

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Sea level trend and variability around the Peninsular Malaysia” by Q. H. Luu et al.

Q. H. Luu et al.

tmslqh@nus.edu.sg

Received and published: 28 October 2014

Reviewer: The authors present analyses of mean sea level (MSL) trends and variability along the Malaysian coastline. To my knowledge, this region has only barely been investigated so far, and hence, comprehensive studies of MSL in the region are required. However, the quality of this manuscript is far below the standards of scientific publishing, which is mainly related to the poor English, but also due to missing process-based investigations providing new insights into the variations of MSL in the region. Hence, I cannot recommend the paper to be published in Ocean Science in its present form, but I would like to encourage the authors to submit an improved version after doing additional analyses and after significantly improving the linguistic style of the text. Let me explain why:

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



[Interactive
Comment](#)

Answer: We thank the reviewer for this comment and suggestion. We address all his questions in details below, and have modified the manuscript accordingly. Provided the significance of the study, sufficient analysis done and substantial rewriting made, we believe that the improved manuscript bear an opportunity to be fairly reevaluated.

Reviewer: 1. The language is of rather poor quality. For instance, there are dozens of articles (the, a) missing making the manuscript only hardly readable. In fact, it is currently not possible to provide specific comments, since the quality is so poor that it requires substantial rewriting. I would like to encourage the authors, to ask someone else (native speaker, or a colleague who is experienced in publishing papers in international journals) for a thorough review before resubmitting the work again in OSD or somewhere else.

Answer: The manuscript is now intensively reviewed by external researchers in both content and language aspects.

Reviewer: 2. Furthermore, the paper provides no novel insights into physical processes affecting sea level in the region. The fact that MSL in the region is highly linked to ENSO or IOD events is already well known (e.g. Nideesh et al., 2013). Also the major mechanisms (at least on a larger spatial scale) are well established (wave propagation driven by remote and local winds). What I miss is a deeper analysis (i) how such signals propagate along the Malaysian coastlines (ii) whether single events are either linked to remote or local wind forcing (and therefore connected to the different indices), or even anything else. This requires, of course, more sophisticated statistical analyses (e.g. spectral analyses) or numerical simulations (or the use of available numerical simulations). In the present form the paper is just another one showing correlations between sea level and ENSO/IOD indices.

Answer: This study is not focused in revealing the mechanism associated physical process of how the ENSO and IOD signals propagate into the Malacca Strait. As pointed out by the reviewer, the suggested problem is complicated and requires a lot

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

of sophisticated analysis and modelling works.

Instead, our paper aim to quantify the long-term rate of sea level rise, estimate the magnitude of interannual variability and link them to climate drivers (ENSO and IOD) comprehending the difference in seasonal patterns along the Malaysia coasts. For example, the sea level rise rates for this region have been derived in the manuscript (by taking into account the vertical land motion and validate with tendency from satellite data), which have not been obtained in sufficient details elsewhere. On top of these, we presume the existence of a hydraulic constriction in the Singapore Strait, which is an interesting subject to clarify; and provide a quantitative illustration on the importance of vertical land motion data in correctly estimate mean sea level, which may partly prompt the involvement of local government.

The suggested work of Nideesh et al. (2013) which elucidated the mechanism associated with decadal and long-term sea level trend at a synoptic scale will be discussed in the revised manuscript.

Reviewer: 3. The authors state that one region experiences “two annual cycles”, while the other one shows a “single annual cycle”. What you require is a more sophisticated analysis of annual/semi-annual harmonics (see for instance Plag and Tsimplis, 1999, or dozens of papers in the last ~15 years dealing with seasonal sea level changes).

Answer: In line with the reviewer’s comment, we have did an additional analysis to apprehend the temporal evolution of seasonal sea level, and discuss the contribution of climate drivers (ENSO, IOD). In addition, the used terms are changed to “annual/semiannual harmonics”.

Reviewer: 4. There are several statements in the paper, where it is simply unclear what the authors refer to. The most prominent example is the statement: “sea level change is highly non-uniform spatially and temporally, mostly due to local adjustment to the global warming: : :”. Yes sea level is spatially and temporally highly variable, but the physical explanations are gravitational and hydrological effects, local and remote atmospheric

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



[Interactive
Comment](#)

forcing and resulting barotropic and baroclinic adjustment processes in the ocean, vertical land motion, local anthropogenic interventions such as embankments, etc.. How these effects have an anthropogenic signature is another question: : At another stage the authors refer to “wind stress curl blowing from”. It is new to me that the wind stress curl blows. Such statements cast doubt on the technical understanding of physical processes.

Answer: The sentence at page 1521, line 19-21 is revised as “However, sea level change is highly non-uniform spatially and temporally, local adjustment to dynamic and tendentious changes of the Earth system, both globally and regionally. Stammer et al. (2013) summarized and discussed various reasons attributed to contemporary change, from increase in ocean heat content, melting of ice sheets and glaciers, modification in land water storage at global scale, to local variations associated with land motion and geoid alteration at regional scale.”

Regarding the “wind stress curl” comment we modified text as “The complexity of the pattern is arguably due to competing of the seasonally persistent wind from the SCS with the rotation of vertical column of the air mass associated with the wind from the Andaman Sea blowing toward the Malacca Strait.”

Reviewer: 5. I was wondering about the gap-filling procedure. The authors state that they use the ENSO index in combination with atmospheric reanalysis data (wind stress) via multiple regression to fill existing gaps. I suggest using nearby stations (first) for gap filling results in much better reconstructions. There are two reasons for that: First, a multiple regression will not/or only poorly account for non-linear local effects, which are probably much better captured by nearby stations, which are affected by similar mechanisms. Furthermore, you assume that sea level only responses to atmospheric forcing, which is not the case. Second, the quality of much reanalysis data sets in these regions are only of poor quality due to missing observations required for data assimilation. I would like to encourage the authors to be more careful with such approaches, or at least demonstrate in a more detailed and convincing manner how

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

the filling procedure works.

Answer: In line with the reviewer's comment, we have filled the gaps using nearby stations. Provided there are stations nearby, the recommended technique is indeed robust and provides a better fit. Therefore, we adapted this method to reconstruct the gappy data in the revised manuscript.

Reviewer: 6. The authors provide no information on how the trends and their uncertainties are calculated. Do you use OLS estimates with standard errors assuming no significant autocorrelation of the residuals? Please provide more detailed information on that point and ensure that your assumptions are valid. In fact, you have to account for the serial correlation present in sea level records: at least due to a reduction of the number of degrees of freedom, as for instance described in Santer et al. (2000).

References Plag and Tsimplis (1999) Temporal variability of the seasonal sea level cycle in the North Sea and Baltic Sea in relation to climate variability, *Global and Planetary Change* Santer, B. D., T. M. L. Wigley, J. S. Boyle, D. J. Gaffen, J. J. Hnilo, D. Nychka, D. E. Parker, and K. E. Taylor (2000), Statistical significance of trends and trend differences in layer-average atmospheric temperature time series, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 105(D6), 7337–7356, doi:10.1029/1999JD901105. Nidheesh et al. (2013), Decadal and long-term sea level variability in the tropical Indo-Pacific Ocean, *Climate Dynamics*.

Answer: As described in Table 1's footnote, uncertainties are calculated using ordinary/linear least square (OLS) fitting technique for 95% confidence level in the manuscript. Before applying the OLS, we did test the autocorrelation (in the below Figure 1). As exhibited, the residuals are uncorrelated between measurements for all stations. As there is no significant autocorrelation of the errors, this fact implies that our regression method is not biased.

The authors thank the reviewer for his useful comments which help improving the manuscript significantly.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., 11, 1519, 2014.

OSD

11, C950–C956, 2014

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C955






Fig. 1. Autocorrelation analysis for reconstructed data from 12 selected tide gauge stations around Peninsular Malaysia for period 1984-2011. Red circles are autocorr values; blue lines are confidence bounds.

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