

## ***Interactive comment on “The double high tide at Port Ellen: Doodson’s criterion revisited” by Hannah A. M. Byrne et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 28 April 2017

THIS IS NOT A REVIEW. SO PLEASE IGNORE THE MANUSCRIPT RATINGS, SINCE THIS WEBSITE REFUSES TO WORK UNLESS THOSE BUTTONS ARE CLICKED.

When I began reading this paper, I was inclined to send in a favourable review. However, when I tried checking the mathematics, I ran into so many careless errors that I finally gave up. Please have the authors revise their manuscript and check it carefully this time. After that, I will then review the paper.

Specifically, they need to address the following:

Equation (5) does not follow from Eq (4).

The line after Eq (5) refers to a term in brackets. What brackets?

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Eq (6) is clearly wrong.

Page 5, line 4, a new variable "f" is introduced but not defined.

Figure 1 has a floating label "D" but it doesn't point to anything.

In their revision, the authors may also wish to consider a previous paper by Godin, published in 1993 in the Deut Hydrogr Zeitschrift.

---

[Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/os-2017-12, 2017.](#)

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

