

## ***Interactive comment on “An observed 20 yr time-series of Agulhas leakage” by D. Le Bars et al.***

**N. Swart**

Neil.Swart@ec.gc.ca

Received and published: 22 February 2014

Firstly, thanks to the authors for this nice piece of work. I look forward to it being published.

I have a few comments:

1) In figure 1b, what is labelled as the "GoodHope section" is not really accurate - the GoodHope section starts out westward from Cape Town near 34S, not near 30S as shown. For example see Swart et al. [2008] (<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2007JC004223/abstract>). Maybe there are good reasons for your choice - but then don't call it the "GoodHope section".

2) As for the long-term trends, we are told: "Over this short period the trends have the

C20

same sign in the model and altimetry, 0.6 Svdecade<sup>-1</sup> and 2.9 Svdecade<sup>-1</sup> respectively. But when we look at the trends in Fig 9b. they are all of opposite sign in altimetry and the model (presumably because they are from different periods). Why not include the altimetry trend over the "short" overlapping period so we can compare visually.

It would also be useful to know a bit more about how the trends were calculated. I'm assuming for the model they are centered 20 year running trends, but it is not clear - for the SSH (green) they seem to extend to 1999, but this is <10 for 2007 which is the end of the model run. You could also provide confidence intervals if you want to show whether the trends are significant.

3) Also for the trends, another possible reason for a positive trend in the model and no or small trend in the altimetry is that the model forcing is wrong. What is important here are the wind-stress fields. The CORE wind stress is derived from NCEP Reanalysis 1, and this has well known trend biases in the Southern Hemisphere winds.

4) Fig 8 caption could use "altimetry" in there just to make clear that it is not from the model.

5) Finally, is it not a surprise (dissapointment??) that the simulated transport does not show the same interannual variability as the observed transport, despite being driven with the observed forcing. This tells us something - the response to the forcing is indirect.

There are also some small grammatical things, which are not serious, but for example in Fig. 9b caption it says "blue circles in are sensitivity a..." but it should say "blue circles are a sensitivity..."

Also in the abstract: "which allows to deduce" → "which allows us to deduce" "allows to validate" → "allows us to validate" "does not allow to determine" → "does not allow us to determine"