

Interactive comment on “Tidal variability in the Hong Kong region” by Adam T. Devlin et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 3 January 2019

The authors set out to investigate how the observed tides around Hong Kong, and in the wider SCS, have changed over the last decades. The use of such a large data set from a small region is interesting, and there are some intriguing results, but there are issues I think must be addressed before this could be published. Both of these points are already raised by Review 1 and by Richard Ray in their comments, and I second them here (hence the brevity of this review).

Major comments The paper is a difficult read, mainly because we are constantly interrupted by quantifications. The reader could look up numbers in the figures and tables rather than being told that this gauge changed this much compared to that gauge. Maybe consider saying that “A increased more than B with a factor N”. The overtime analysis really doesn’t add much, even if it wasn’t flawed (see Ray’s comment). If it is to be included, and I don’t think it will be significant once it is analysed properly, we will have to be told why the changes are of interest. I think it would be more worthwhile,

C1

and this is seconding Review 1, to focus on the main constituents around Hong Kong alone, and delete the speculations about why the tides may have changed in the SCS. If the latter part is to be included, we need to be told with more certainty why these changes have occurred.

Minor comments L127: it is surprising to not see references to work by Alford and collaborators here.# L176-196: I suggest deleting this and just give a very brief summary: we have NN gauges spanning NN years (see table and figures. . .). L273: why distinguish between historical and modern, using some arbitrary cutoff? Technically, they are all historical, since they are in the past. . .

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/os-2018-62>, 2018.