the caption from "Summary of quality of data ..." to "Summary of quality indexes of data ..." or "Statistics on quality of data ..."

## **TEXT editing:**

- There is an inconsistency in figure references that should be fixed. Base on the guidelines (https://www.earth-system-science-data.net/submission.html#figurestables) it should be (Fig.2b) and not (fig 2b), or (Fig. 4) and not (Figure 4), etc.
- the "meter" unit is not used in a consistent way, e.g. line 117: 26 meters, line 125: 12 m (27-39 m). Should be fixed.