Interactive comment on "ENSURF: multi-model sea level forecast – implementation and validation results for the IBIROOS and Western Mediterranean regions" *by* B. Pérez et al.

K. Horsburgh (Referee)

kevinh@pol.ac.uk

Abstract Please re-write the abstract to describe the project in terms that make sense to readers outside of the ECOOP/GOOS/NOOS/IBIROOS community. There are far too many acronyms there. An abstract is meant to summarise the science not the funding mechanism or the partnership arrangements.

Introduction, objectives and general description The weakest part of the paper is the introduction and then description of numerical modelling, yet this is put forward as the main rationale for the work. The introduction (p763, line 25) gives a false impression of how mature operational surge modelling systems function. It is stated (p765, line 1)

that the system was implemented in the NOOS region yet it does not involve the UK, Dutch, Danish or German operational models - which are amongst the best developed in the world. There is a muddled description of the differences between 3D and 2D depth-averaged models, yet no serious attempt is made to challenge the well-known fact that 3D models do not perform any better for storm surge simulation. As it stands, to imply that the merged approach described in the paper somehow improves upon current operational forecasting practices is totally misleading. I recommend modifying sections 1 and 2 to describe in a more accurate way that the project is offering a technique that may be valuable to operational systems, without giving the impression that ENSURF has all the answers.

Numerical modelling Please ask the modellers to check that their respective model descriptions are complete and properly referenced. Also, seek consistency between the descriptions so that the reader can tell the similarities and differences between the models. In fact, if the paper is trying to comment on aspects of model performance due to differences in dimensions or parameters then please consider introducing more detail into Table 1. In 2.1.2 Charnock is spelled Charnok. Henry would turn in his grave. Section 2.1.4 is the worst description of a numerical model that I have ever seen: what is the (unreferenced) "C. Fairall COARE method"? The relevant (not first) author should do this properly and this time devote sufficient time to it.

The English needs thoroughly checking throughout It would greatly assist the paper if a native English speaker provided a final edit. Many examples of phrases needing correction are evident in just the first few pages P762, line 23. ..differences between, not "on" P763, line 8. Prone not "prompt" P763, line 21. "although not always considered with the importance it has, ...". This is not English or even close.