

Interactive comment on “Storm surge forecasting: quantifying errors arising from the double-counting of radiational tides” by Joanne Williams et al.

R. D. Ray (Editor)

richard.d.ray@nasa.gov

Received and published: 27 July 2018

Dear Dr Williams and colleagues:

Since all formal (and informal) reviews are now in, I invite you to address the reviewer comments and to revise your paper accordingly. Let me also add a few points to those made by reviewers:

1. At several points in the paper, you refer to the nodal tide (or node tide). I think most readers will take this to mean the near-equilibrium zonal tide of period 18.6 years. But surely you are instead referring to 18.6-y modulations of all lunar tides (especially the

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



large ones like M2, O1, and K1). Yes? I think Phil, in informal comments, also thought you were referring to the 18.6-y tide; there is thus no reason to cite his 2012 paper on the topic, as it's irrelevant (assuming I'm right about what you've meant). So if you really mean nodal modulations of major tides, it's best not to call that the node tide, even though all of this does arise from the moon's nodal precession.

2. Both reviewers found the nomenclature problematic – e.g. see Point (1) of Reviewer #1 – and I also had to repeatedly read the relevant text because I kept getting confused about what was what. So please give some thought to making this clearer, possibly along the lines suggested by Reviewer #1, or some other way if you have a good idea.

3. Many figures are difficult to see because they are so small, and their fonts are even smaller. Remember that most journals end up reducing figure sizes anyway, so give some care to figure legibility.

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/os-2018-63>, 2018.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

