



Interactive  
Comment

## ***Interactive comment on “Search for the 531 day-period wobble signal in the polar motion based on EEMD” by H. Ding and W. B. Shen***

### **Anonymous Referee #3**

Received and published: 30 May 2015

#### General comments:

This paper studied the 531 day-period wobble signal in the polar motion by using EEMD. The authors confirmed that EEMD is a helpful demodulation method, and can provide better analysis than tradition Fourier spectra analysis. After using EEMD, the 531 dW signals are found in IMF5 and IMF6, with different amplitudes and phases, and furthermore, the reasons why the 531 dW signal cannot be detected directly by using tradition spectra method after 1978 in the PM series are found. The paper is very well written and structured. The results are very interesting to readers. Therefore, I recommend accepting this paper for publication after the following minor points are addressed.

#### Specific comments:

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



1. The authors may need to provide one figure to show all the IMFs decomposed by using EEMD. In this way, the readers may feel easier to understand the research.

2. On page 655, the authors declared that “By carefully examining Table 1 we can find that the amplitudes of the 531 dW in IMF6 clearly have some proportional relation with their corresponding amplitudes of CW, whereas the amplitudes of the 531 dW and CW in IMF5 have no obvious relationship”. But, it seems difficult to find the relationships in IMF6. The authors should make this part clearer.

3. In the figures, the authors presented the Phases for different IMFs. In my opinion, the authors may need to mention how to determine the Phases for different IMFs before showing the results.

Technical corrections:

4. On page 654, the fifth line in the second paragraph, the authors start talking about Figs. 5 and 6. But after carefully reading, it should be Figs. 3 and 4, not Figs. 5 and 6.

5. Also in this paragraph, the authors discussed the results for different time periods. The first time period should be 1962-1977, not 1962-1978.

---

Interactive comment on Nonlin. Processes Geophys. Discuss., 2, 647, 2015.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)