

Response to Editor Review (Philip Woodworth, 2020/10/26)
2020/11/05

We thank the Editor for his thorough review, comments, and suggestions. The Editor comments are in bold, our replies are in normal font.

In the following, the line numbers correspond to the previous submitted version.

Many thanks for the latest version (V3) of the paper which I have read. Thanks for attending to the 'MSL without VLM correction' issue. I think that reads better now. But I have two remaining issues with the paper.

One issue is the usual set of small edits which I list below. These will not take you long. I am sure you are getting as tired of these things as I am but until the second issue is dealt with I may as well continue to send along these minor edits, which you can accept or not as you want.

The small edits have been corrected – see below.

But the second is, as I mentioned last time, to do with the discussion of Figure 12 and the air pressure pattern on seasonal timescales and its implications for M2 amplitude being the OPPOSITE of the relationship on interannual timescales.

I see that you changed Fig 12 (a) and (c) to focus on the North Sea area, ok. But the same problem remains, the inference of higher pressure in the south leads to larger M2 (as one learns from (a) and (b)) is OPPOSITE to the inference on seasonal timescales from (c) and (d). You have disposed of this problem with a minor edit to the text at line 361 to say 'and obtained values close to the ones in Figure 12 (a) in terms of magnitude (a dozen of hPa)'. Well, yes, they are similar in magnitude but not in sign!

We agree that Fig 12 is confusing, and we propose to remove the seasonal analogy, i.e. Fig 12 (b), (c) and (d), as well as the corresponding paragraph « We conducted...available observations ». We only keep Fig 12 (a) (which becomes now Fig 12) on the North East Atlantic (instead of the North Sea).

The seasonal analogy was initially here to answer to the Referee Comment #1, who reported that the changes in sea level pressure were too small to cause the observed M2 changes. That's why we focused on the magnitude of the signal. The idea was to say that if at seasonal scale, a dozen of hPa may generate changes of a few cm, it could also be possible at decadal scale. However, this paragraph has now been removed.

We had differently interpreted Fig12 (b) (c) (d), and possibly misinterpreted, that's why we prefer to remove it. Our interpretation in terms of sign was the following: Fig 12 (c) shows on average a negative pressure difference in the North Sea (-3.6 hPa), which leads to low values of M2 in January, according to Fig 12 (d). By contrary, Fig 12 (a) shows in average a positive pressure difference in the North Sea (6.4 hPa), so we may expect high values of M2 in case of NAO+ (which is consistent with Fig 12 (b)). However, these figures have now been removed.

Your problem to my mind is that you are trying to make too strong a connection between the air pressure patterns and M2. Let's leave Huess and Andersen aside for a moment. I am reasonably convinced by the work of Mueller (2012) and Grawe et al (2015) that the main reason for the

seasonal M2 variability is the seasonal stratification. They may be wrong, but they are the latest sets of work on this topic. If that is the case, then you can try till the cows come home (as we say) to make a connection between air pressures and M2 on seasonal timescales that will look anything like the pattern you show for interannual timescales (if also true). I hope you see what I mean. The seasonal M2 variability could still of course be connected to water depth of a similar magnitude as you have interannually but for entirely different reasons.

The Fig 12 was here mainly to answer to Referee Comment #1. We agree that there could be other reasons than pressure differences to explain M2 variability, that's why we had mentioned at the end of the paragraph the hypothesis of stratification from Müller et al. (2014) and Gräwe et al. (2014). However, this paragraph has now been removed.

So I think the para 'We conducted .. available observations' needs to be completely rewritten so show that you understand things seasonally and not dispose of Muller etc. at the end of the para as 'other hypotheses'. They are not - they are the best hypotheses at the moment. You should by all means mention the Huess and Andersen work of course, and keep all of Fig 12 if you want, but make it clear in the text that the simple association of patterns does not have the right sign and not try to hide that with disingenuous words like 'in terms of magnitude'.

As mentioned previously, Figure 12 (b) (c) (d) and the corresponding paragraph "We conducted...available observations." have been removed. We have rewritten the previous paragraph from "These results suggest that a NAO-related mechanism may explain part of the variability of M2". We now first mention the hypothesis of stratification from Müller et al (2014) and Gräwe et al. (2014), and in a second time, we mention the Huess and Andersen work.

I have actually spent some time on trying to understand why Huess and Andersen obtained maximum M2 in summer (which I assume is what their phase of 180 degrees means) by turning on winds for surges, which must be dominated by winter westerlies as in your Figure 2(c). I haven't fully understood all that and perhaps that can be returned to by someone else again, but for now I think you should not base most of your seasonal discussion on that, rather than Mueller etc.

We believe that dedicated simulations should help to estimate the respective role of stratification and/or meteorological forcing (sea-level pressure and winds) in M2 variations.

I hope you can be patient and address this issue seriously. Until you do that I do not feel I can accept the paper. I am conscious that I am functioning here more as a reviewer more than an editor, so I have copied this set of comments to the executive editor (as I did for my comments on the V2 version) and he can let me know if I am not doing my job correctly. I hope you can see that I am on your side here (because I am intrigued if there really is an NAO connection). However, I can also if you wish send the latest draft to the original two reviewers although I doubt if they will be pleased to see it again.

We can see your helpful attitude, and we thank you sincerely, it is highly appreciated.

Small comments on the text and figures:

Would you be willing to change the title to read '.... tide along North ...'? It is up to you but I think that would be better.

Yes, it has been changed.

line 1 - M2 along North ..

Yes, it has been changed.

7 - up to 2.5 mm/yr at Wilmington since 1910.

It has been changed.

19 - and Boston

It has been added.

20 - at the North Atlantic basin scale and at a quasi-global ..

It has been changed.

21 some coastal stations

It has been added.

23-24 I would remove this sentence. This example is from the Pacific which looks odd in a paper about the Atlantic. You do mention this paper lower down ok so it will be included.

Yes, it has been removed.

If you agree then: For example, Ray and Talke ..

Yes, it has been done.

32 - Cap --> Cape

It has been corrected.

45 – Hawaii

It has been corrected.

50 – waters

It has been corrected.

65 The first section below ['below' because this isn't the first section in the paper]

It has been added.

70 Tide gauge selection

It has been corrected.

73 by the Rijkswaterstaat (RWS) in the Netherlands.

It has been added.

77 - 249 from UHSLC

It has been added.

93 - in 1846, 1879 and 1896 respectively ...

It has been corrected.

96 developed

It has been corrected.

99 - I guess this is optional at this stage, but don't you think 3 hour sampling is a bit coarse? Have you checked that this sampling results in the same M2 amplitudes as for hourlies?

You could test that using an hourly series and then have something like:

... was 3 hours. (We checked with an hourly time series from Brest, with a comparable M2 magnitude to the Netherlands, that 3-hourly sampling did not result in a reduction of M2 amplitude in a tidal analysis compared to hourly sampling.)

[If true of course]

Yes, we agree that 3 hour sampling may be a bit coarse. As suggested, we have conducted tests, and we added the conclusions in the text “We checked with hourly time series from recent years (1971-2018), that 3-hourly sampling did not result in a significant reduction of M2 amplitude in a tidal analysis compared to hourly sampling.” Indeed, at Hoek van Holland, we found on average a reduction of only 1.4 cm, whereas M2 varies from 71 cm to 80.5 cm over the whole period (Figure B1). At Delfzijl, we found a reduction of 2.4 cm, whereas M2 varies from 113.8 cm to 137.6 cm over all the period (Figure B1).

100 .. seasonal modulation affecting the computed amplitudes.

It has been changed.

line 3 of Table 1 caption: ... since 1990 up to 2018 in each case (standard ..

It has been added.

125 - I would drop 'with yearly values'. What does that mean anyway, you are using winter values

Yes, it has been removed.

128 - the NAO index

It has been corrected.

137-140 - I would drop from 'We computed' to the end of the para and replace with:

However, we made use only of data from 1850 to be more consistent with the temporal coverage of the tide gauge measurements. This will be discussed in Section 4.

It has been added.

The reason for this is that the reader will ask why you defined winter as Dec-Feb when the NAO and AO indices are Dec-March. But I come back to this below.

Yes, we mention later that we define winter as December-February, as suggested.

142 - you use US spelling here (harbor) and UK spelling (harbour) at line 163 and elsewhere.

Please check you use standard spelling throughout (preferably UK).

We corrected with “harbour” instead of “harbor” at lines 147 and 160.

155 - .. Cuxhaven could therefore be sensitive

It has been corrected.

162 - would this link not be better as a reference in the normal way?

Yes, we did it.

168 - drop comma after result

It has been removed.

176 archaeology

It has been corrected.

182 .. magnitude of unnormalized M2 ..

It has been changed.

199-200 I still don't understand this sentence about small amplitude at Key West. You are discussing normalised changes so it shouldn't matter what the actual amplitude is.

This sentence has been removed.

209 between the 1870s

It has been corrected.

215 However, note that ..

It has been changed.

234 - (1) some spatially-coherent changes .. [you have two recents in the same sentence]

It has been changed.

238 - I think 1990 here should be 1910 or the paragraph doesn't make sense. Right? If so, I would move this para to line 230 so all the information for 1910- comes in two paragraphs, followed by the one ('The trends') on 1990-.

Yes, we corrected 1990 to 1910, and moved the paragraph to line 230.

264 - with 9-year

It has been corrected.

278 - current profiles .. shelves ... modifies

It has been corrected.

280 circulation on the tide

It has been corrected.

When you computed these correlations and the p-values did you allow for serial correlation?

If so, say so. If not, the correlations will be less significant than you think.

Here, we did not investigate serial correlation. A Durbin-Watson test shows that there is some positive correlation in the residuals.

295 - (the NAO index ..

It has been corrected.

300 - two indices are closely related.

It has been changed.

310 - NAO and MSL at each station: there ... below. [i.e. drop the brackets]

It has been changed.

324 - ... dependent) naturally captures better the ..

[this is an obvious statement!]

It has been changed.

325 observed since 1990

It has been corrected.

333 ... (Figure 11(b)). (We define winter here as December-February.) This way ..

It has been added.

335 .. onshore by westerly winds

It has been added.

338 I don't understand how you infer -15 to 24 from Figure 12(a). I see +/- 10 on average.

This was a problem of update: the values in the text (-15 to 24 cm) still referred to the North East Atlantic, whereas the Figure 12 (a) was zoomed in the North Sea. As now, Figure 12 is back on the North East Atlantic, we do not need to change the values.

342 .. yield centimetric changes in M2 amplitude.

It has been changed.

343 is roughly un agreement

It has been added.

347 Note that the M2 amplitude

This paragraph has been removed.

But the para 345- needs considerable revising, see above

This paragraph has been removed.

380 - since 1910 and since 1990

It has been added.

Fig 12 - see my comments above, but can the right plots be moved more right as the 'hPa' of the left is confusingly close to the 'M2(cm)' on the right

Figures 12 (b) (c) (d) have been removed.

395 tends

It has been corrected.

411 may not be

It has been corrected.

Large-scale changes of the semidiurnal tide ~~along over the~~ North Atlantic coasts from 1846 to 2018

Lucia Pineau-Guillou¹, Pascal Lazure¹, and Guy Wöppelmann²

¹IFREMER, CNRS, IRD, UBO, Laboratoire d’Océanographie Physique et Spatiale, UMR 6523, IUEM, Brest, France

²LIENSS, Université de la Rochelle-CNRS, La Rochelle, France

Correspondence: Lucia Pineau-Guillou (lucia.pineau.guillou@ifremer.fr)

Abstract.

We investigated the long-term changes of the principal tidal component M_2 ~~along over the~~ North Atlantic coasts, from 1846 to 2018. We analysed 18 tide gauges with time series starting no later than 1940. The longest is Brest with 165 years of observations. We carefully processed the data, particularly to remove the 18.6-year nodal modulation. We found that M_2 variations are consistent at all the stations in the North East Atlantic (Cuxhaven, Delfzijl, Hoek van Holland, Newlyn, Brest), whereas some discrepancies appear in the North West Atlantic. The changes started long before the XXth century, and are not linear. The secular trends in M_2 amplitude vary from one station to another; most of them are positive, up to 2.5 mm/yr ~~at Wilmington in the period~~ since 1910. Since 1990, the trends switch from positive to negative values in the North East Atlantic. Concerning the possible causes of the observed changes, the similarity between the North Atlantic Oscillation and M_2 variations in the North East Atlantic suggests a possible influence of the large-scale atmospheric circulation on the tide. Our statistical analysis confirms large correlations at all the stations in the North East Atlantic. We discuss a possible underlying mechanism. A different spatial distribution of mean sea level (corresponding to water depth) from one year to another, depending on the low-frequency sea-level pressure patterns, could impact the propagation of the tide in the North Atlantic basin. However, the hypothesis is at present unproven.

1 Introduction

Tides have been changing due to non-astronomical factors since the XIXth century (Haigh et al., 2019; Talke and Jay, 2020). In the North Atlantic, secular variations have been observed at individual tide gauge stations, e.g. Brest (Cartwright, 1972; Wöppelmann et al., 2006; Pouvreau et al., 2006; Pouvreau, 2008), Newlyn (Araújo and Pugh, 2008; Bradshaw et al., 2016), New York (Talke et al., 2014), ~~and~~ Boston (Talke et al., 2018), but also at regional scale, e.g. Gulf of Maine (Doodson, 1924; Godin, 1995; Ray, 2006; Ray and Talke, 2019), ~~at the North Atlantic basin scale~~ (Müller, 2011), and at a quasi-global scale (Woodworth, 2010; Müller et al., 2011; Mawdsley et al., 2015). Long-term changes in tidal constituents are rather small at ~~some~~ coastal stations, but tend to be statistically significant. The order of magnitude of these changes varies spatially, and may reach a few cm/century for M_2 amplitude. For example, ~~Colosi and Munk (2006) reported changes of about 1 cm at Honolulu, Hawaii, between 1915 and 2000.~~ Ray and Talke (2019) found trends varying from -1 to 8 cm/century in the Gulf of Maine

25 over the last century. Woodworth et al. (2010) and Müller et al. (2011) found trends of a few % per century in the Atlantic. The changes can be larger in many estuaries and rivers (Talke and Jay, 2020).

The physical causes of these changes can be multiple and difficult to disentangle. In particular, the complexity comes from the possible interaction between local and large-scale causes. Changes may have a local scale origin, such as changes in the nearby environment (e.g. harbour development, deepening of channels, dredging, siltation) or changes in the instrumentation (e.g. tide gauge technology, observatory location, instrumental errors). For example, Familkhalili and Talke (2016) show that mean tidal range at Wilmington has doubled since the 1880s, due to channel deepening in the Cape Fear River Estuary. Changes may also have a large-scale origin, i.e. regional or global. Haigh et al. (2019) reported several possible large-scale mechanisms: (1) tectonics and continental drift, (2) water depth changes due to mean sea level rise or geological processes such as the Earth's surface glacial isostatic adjustment (Müller et al., 2011; Pickering et al., 2017; Schindelegger et al., 2018), (3) shoreline position, (4) extent of sea-ice cover (Müller et al., 2014), (5) sea-bed roughness, (6) ocean stratification which may modify the internal tides and bottom friction over continental shelves (Müller, 2012), (7) non-linear interactions and (8) radiational forcing (Ray, 2009).

Several authors have explored Mean Sea Level (MSL) rise as a potential mechanism to explain M_2 changes. For example, simulations by Pickering et al. (2012) show that a 2m sea level rise could modify M_2 from -20 to 20 cm around the whole ocean. Idier et al. (2017) show that depending on the location, the changes can account for +/-15% of the regional sea level rise. Schindelegger et al. (2018) find changes of about 1–5% of the sea level rise. Beyond MSL rise, other mechanisms have been explored to explain M_2 changes. For example, Colosi and Munk (2006) attribute the changes of M_2 amplitude at Honolulu, Hawaii, to a 28° rotation of the internal tide vector in response to ocean warming. Ray and Talke (2019) suggest that long-term changes in stratification could play a role in the Gulf of Maine. Müller (2011) suggests a possible link between M_2 changes and atmospheric dynamics in the North Atlantic; he reported that the timeseries of the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) show similar characteristics to those of the tidal amplitudes and phases. In the Gulf of Maine, Pan et al. (2019) suggest that changes in the response of the nodal modulation of the M_2 tide from 1970s to 2013 may be linked with the NAO. In Southeast Asian waters, Devlin et al. (2018) show that the impact of atmospheric circulation (via the wind stress, through Ekman current) on the M_2 seasonal cycle may be significant and comparable to the effect of permanent (geostrophic) currents. In the North Sea, Huess and Andersen (2001) explain a large part of M_2 seasonal cycle by the role of atmospheric dynamics, whereas Müller et al. (2014) and Gräwe et al. (2014) suggest a major role of the thermal stratification. These examples show the diversity of mechanisms that play a role in tide changes. In the present paper, we focus on the role of MSL and atmospheric dynamics.

55

This paper has two main objectives. The first is to characterize the secular changes of the M_2 tide over the North Atlantic. We focus on the longest time series, i.e. starting no later than 1940. This approach is complementary to previous studies investigating M_2 changes focusing on smaller spatial scales, e.g. Brest (Pouvreau et al., 2006; Pouvreau, 2008), Gulf of Maine (Ray, 2006; Ray and Talke, 2019), or focusing on shorter temporal scales, i.e. recent decades (Woodworth, 2010; Müller, 2011). The

60 second objective is to detect if there is any large-scale coherence in the observed changes in the North Atlantic, and investigate the possible link with the atmospheric circulation, already mentioned by Müller et al. (2011), on the basis of qualitative criteria. Here, we further bring quantitative insights on the possible influence of the NAO, and discuss a possible NAO-related climate mechanism that can partly explain the observed changes.

65 The paper is organised as follows. The first section below describes the data: the sea level data (i.e. tide gauges and their processing) and the atmospheric data (i.e. climate indices and sea level pressure data). The following section presents the results (i.e. M_2 variations and trends). We then discuss a possible link between the observed tidal changes and MSL, as well as climate indices.

2 Data

70 2.1 Sea level data

2.1.1 Tide gauges selection

The tide gauge data were retrieved from the University of Hawaii Sea Level Center (UHSLC, website accessed April 2020). The dataset consists of 249 stations in the Atlantic Ocean, with hourly sea level observations. Two additional long-term stations - Delfzijl and Hoek van Holland - were provided by Rijkswaterstaat (RWS) in the Netherlands.

75

We selected the stations following three criteria: time series (1) starting before 1940, (2) with at least 80 years of data, (3) with tidal amplitude significant enough to detect trends, i.e. M_2 amplitude larger than 10 cm. Note that we selected only years with at least 75% of data (see section 2.1.2). Only 24 stations among the 249 from UHSLC followed the two first criteria (Figure 1). They are all located in the northern hemisphere. On the east side of the North Atlantic, Stockholm, Gedser, Hornbaek, Tregde and Marseille were discarded due to too small an M_2 amplitude (i.e. lower than 10 cm). These stations are located in the Baltic Sea (Stockholm, Gedser), in the strait separating the Baltic and the North Sea (Hornbaek), in the North Sea (Tregde), and in the Mediterranean Sea (Marseille). On the west side of the North Atlantic, Galveston, Pensacola and Cristobal were also discarded due to too small a tidal amplitude (i.e. lower than 10 cm). These stations are located in the Gulf of Mexico (Galveston, Pensacola) and the Caribbean Sea (Cristobal).

85

Finally, 18 stations followed the three criteria detailed above, and were selected for this study (see stations in bold in Figure 1, 16 stations are from UHSLC, and 2 from RWS). Among them, 5 are located on the North East Atlantic coasts (Newlyn, Brest, Hoek van Holland, Delfzijl and Cuxhaven - note that Hoek van Holland, Delfzijl and Cuxhaven are located in the North Sea) and 13 are located on the North West Atlantic coasts (Halifax, Eastport, Portland, Boston, Newport, New London, New York, Atlantic City, Lewes, Wilmington, Charleston, Fort Pulaski and Key West).

90




Figure 1. Tide gauges in the North Atlantic. Stations with time series starting before 1940 and longer than 80 years are labelled. Stations selected for this study are in bold.

The main characteristics of the 18 selected stations are summarised in Table 1. Among them, only Brest, Hoek van Holland and Halifax started in the XIXth century, **respectively** in 1846, 1879 and 1896 **respectively** (Table 1, column 2). The number of years with data for each station varies between 81 and 165 years, Brest being the longest time series (Table 1, column 3).

95 2.1.2 Data processing

Harmonic analysis was performed in order to compute the M_2 amplitude. We used the MAS program (Simon, 2007, 2013), developed by the French Hydrographic Office (SHOM). This program gives results similar to the T_Tide harmonic analysis toolbox (Pawlowicz et al., 2002). For instance, Pouvreau et al. (2006) found no differences in the yearly amplitudes of M_2 at Brest over the period 1846 to 2005 using either T_Tide or MAS. Hourly time series were analysed yearly. Note that at Delfzijl and Hoek van Holland, data had to be interpolated every hour before 1970, as the temporal sampling was 3 hours. (We checked with hourly time series from recent years (1971-2018), that 3-hourly sampling did not result in a significant reduction of M_2 amplitude in a tidal analysis compared to hourly sampling.) We processed only years with at least 75% of data, to avoid seasonal modulation affecting the computed amplitudes M_2 -seasonal-modulation. In the North Atlantic, M_2 is affected by a seasonal variation of a few percent (Pugh and Vassie, 1976; Huess and Andersen, 2001; Müller et al., 2014; Gräwe et al., 2014). Considering only years with at least 75% of data resulted in excluding up to 15 years for a given station (Table 1, columns 3 and 4). We carefully removed the nodal modulation of M_2 amplitude (Simon, 2007, 2013), as described briefly in Appendix A. Finally, 3 station-years were discarded due to problems in the record (1953 and 1962 at Delfzijl, 1953 at Hoek van Holland),

Table 1. Main characteristics of tide gauge records selected for this study. Name of the station, timespan, number of years with data, number of years analysed (i.e. with at least 75% of data), M_2 average amplitude and standard deviation over the period 1910-2010, M_2 nodal modulation, estimated trends in M_2 amplitude since 1910 and since 1990 **up to 2018 in each case** (standard errors are 1-sigma).

Name	Timespan	Nb of yrs with data	Nb of yrs analysed	$\overline{M_2}$ (cm) [1910-2010]	M_2 nod. mod. f_{nod}	M_2 trends since 1910 (mm/yr)	M_2 trends since 1990 (mm/yr)
Cuxhaven	1918-2018	102	101	135.05 ± 3.68	1.8 %	0.68 ± 0.10	-0.47 ± 0.41
Delfzijl	1879-2018	138	138	125.58 ± 6.96	1.7 %	2.02 ± 0.09	-0.09 ± 0.24
Hoek van Holland	1900-2018	88	82	76.95 ± 2.63	0.8 %	0.85 ± 0.06	-0.45 ± 0.14
Newlyn	1916-2016	102	98	170.66 ± 0.75	3.3 %	0.14 ± 0.02	-0.28 ± 0.14
Brest	1846-2018	165	158	204.54 ± 0.91	3.8 %	0.13 ± 0.02	-0.36 ± 0.12
Halifax	1896-2012	99	95	62.83 ± 0.64	3.7 %	-0.15 ± 0.02	0.32 ± 0.17
Eastport	1930-2018	90	82	263.51 ± 2.50	2.5 %	0.80 ± 0.07	1.01 ± 0.39
Portland	1910-2018	109	104	135.07 ± 1.84	2.8 %	0.56 ± 0.03	0.72 ± 0.20
Boston	1922-2018	98	96	136.57 ± 1.03	2.9 %	0.27 ± 0.03	0.42 ± 0.20
Newport	1931-2018	89	84	50.86 ± 0.41	4.1 %	-0.09 ± 0.01	-0.03 ± 0.08
New London	1939-2018	81	76	35.93 ± 0.25	3.5 %	0.06 ± 0.01	0.03 ± 0.05
New York	1921-2018	95	80	65.13 ± 0.83	3.7 %	0.33 ± 0.02	0.93 ± 0.12
Atlantic City	1912-2018	107	101	58.48 ± 0.31	3.8 %	0.00 ± 0.01	-0.18 ± 0.07
Lewes	1919-2018	85	72	59.91 ± 0.43	3.1 %	-0.06 ± 0.02	-0.33 ± 0.06
Wilmington	1936-2018	84	82	56.84 ± 6.16	1.7 %	2.51 ± 0.09	1.80 ± 0.20
Charleston	1901-2018	101	100	76.40 ± 1.33	3.0 %	0.32 ± 0.03	-0.02 ± 0.08
Fort Pulaski	1936-2018	84	78	100.60 ± 1.01	3.1 %	0.18 ± 0.04	-0.01 ± 0.17
Key West	1913-2018	106	104	17.50 ± 0.36	2.9 %	0.08 ± 0.01	0.13 ± 0.02

and 2 more station-years due to doubtful M_2 values (1972 at Eastport, 1978 at Newport).

110 At all the stations, we computed the normalized M_2 amplitude, removing the average and dividing by the standard deviation over the period 1910-2010

$$Normalized\ M_2(t) = \frac{M_2(t) - \overline{M_2}_{[1910,2010]}}{\sigma_{M_2[1910,2010]}} \quad (1)$$

the average $\overline{M_2}$ and standard deviation σ_{M_2} over the 1910-2010 period being given in Table 1 (column 5). The idea is to scale the data, in order to compare all the stations together.

2.2.1 Climate indices

We investigated the correlation between secular changes in the tide and climate indices, such as the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO) or the Arctic Oscillation (AO) - also called Northern Annular Mode (NAM) (Hurrell, 1995; Hurrell and Deser, 2009; Thompson and Wallace, 2000; Thompson et al., 2000). These climate indices are related to the distribution of atmospheric masses. They are based on the difference of average sea-level pressure between two centres of actions (i.e. stations) over long periods (e.g. monthly, seasonal, annual).

The NAO is the major pattern of weather and climate variability over the Northern Hemisphere (Hurrell, 1995; Hurrell and Deser, 2009). Variations of NAO drive the climate variability over Europe and North America (Hurrell et al., 2003). We used the wintertime (December to March) Hurrell station-based NAO Index (retrieved from <https://climatedataguide.ucar.edu/climate-data/hurrell-north-atlantic-oscillation-nao-index-station-based>). It is based on the difference of normalized average winter sea-level pressure between Lisbon (Portugal) and Stykkisholmur/Reykjavik (Iceland). The normalization involves removing the mean (1864–1983) and dividing by the long-term standard deviation. The NAO index covers the period 1864-2019, ~~with yearly values.~~

The Arctic Oscillation (AO) is another index which resembles to the NAO index. It is defined as the first EOF of northern hemisphere winter sea-level pressure data (Thompson and Wallace, 1998, 2000; Thompson et al., 2000). The AO index is highly correlated with the NAO. We used the wintertime Hurrell AO index (retrieved from <https://climatedataguide.ucar.edu/climate-data/hurrell-wintertime-slp-based-northern-annular-mode-nam-index>). The AO index covers the period 1899-2019.

To remove the interannual variability and estimate low frequency variations, climate indices were low-pass filtered with a 9-year mean filter.

2.2.2 Sea level pressure

We employed the Twentieth Century Reanalysis (20CR version 3 dataset) (Compo et al., 2011; Slivinski et al., 2019), a historic weather reconstruction from 1836 to 2015, with a 1° gridded global coverage. ~~However, we made use only of data from 1850 to be more consistent with the temporal coverage of the tide gauge measurements. This will be discussed in Section 4. We computed the mean winter (December to February) sea-level pressure at each grid point over the period 1850-2015. We averaged from 1850 rather than 1836 (20CR starting date) to be consistent with the temporal coverage of the tide gauge measurements. We also computed yearly anomalies, i.e. removing the average sea-level pressure at each grid point.~~

3.1 M_2 variations

For the North East Atlantic, the variations of normalized M_2 amplitude are presented in Figure 2 (a).

The first result is that since 1910, the variations show similar patterns at all the stations; M_2 amplitude decreases up to the 1960s, then increases, and decreases again from the 1990s. This suggests that these changes are probably due to large-scale processes, rather than local effects due to changes in the environment (e.g. harbour development, dredging, siltation) or instrumentation errors. The similar patterns between Brest and Cuxhaven may be surprising, as Cuxhaven is located in the North Sea, and not in the open Atlantic Ocean, and far away from Brest, around 1300 km. This indicates that the spatial scale of the processes responsible for these changes must be at least as large as the North East Atlantic. Different authors have noticed the increase of tidal range from 1960 to 1990 in the southern North Sea. Hollebrandse (2005) found a gradual increase during the period 1955-1980 at all the stations of the Dutch coast (5 stations including Hoek van Holland) and the German coast (7 stations). Mudersbach et al. (2013) found a significant increase in M_2 amplitude at Cuxhaven since around the mid-1950s. Note that Cuxhaven is located in the German Bight; shallow depths and the shape of the coastline may induce some amplification. Variations in M_2 at Cuxhaven could be therefore sensitive to local effects, such as the migration of the underwater channels and the evolution of the tidal flats (Jacob et al., 2016). Moreover, Cuxhaven is located in the Elbe estuary, and some river engineering works, such as narrowing and deepening, may induce tidal amplification (Winterwerp and Wang, 2013; Winterwerp et al., 2013).

Before 1910, normalized M_2 values are higher at Brest than at Delfzijl. The construction of dykes that have gradually closed the harbour of Brest since the end of the XIXth century may have altered the tide at Brest. The high values before 1910 may be due to local changes, in addition to large-scale changes. To go further, the potential role of these successive constructions needs to be investigated (Wikipedia contributors, 2020)(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brest_Arsenal). Cartwright (1972) made a first attempt to evaluate the influence of reducing the width of access to the harbour but did not take into account a potential role of dredging for which we have no information. This example underlines the complexity of interpretation of the variations when changes of local and large-scale origin occur at the same time. Note that in the following, we focus mainly on the XXth century, as most of the stations start after 1900 (15 out of 18 stations).

The second result is that there is no obvious linear trend in M_2 variations, but rather break or change points, M_2 increasing and then decreasing, depending on the periods considered. Overall, M_2 decreases from 1910 until 1960, increases again until 1980-1990, to finally decrease since 1990; note that the curve flattens between 1920 and 1940. Pouvreau et al. (2006) already noticed these variations at Brest and Newlyn, and suggested a long-period oscillation of around 140 years, rather than a steady secular trend. A careful analysis of the harmonic development of the tidal potential showed that no tidal component could explain this oscillation. Similarly, no linear combination of tidal harmonic components could explain it (Pouvreau et al., 2006). This indicates that these variations are not due to an astronomical component. However, in contrast to Brest, M_2 at Delfzijl




Figure 2. Normalized annual M_2 amplitude (a) in the North East Atlantic (b) in the North West Atlantic, stations with positive trends (c) in the North West Atlantic, stations with negative or no trend. The stars in (b) in the 1860s correspond to M_2 amplitude at Eastport and Portland from Ray and Talke (2019), and New York from Talke et al. (2014), after normalization (Eq. (1)).

stays flat between 1880 and 1920. The decrease observed at Brest between 1880 and 1920 may be due to harbour development and/or dredging (see above). This underlines the importance of sea level data archaeology, for research studies related to long-term changes (Pouvreau, 2008; Woodworth et al., 2010; Marcos et al., 2011; Talke and Jay, 2013, 2017; Ray and Talke, 2019; Bradshaw et al., 2015, 2020).

The third result is that changes in M_2 have not the same order of magnitude at each station (see Figure B1 in Appendix B for time series of M_2). Note that Figure 2 represents normalized M_2 , i.e. removing the average and dividing by the standard deviation. The order of magnitude of ~~unnormalized (not-normalized)~~ M_2 changes are roughly the same at Brest and Newlyn (standard deviations of 0.9 and 0.8 cm respectively, Table 1, column 5), but more than three times larger at Cuxhaven (standard deviation of 3.7 cm), and even larger at Delfzijl (standard deviation of 7 cm). This suggests that the North Sea may be more sensitive to the processes responsible for these changes. Note also that the environmental setting of Cuxhaven and Delfzijl in the Elbe and Ems estuaries, respectively, could introduce some amplification (Winterwerp and Wang, 2013; Winterwerp et al., 2013).

For the North West Atlantic, the variations of normalized M_2 amplitude are presented in Figure 2 (b) and (c). The first feature is that M_2 amplitude varies differently in the North West and in the North East Atlantic. The second is that there are discrepancies between stations, even when close to each other (e.g. Atlantic City and Lewes). We split the stations into two groups, in order to facilitate the detection of patterns, each being consistent in terms of trends: one with positive trend (group 1 in Figure 2 (b)), the other one with negative or no trend (group 2 in Figure 2 (c)).

The first group (with positive trends) consists of 9 stations (Figure 2 (b)). Three outcomes can be highlighted. The first is that M_2 amplitude increases overall since 1900. However, between 1980 and 1990, all the stations slightly decrease, and since 1990 they increase again. The second outcome is that the rate of increase is very different from one station to another (keeping in mind that M_2 is normalized by standard deviation in Figure 2). Portland is increasing 1.4 times faster than Charleston (standard deviations being respectively of 1.82 and 1.33 cm), and 28 times faster than Key West (standard deviation being only 0.36 cm at Key West). ~~The very slow increase of M_2 at Key West is due to a small tidal amplitude (i.e. only 17.5 cm mean amplitude for M_2 , see Table 1, column 5).~~ The large increase in Portland may be explained by some amplification in the Gulf of Maine. In many semienclosed basins, resonance leads to tidal amplification (Talke and Jay, 2020; Haigh et al., 2019). In the Gulf of Maine, Ray and Talke (2019) reported that the tides in the Gulf are in resonance, with a natural resonance frequency close to the N_2 tide (Garrett, 1972; Godin, 1993). Tides may be then very sensitive to any changes in the environment (e.g. basin configuration - shape, depth - but also external forcing). The third outcome, and probably the most interesting one, is related to the values of M_2 at Eastport, Portland and New York in the 1860s, estimated from Ray and Talke (2019) and Talke et al. (2014), and represented (after normalization) as stars on Figure 2 (b). These values are not consistent with the positive linear trends observed since 1900, which provides some consistency with the hypothesis formulated from the analyses of the data prior to the XXth century in Figure 2 (a): long-term variations introduce some breaks or change points, M_2 increasing and

then decreasing, depending on the periods considered. The decrease observed between the 1870s and 1920s at the four stations (Brest, Eastport, Portland, New York) suggests a possible large-scale signal, in addition to local processes.

The second group (with negative or no trend) consists of 4 stations (Figure 2 (c)). Two points can be highlighted. The first is that M_2 decreases overall for Halifax, Newport and Lewes. This is less clear for Atlantic City, which is quite noisy and shows no significant trend. The second point is that at Halifax, M_2 values in 1896-1897 are higher than those after 1920. This suggests that the decrease may have started before the XXth century. However note that at Halifax, there is a long gap in the data recording (1898-1919), which raises the possibility of an instrumentation origin in the observed decrease of the M_2 amplitude.

3.2 Estimated trends

We estimated the trends for M_2 amplitude at each station, using linear regression. We computed the trends over two periods: 1910-2018, which corresponds roughly to the whole period of data (only 5 stations start before 1910), and 1990-2018, which corresponds to recent decades. Some tests showed that the later results were not very sensitive to the start date (moving 1990 to 1985 or 1995). The results are summarised in Table 1 (columns 7 and 8) and Figures 3 and 4.

The trends estimated from 1910 vary significantly from one station to another (Figure 3). They are positive overall (up to 2.5 mm/yr at Wilmington), which is consistent with previous findings (Araújo and Pugh, 2008; Ray, 2009; Woodworth, 2010; Müller et al., 2011; Ray and Talke, 2019). They are slightly negative at three stations (Halifax, Newport, Lewes), and one station shows no significant trend (Atlantic City). The estimates are statistically consistent with those found previously by different authors (e.g. 0.15 ± 0.02 mm/yr at Newlyn compared to 0.19 ± 0.03 mm/yr in Araújo and Pugh (2008), 0.56 ± 0.03 mm/yr in Portland, compared to 0.59 ± 0.04 mm/yr in Ray and Talke (2019)). In the North East Atlantic, the trends are consistent with each other (in terms of sign), which is not surprising as the stations vary similarly (Figure 2 (a)).

~~The trends estimated since 1990 are quite different from those estimated since 1910 (Figures 3 and 4), with more stations with negative trends: 9 stations out of 18 have post-1990 negative trends, whereas only 3 stations out of 18 have post-1910 negative trends (Table 1, columns 7 and 8). In the North East Atlantic, they all switch from positive to negative trends. This underlines (1) some spatially-coherent recent changes in recent decades (Müller, 2011; Ray and Talke, 2019) and (2) the difficulty to estimate long-term trends from short records (i.e. less than 30 years), especially if the data are noisy (interannual variability) and the underlying processes non-linear (change points).~~

The largest trends since 1910 1990 are mainly observed in semi-closed basins: Wilmington in the Cape Fear River Estuary, Delfzijl in Ems estuary, Cuxhaven in Elbe estuary, Eastport and Portland in the Gulf of Maine. This suggests a possible amplification due to resonance effects (e.g. Gulf of Maine) and/or propagation in shallow waters (e.g. Cuxhaven), in addition to local effects. The stations located in estuaries or in a harbour with a channel may have been subject to dredging. Channel




Figure 3. Estimated trends in M_2 amplitude over the period 1910-2018




Figure 4. Estimated trends in M_2 amplitude over the period 1990-2018

deepening increases the water depths, which reduces the effective drag, and leads to tidal range amplification. This effect may be particularly large in estuaries (Ralston et al., 2019; Talke and Jay, 2020), and may explain the larger trends at Wilmington (Famikhali and Talke, 2016) and Delzijl. Finally, the shifting locations of amphidromic points could also play a role (Haigh et al., 2019). In the North Sea, different authors show a possible migration of the present day amphidromes, under a 2 m sea-level rise scenario (Pickering et al., 2012; Idier et al., 2017).

The trends estimated since 1990 are quite different from those estimated since 1910 (Figures 3 and 4), with more stations with negative trends: 9 stations out of 18 have post-1990 negative trends, whereas only 3 stations out of 18 have post-1910 negative trends (Table 1, columns 7 and 8). In the North East Atlantic, they all switch from positive to negative trends. This underlines (1) some spatially-coherent recent changes in recent decades (Müller, 2011; Ray and Talke, 2019) and (2) the difficulty to estimate long-term trends from short records (i.e. less than 30 years), especially if the data are noisy (interannual variability) and the underlying processes non-linear (change points).

The trends have to be interpreted very carefully as the M_2 variations are not linear, and may increase or decrease depending on the years; as a consequence, the estimated trends depend strongly on the period considered to estimate it. The interannual variability also plays an important role, and when substantial, trends can vary depending on the computational period. For example, at Cuxhaven, the large interannual variability leads to a large uncertainty on the trend computed since 1990 (-0.47 ± 0.41 mm/yr).

4 Discussion

4.1 Possible link with mean sea level rise

The MSL rise could partly explain M_2 changes. Simulations show that MSL rise can result in an change of M_2 up to $\pm 10\%$ of the rise (Pickering et al., 2017; Idier et al., 2017; Schindelegger et al., 2018). Schindelegger et al. (2018) show that the sign of the observed M_2 trend is correctly reproduced at 80% of the tide gauges on a global scale, but their simulated trends tend to differ from observations by a factor 3 to 5, i.e. their simulations underestimate the M_2 response to MSL rise in terms of magnitude. Schindelegger et al. (2018) conclude that “magnitudes of observed and modeled M_2 trends are within a factor of 4 (or less) from each other in nearly 50% of the considered cases”. The large discrepancies between the simulations and the observations strongly suggest that MSL rise is not the only process that may explain M_2 changes – other large-scale processes, in addition to local processes, may also play a role.

Figure 5 shows the annual MSL, after removing the average over the period 1910-2010, and filtering with a 9-year time windows. The correlations between M_2 and MSL indicate that M_2 varies strongly with MSL (see section 4.2). However, M_2 variations show some variability in the North East Atlantic (Figure 2 (a)), which may not be explained with MSL rise alone.

4.2 Possible link with MSL and climates indices

Other processes than MSL rise may impact the tide (see section 1), such as the atmospheric circulation and the ocean stratification. Ocean and atmosphere are fully coupled, and air-sea fluxes are responsible for the exchange of momentum, water (evaporation and precipitation budget) and heat at their interface. Among the wide range of possible interactions, two mechanisms have been explored for their ability to modify the tide. (1) The momentum flux (wind stress) and the gradient of sea level pressure which act on the barotropic tide and (2) the water and heat fluxes which induce changes in both temperature and salinity distribution in the ocean. The latter effect acts on the stratification which in turn could impact the tide in two different ways. The first way is the internal tide generation which transfers energy from barotropic and baroclinic motion and modifies surface tidal expression (Colosi and Munk, 2006). However, in the present study, most of the observations comes from coastal stations sheltered by wide continental shelves which dampen internal waves. More important is the second way: the stratification acts on the eddy viscosity profile by modifying currents profiles and bottom drag over continental shelves, which in turn




Figure 5. Annual Mean Sea Levels (MSL), after removing the average over the period 1910-2010. MSL values are filtered using 9-year windows.

modifies the M_2 surface expression (Kang et al., 2002; Müller, 2012; Katavouta et al., 2016).

Here, we focus on the effect of the atmospheric circulation on the tide. We used pressure indices (NAO and AO) that are relevant to represent atmospheric circulation. The NAO index represents the difference of normalized sea level pressure between the Azores high pressure system and the Iceland low pressure one (Hurrell, 1995). It indicates the redistribution of atmospheric masses between the Subtropical Atlantic and the Arctic (Hurrell and Deser, 2009). In the North East Atlantic, the similarity between the variations of the low-frequency winter NAO index and those of M_2 (Figure 6) suggests a possible impact of large-scale atmospheric circulation on the tide. The NAO index varies from positive to negative phases. Filtering the interannual variability, the NAO index tends overall to decrease between 1910 and 1970, then increase until 1990, and once again decrease. The same way, M_2 amplitude tends to decrease up to 1960, then increase until 1990, and once again decrease. These similar patterns raise a possible connection between NAO and M_2 variation, already mentioned by Müller (2011) on the basis of qualitative criteria. In the following, we bring quantitative insights on the possible influence of NAO.

We computed the correlations (r-value) between normalized M_2 and climate indices, NAO and AO (Figure 7). M_2 , NAO and AO are filtered using the same time window (9 years). The correlations are computed since 1910, to have similar periods for all the stations. The correlations are considered as significant only if the p-value is lower than 0.05 (95% significance level). The results are the following: (1) for NAO, 14 stations out of 18 show significant correlation. Note that at Brest, the correlation is significant since 1910, but not since 1864 (the NAO index used in this study starts only in 1864). This can be explained by the M_2 larger amplitude over all the XIXth century, which decreases between 1890 and 1910 (Figure 2 (a)), possibly due




Figure 6. Low frequency winter NAO and AO indices, obtained with a 9-year mean filter. Normalized annual M_2 amplitudes in the North East Atlantic (from Figure 2 (a)) are also plotted in grey.




Figure 7. Correlation (r-value) since 1910 between M_2 and (a) North Atlantic Oscillation and (b) Arctic Oscillation. Black dots are stations with no significant correlation. M_2 , NAO and AO are filtered using the same time window (9 years).

310 to harbour development and dykes construction (see section 3.1). (2) In the North East Atlantic, all the stations are positively correlated with NAO. (3) The strongest correlations (i.e. greater than 0.5) are in the northern part of the North Atlantic, with




Figure 8. Variance explained (r^2 -value) since 1910 between M_2 and NAO, M_2 and MSL, M_2 and fitted model $\alpha MSL + \beta NAO$ (model 2), NAO and MSL. M_2 , NAO and MSL are filtered using the same time window (9 years). Note that there is no orange bar for NAO-MSL when the correlation is not significant ($p > 0.05$).




Figure 9. Relative contribution of α compared to β in the fitted model $\alpha MSL + \beta NAO$. Black dots are stations with no significant M_2 -NAO correlation. The size of each large dot is proportional to the correlation between M_2 and the fitted model. Stations with no MSL-NAO correlations are labelled in bold.

strong positive correlations at Cuxhaven and Hoek van Holland, and strong negative correlation at Halifax (-0.55). (4) For AO, we found similar, but overall larger, r-values. This is not surprising as these two indices are **closely related highly-correlated**.




Figure 10. Variations since 1910 of M_2 , α MSL (model 1), α MSL+ β NAO (model 2). M_2 , NAO and MSL are filtered using the same time window (9 years).

315 To go further in the relative contribution of MSL and NAO in M_2 variability, we fitted two linear regression models on M_2 variations. In the following, M_2 , MSL and NAO are filtered over 9-year time windows and normalized. At all the stations, we fitted M_2 variations with a MSL linear regression model (model 1), and a MSL and NAO multiple linear regression model (model 2). Models 1 and 2 may be expressed as:

$$\text{Model 1} = \alpha_1 \text{MSL} \quad (2)$$

320

$$\text{Model 2} = \alpha \text{MSL} + \beta \text{NAO} \quad (3)$$

The correlations between M_2 and model 1 (MSL) and model 2 (NAO and MSL) are presented in Figure 8. We checked if there was correlation between NAO and MSL at the stations: (there is no correlation at 6 stations, and r-value is between 0.2 and 0.6 at 8 stations, see Figure 8 and discussion below). The results are the following: (1) M_2 varies at first order with MSL (Figure 8). (2) The introduction of the NAO (model 2) allows to increase the predictive performance of the model, beyond the inherent effect of adding an additional regression parameter. Indeed, on average, the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) is 99.9 for model 2, instead of 112.7 for model 1. On average, the r^2 -value is 0.67 for model 2 instead of 0.61 for model 1. At some stations, the increase is quite large. For example at Cuxhaven, the r^2 -value jumps from 0.42 to 0.64 between model

1 and 2. (3) The ratio $\frac{\beta}{\alpha+\beta}$ represents roughly the relative contribution of the NAO compared to the total effect of MSL and
 330 NAO (Figure 9), as MSL and NAO are normalized. We found a significant contribution at some stations (e.g. more than 30%
 at Cuxhaven and Halifax), whereas it is negligible at others (e.g. only 5% at Portland). 8 stations out of 18 show large NAO
 contribution ($> 20\%$). The North East Atlantic seems to be more sensitive to the NAO. Note that the interpretation of the
 results is tricky when MSL-NAO correlation is significant (orange bars in Figure 8). For example, at Hoek van Holland, the
 relative NAO contribution is very small, mainly because MSL and NAO are highly correlated ($r = 0.59$). Figure 10 shows
 335 M_2 variations along with the predictions from the two models, at all four stations where the NAO contribution is significant
 ($\frac{\beta}{\alpha+\beta} > 0.25$) and the correlation between M_2 and model 2 is large enough ($r > 0.3$). At Cuxhaven, Halifax and Key West, the
 model 2 (MSL and NAO dependent) **naturally better** captures **better** the M_2 variations than the model 1 (MSL dependent); at
 Brest, the improvement is less significant. The trend-switch observed since **the** 1990 in the North East Atlantic could be partly
 explained by the influence of the NAO on the tide.

340

These results suggest that a NAO-related mechanism may explain part of the variability of M_2 . **As mentioned by Müller**
(2011), “it is shown that sea-level, sea surface temperature and Arctic ice thickness are correlated with the NAO index. Thus,
changes in the dynamics of the atmosphere could affect both M_2 and S_2 tides by processes discussed under (1), (2) and (3).”
An underlying mechanism linked with (2) – sea surface temperature – could be changes in the ocean stratification. This is the
 345 **main hypothesis invoked in Ray (2006) to explain secular changes in M_2 amplitude in the Gulf of Maine; this is also the main**
hypothesis in Müller et al. (2014) and Gräwe et al. (2014) to explain seasonal modulation of M_2 in the North Sea. The rela-
tionship between the NAO index and stratification is complex and spatially variable across the North East Atlantic (Fromentin
and Planque, 1996). In the North Sea, the sea surface temperatures are positively correlated with NAO (Becker and Pauly,
1996), while subsurface temperatures show no significant correlation with NAO (Tian et al., 2016). Stratification could there-
 350 **fore be (positively) correlated with NAO but a dedicated study, outside the scope of this paper, would be necessary. Another**
The underlying mechanism linked this time with (1) – sea level – could be ~~due to~~ the difference of spatial distribution of water
level, ~~depending on the NAO index~~ due to different sea-level pressure and wind stress patterns. This is the hypothesis invoked
in Huess and Andersen (2011) to explain the seasonal modulation of M_2 in the North Sea. They ran a barotropic model, forced
with tides only and with both tides and meteorological fields; their results show that the M_2 seasonal modulation is better cap-
 355 **tured when the model is forced with both tides and meteorological fields rather than with tides only. Figure 11 (a) shows the**
average sea-level pressure during the period 1850-2015, derived from the Twentieth Century Reanalysis (20CR) (Compo et al.,
2011; Slivinski et al., 2019). A positive NAO winter (e.g. 1989) corresponds to a situation with a stronger pressure gradient
than average, between the two pressure systems of Azores and Iceland (Figure 11 (c)). By contrast, a negative NAO winter (e.g.
1969) corresponds to a weaker gradient pressure than usual (Figure 11 (b)). (We define winter here as December-February.)
 360 **This way, from one year to another, the large-scale atmospheric masses are distributed differently, and as a consequence, the**
water volumes are also distributed differently in the Northern Atlantic. In a situation of NAO^+ , the surface waters are pushed
onshore by westerly winds, moving from Iceland to the European coasts of France, Spain and Portugal. Figure 12 (a) shows
the redistribution of the sea-level pressure, between two years with high and low NAO indices (here 1989 and 1969). Note that

this is an extreme situation, as these years have strong positive and negative indices. The changes in terms of water level may vary from -15 cm to 24 cm, assuming an inverse barometer response of sea level. This variation of a few tens of cm is probably negligible offshore, but may have some impact on tide propagation along the continental shelves and in shallow waters. It could also shift slightly the amphidromic points. Assuming that these changes have a similar impact (in terms of magnitude) on M_2 as MSL changes, that is, $\pm 10\%$ in shallow waters according to recent simulations (Pickering et al., 2017; Idier et al., 2017), we find that they can yield centimetric changes in M_2 amplitude up to a few centimeters. In other words, their order of magnitude is roughly in agreement with the changes observed in M_2 (Table 1). However, it is difficult to disentangle the effects of stratification and meteorological forcing (sea-level pressure and wind stress) in M_2 changes, and possibly both mechanisms coexist. Dedicated simulations should be conducted to assess the effects of atmospheric forcing on M_2 variability.

We conducted further investigations in the North Sea to test if the magnitude of sea-level pressure changes induced by large-scale atmospheric circulation (Figure 12 (a), a dozen of hPa) can generate the observed decadal-scale M_2 changes at Cuxhaven (Figure 12 (b), few cm). Note that M_2 changes due to large-scale atmospheric circulation are only a small part of the total observed changes (20 cm at Cuxhaven), as the changes are also due to MSL rise. The underlying mechanism invoked in the present paper (i.e. the influence of the atmospheric circulation on the tide) is close to the one described in Huess and Andersen (2001), except that we are considering a longer time scale (decadal instead of seasonal). Huess and Andersen (2001) explain partly M_2 seasonal variations through the effect of atmospheric circulation. They ran a barotropic model in the North Sea, forced (1) with tides only and (2) with both tides and meteorological fields. Their results show that the M_2 seasonal modulation is better captured when the model is forced with both tides and meteorological fields (their Figure 2, top right, amplitude higher than 10 cm in the German Bight) rather than with tides only (their Figure 2, top left, amplitude lower than 5 cm in the German Bight). It is important to underline that their model is barotropic, and that there is no effect of stratification, which may also play a role in M_2 changes (see 3.3.6 in the review of Haigh et al. (2019)). At seasonal scale, we computed monthly (instead of yearly) M_2 variations at Cuxhaven over 5 years (2010-2015), and we obtained results in agreement with Huess and Andersen (2001). That is, a seasonal cycle with a range of around 15 cm, maximum in summer and minimum in winter (Figure 12 (d)). According to Huess and Andersen (2001), this seasonal cycle is partly due to the atmosphere circulation. We then computed the differences of monthly sea-level pressure between January and July 2015 (Figure 12 (e)), and obtained values close to the ones in Figure 12 (a) in terms of magnitude (a dozen of hPa). This shows that the order of magnitude of sea-level pressure changes between a NAO^+ and NAO^- years (Figure 12 (a), a dozen of hPa) may lead to the M_2 observed changes at Cuxhaven (Figure 12 (b), a few cm, similar to its seasonal variations). The assumption that changes of a dozen of hPa in the North Sea may generate a sea-level response of few centimeters is reasonable, but dedicated simulations should be conducted to confirm or discard the water volume redistribution hypothesis. Note that here, we followed the hypothesis mentioned in Huess and Andersen (2001), who consider that the atmospheric circulation may be partly responsible of M_2 seasonal variations in the North Sea. But there are other hypotheses; Müller et al. (2014) and Gräwe et al. (2014) rather consider that the stratification plays a major role in the North Sea. However, it is difficult to disentangle the respective contribution of each of these two

processes in M_2 seasonal changes, only from the available observations:




Figure 11. Winter sea-level pressure over the North East Atlantic (a) average over 1850-2015 (b) anomaly in 1969 (NAO^-) (c) anomaly in 1989 (NAO^+). Contour intervals are every 2 hPa.




Figure 12. At decadal time scale: (a) Difference of winter sea-level pressure between 1989 (NAO^+) and 1969 (NAO^-) over the North East Atlantic in the North Sea (b) Annual M_2 amplitude at Cuxhaven from 1918 to 2018. At seasonal time scale: (c) Difference of monthly sea-level pressure between January and July 2015 in the North Sea (d) Monthly M_2 amplitude at Cuxhaven from January 2010 to December 2015. Contour intervals are every 4 hPa in (a) and (c).

400 5 Conclusions

We investigated the long-term changes of the principal tidal component M_2 over the North Atlantic coasts. We analysed 18 tide gauges with time series starting no later than 1940. The longest is Brest with 165 years of data. We carefully processed the data, particularly to remove the 18.6-year nodal modulation.

405 We found that M_2 variations were consistent at all the stations in the North East Atlantic (Cuxhaven, Delfzijl, Hoek van
Holland, Newlyn, Brest), whereas variations appear between stations in the North West Atlantic. The changes started long
before the XXth century, and are not linear. The trends vary significantly from one station to another; they are overall positive,
up to 2.5 mm/yr, or slightly negative. Since 1990, in many stations, the trends switch from positive to negative values. The
significant differences between the trends since 1910 and since 1990 indicate caution when interpreting trends based on short
410 records, i.e. less than 30 years, especially if the data are noisy (interannual variability) and the underlying processes non-linear
(change points).

Concerning the causes of the observed changes, M_2 varies primarily with the MSL, but MSL rise is not sufficient to ex-
plain the variations alone. The similarity between the North Atlantic Oscillation and M_2 variations in the North East Atlantic
415 suggests a possible influence of the large-scale atmospheric circulation on the tide. Our statistical analysis confirms large
correlations at all the stations in the North East Atlantic. The trend-switch observed since 1990 could be the signature of the
large-scale atmospheric circulation on the M_2 tide. The underlying mechanism would be a different spatial distribution of water
level from one year to another, depending on the low-frequency sea-level pressure patterns, and impacting the propagation of
the tide in the North Atlantic basin. In the future, dedicated modelling studies should be undertaken to confirm or discard this
420 hypothesis. These simulations should also allow to estimate the effect of the wind (through the Ekman current) and currents on
 M_2 changes (Devlin et al., 2018).

In this study, we focused only on M_2 amplitude. A similar analysis on the phase lag would draw a more complete picture
of the M_2 variations (Müller, 2011; Woodworth, 2010; Ray and Talke, 2019). Other constituents are also affected. Results
425 show that S_2 amplitude decreases at all the stations located in the North West Atlantic, and in contrast, tends to increase in
the North East Atlantic (not shown). The large-scale decrease of S_2 observed in the North West Atlantic is consistent with
previous studies (e.g. Ray, 2006, in the Gulf of Maine). Further investigations should be definitely conducted to extend this
work to more constituents.

430 The historic data show that the changes started long before the XXth century. This conclusion would not have been possible
without the huge work of data rescue undertaken over the past decades (e.g. Pouvreau et al., 2006; Pouvreau, 2008; Bradshaw
et al., 2016). This underlines the great importance of sea level data archaeology, which allows to extend and improve histori-
cal datasets (Pouvreau, 2008; Woodworth et al., 2010; Marcos et al., 2011; Talke and Jay, 2013, 2017; Ray and Talke, 2019;
Bradshaw et al., 2015, 2020; Haigh et al., 2019). This is essential for studies related to climate change.

435

Finally, we should mention several additional limitations and perspectives in this study. (1) We processed the time series con-
sidering that they were quality controlled. A fuller analysis of the data quality before processing would probably be valuable.
(2) We did not investigate the history of each station. There are probably some local changes (e.g. environment or instrumenta-
tion) that may explain a part of the variability of M_2 amplitude, and some discrepancies between stations. (3) The tide gauges

440 are located mainly in harbours. They are affected at the same time by local and regional/global scale changes, that are difficult to separate. Moreover, they may **not** be **not** representative of changes offshore. A similar study based on satellite altimetry data would probably be of great interest, even if temporal scale for satellite data is still rather short (i.e. < 30 years) compared to climate-scale processes. (4) We focused mainly on the UHSLC dataset, which consists of 249 stations in the Atlantic Ocean. Other relevant stations (that are not in this dataset) may be considered in future studies. (5) We did not investigate the impact of storminess on the tide. Dedicated studies are necessary to estimate if changes in storminess could affect significantly tidal constituents. (6) We used only winter AO and NAO indices, which show more variability than annual indices. A similar analysis with annual indices shows similar results for the correlation with AO or NAO (positive correlation on the North East Atlantic). With annual rather than monthly indices, the difference of pressure fields will decrease, and as a consequence, the magnitude of the sea-level response will also decrease. Further investigations should be conducted on this point.

450

Appendix A: Nodal modulation

The M_2 component is subject to a 18.6-year modulation, separated from a neighboring line in the tidal potential (m_2) whose Doodson number differs in its 5^{th} frequency (255 555 and 255 545 for M_2 and m_2 , respectively) (Doodson and Warburg, 1941; Pugh and Woodworth, 2014). This 5^{th} frequency corresponds to N' , the negative of the mean longitude of the Moon ascending node - hence the "nodal" term - whose period is 18.6 years. Note that there is also another component close to M_2 , whose Doodson number differs only from the 5^{th} frequency (255 565), but it is negligible, its amplitude in the tidal potential being only 0.05% of M_2 , whereas m_2 amplitude is 3.7 % of M_2 (Simon, 2007, 2013). With one year of hourly data, the two components M_2 and m_2 cannot be separated by a yearly harmonic analysis (at least 18.6 years are necessary). As a consequence, M_2 amplitude is modulated by m_2 . However, we can estimate this modulation, and remove it. The harmonic formulation is expressed schematically as a sum of harmonic components

460

$$h(t) = \sum_i a_i \cos(V_i(t) - \kappa_i) \quad (A1)$$

where $h(t)$ is the sea level height at time t , $V_i(t)$ is the astronomical argument (computed from Doodson number) and a_i , κ_i the amplitude and phase lag of each component. Considering that M_2 and m_2 are very close in terms of frequency, we can assume that their phase lags are similar ($\kappa_{M_2} \simeq \kappa_{m_2}$). As their difference of astronomical arguments is $V_{m_2} - V_{M_2} = N' + \pi$, the M_2 and m_2 contributions to the total water level may be expressed as

465

$$h_{M_2}(t) + h_{m_2}(t) = h_{M_2}(t)[1 + f_{nod} \cos(N' + \pi)] \quad (A2)$$

where f_{nod} , the nodal modulation, is the ratio of the amplitude of m_2 and M_2 . As M_2 and m_2 are very close in terms of frequency, f_{nod} is generally considered as close to the ratio of their amplitude in the tidal potential, A_{m2} and A_{M2}

$$f_{nod} = \frac{a_{m2}}{a_{M2}} \simeq \frac{A_{m2}}{A_{M2}} \simeq 0.037. \quad (A3)$$

470 The negative of the mean longitude of the Moon ascending node is expressed simply as a function of time (p. 116 in Simon (2007), p. 112 in Simon (2013))

$$N' = -N = 234.555 + 1934.1363T + 0.0021T^2 \quad (A4)$$

with N' in degrees, and T the time elapsed since 2000/01/01 at 12:00, expressed in Julian centuries (36 525 days).

475 The tidal program we used (MAS) corrected M_2 applying the usual 3.7% nodal modulation (Eq. (A3)). However, this value may vary significantly from one station to another; Ray (2006) reported values ranging from 2.3 % to 3.6 % in the Gulf of Maine. Here, we computed directly f_{nod} from the observed data, proceeding as follows. (1) We added the default nodal correction $1 + 0.037\cos(N' + \pi)$ to the M_2 variations. (2) We detrended the obtained signal removing the last Intrinsic Mode Function (IMF) of an Empirical Mode Decomposition (EMD) (Huang et al., 1998); note that the EMD is an analysis tool which partitions a series into 'modes' (i.e. IMFs), the last one being the trend of the signal. (3) We fitted a function $a_{m2} \cos(N' + \pi)$ to this detrended signal to estimate a_{m2} , N' being expressed as in Eq. (A4). (4) We finally computed f_{nod} as the ratio between m_2 and M_2 amplitudes (Eq. (A3)). Figure A1 (a) shows an example of estimate of M_2 modulation at Newlyn: the fit leads to a nodal modulation of 3.3 %. Note that this value is consistent with Woodworth (2010) (3.2 %), whereas Woodworth et al. (1991) gave a slightly different value (2.8 %). Figure A1 (b) shows the impact of this value rather than the default one: oscillations of 18.6 years are clearly reduced. Note that in this study, the m_2 amplitude - and then the nodal correction - could have been computed from the full time series harmonic analysis, as records are longer than 18.6 years. However, the method presented here to compute the nodal correction can be applied even for time series shorter than 18.6 years.

490 The computed nodal modulations are summarised in Table 1 (column 6). They vary from 0.8 to 4.1 %. Note that these values are consistent with those obtained by previous authors (Ray, 2006; Müller, 2011; Woodworth, 2010; Ray and Talke, 2019). Only the value at Charleston differs significantly: 3.0 % in our study compared to 3.7% in Müller (2011).

Appendix B: Time series of annual M_2 amplitude at all the stations

495 *Author contributions.* LPG analysed the data and wrote the paper. PL and GW contributed to the interpretation of the data and the writing of the paper.




Figure A1. (a) Estimation of the nodal modulation of M_2 amplitude (mean removed) at Newlyn (b) Impact on M_2 amplitude of the nodal modulation correction at Newlyn. M_2 is detrended in (a) to better fit the nodal modulation.

Competing interests. The authors declare no competing interests.

Acknowledgements. This work was supported by the Research Theme "Long-term observing systems for ocean knowledge" of the ISblue project "Interdisciplinary graduate school for the blue planet", co-funded by a grant from the French government under the program "Investissements d'Avenir" (ANR-17-EURE-0015). The sea level observations were provided by the University of Hawaii Sea Level Center -
500 retrieved from <ftp://ftp.soest.hawaii.edu/uhslc/rqds>, accessed April 2020. The sea level data at Delfzijl and Hoek van Holland were provided by Rijkswaterstaat (RWS) Service Desk, Netherlands. The climate indices (NAO and AO indices) were provided by the the Climate Analysis Section, NCAR, Boulder, USA - retrieved from <https://climatedataguide.ucar.edu/climate-data/>, accessed April 2020. The AMO index was provided by NOAA Physical Sciences Laboratory - retrieved from <https://psl.noaa.gov/data/timeseries/AMO/>, accessed April 2020. The harmonic analysis program MAS was provided by the French Hydrographic Office (SHOM). Support for the Twentieth Century Reanalysis
505 Project version 3 dataset was provided by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science Biological and Environmental Research (BER), by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Climate Program Office, and by the NOAA Physical Sciences Laboratory. The authors very warmly thank the two reviewers (Stefan Talke and an anonymous reviewer) and the Editor (Philip Woodworth) for their careful reading and their many constructive comments, which allowed to greatly improve the paper.




Figure B1. Annual M_2 amplitude at the 18 selected tide gauges

References

- 510 Araújo, I. B. and Pugh, D. T.: Sea levels at Newlyn 1915–2005: Analysis of trends for future flooding risks, *J. Coast. Res.*, 24, 203–212, <https://doi.org/10.2112/06-0785.1>, 2008.
- Becker, G. A. and Pauly, M.: Sea surface temperature changes in the North Sea and their causes, *ICES J. Mar. Sci.*, 53, 887–898, <https://doi.org/10.1006/jmsc.1996.0111>, 1996.
- Bradshaw, E., Rickards, L., and Aarup, T.: Sea level data archaeology and the Global Sea Level Observing System (GLOSS), *Georesj*, 6, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.grj.2015.02.005>, 2015.
- 515 Bradshaw, E., Woodworth, P., Hibbert, A., Bradley, L., Pugh, D., Fane, C., and Bingley, R.: A century of sea level measurements at Newlyn, Southwest England, *Mar. Geodesy*, 39, 115–140, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490419.2015.1121175>, 2016.
- Bradshaw, E., Ferret, Y., Pons, F., Testut, L., and Woodworth, P.: Workshop on sea level data archaeology, Paris, France, 10 – 12 March 2020, Tech. rep., Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, Workshop Report No. 287, 2020.
- 520 Cartwright, D. E.: Secular changes in the oceanic tides at Brest, 1711–1936, *Rev. of Geophys.*, 57, 433–449, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.1972.tb05826.x>, 1972.
- Colosi, J. A. and Munk, W.: Tales of the venerable Honolulu tide gauge, *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, 36, 967–996, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JPO2876.1>, 2006.
- Compo, G. P., Whitaker, J. S., Sardeshmukh, P. D., Matsui, N., Allan, R. J., Yin, X., Gleason, B. E., Vose, R. S., Rutledge, G., Bessemoulin, P., Brönnimann, S., Brunet, M., Crouthamel, R. I., Grant, A. N., Groisman, P. Y., Jones, P. D., Kruk, M., Kruger, A. C., Marshall, G. J., Maugeri, M., Mok, H. Y., Nordli, Ø., Ross, T. F., Trigo, R. M., Wang, X. L., Woodruff, S. D., and Worley, S. J.: The twentieth century reanalysis project, *Quart. Journ. Roy. Meteorol. Soc.*, 137, 1–28, <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.776>, 2011.
- 525 Devlin, A. T., Zaron, E. D., Jay, D. A., Talke, S. A., and Pan, J.: Seasonality of tides in Southeast Asian waters, *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, 48, 1169–1190, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JPO-D-17-0119.1>, 2018.
- 530 Doodson, A. T.: Perturbations of harmonic tidal constants, *Proc. Royal Soc.*, 106, 513–526, <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.1924.0085>, 1924.
- Doodson, A. T. and Warburg, H. D.: Admiralty manual of tides, HMSO, London, U.K, 1941.
- Familkhalili, R. and Talke, S. A.: The effect of channel deepening on tides and storm surge: A case study of Wilmington, NC, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 43, 9138–9147, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL069494>, 2016.
- Fromentin, J.-M. and Planque, B.: Calanus and environment in the eastern North Atlantic. II. Influence of the North Atlantic Oscillation on C. finmarchicus and C. helgolandicus, *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, 134, 111–118, <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps134111>, 1996.
- 535 Garrett, C.: Tidal resonance in the Bay of Fundy and Gulf of Maine, *Nature*, 238, 441–443, <https://doi.org/10.1038/238441a0>, 1972.
- Godin, G.: On tidal resonance, *Cont Shelf Res*, 13, 89–107, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0278-4343\(93\)90037-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0278-4343(93)90037-X), 1993.
- Godin, G.: Rapid evolution of the tide in the Bay of Fundy, *Cont Shelf Res*, 15, 369–372, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0278-4343\(93\)E0005-S](https://doi.org/10.1016/0278-4343(93)E0005-S), 1995.
- 540 Gräwe, U., Burchard, H., Müller, M., and Schuttelaars, H. M.: Seasonal variability in M2 and M4 tidal constituents and its implications for the coastal residual sediment transport, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 41, 15 563–5570, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GL060517>, 2014.
- Haigh, I. D., Pickering, M. D., Green, J. A. M., Arbic, B. K., Arns, A., Dangendorf, S., Hill, D. F., Horsburgh, K., Howard, T., Idier, D., Jay, D. A., Jänicke, L., Lee, S. B., Müller, M., Schindelegger, M., Talke, S. A., Wilmes, S., and Woodworth, P. L.: The tides they are a-changin’: A comprehensive review of past and future nonastronomical changes in tides, their driving mechanisms and future implications, *Rev. of Geophys.*, 57, e2018RG000 636, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018RG000636>, 2019.
- 545

- Hollebrandse, F.: Temporal development of the tidal range in the southern North Sea, Tech. rep., Master thesis, Faculty of Civil Engineering and Geosciences, Delft University of Technology, 2005.
- Huang, N. E., Shen, Z., Long, S. R., Wu, M. C., Shih, H. H., Zheng, Q., Yen, N.-C., Tung, C. C., and Liu, H. H.: The empirical mode decomposition and the Hilbert spectrum for nonlinear and non-stationary time series analysis, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A*, 454, 903–995, <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.1998.0193>, 1998.
- Huess, V. and Andersen, O. B.: Seasonal variation in the main tidal constituent from altimetry, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 28, 567–570, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1029/2000GL011921>, 2001.
- Hurrell, J.: Decadal trends in the North Atlantic Oscillation, regional temperatures and precipitation, *Science*, 269, 676–679, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.269.5224.676>, 1995.
- Hurrell, J., Kushnir, Y., Ottersen, G., and Visbeck, M.: An overview of the North Atlantic Oscillation, *Geophys. Monogr. Ser.*, 134, 1–36, <https://doi.org/10.1029/134GM01>, 2003.
- Hurrell, J. W. and Deser, C.: North Atlantic climate variability: The role of the North Atlantic Oscillation, *J Mar Syst*, 78, 28–41, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmarsys.2008.11.026>, 2009.
- Idier, D., Paris, F., Cozannet, G. L., Boulahyaa, F., and Dumas, F.: Sea-level rise impacts on the tides of the European Shelf, *Cont Shelf Res*, 137, 56–71, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2017.01.007>, 2017.
- Jacob, B., Stanev, E. V., and Zhang, Y. J.: Local and remote response of the North Sea dynamics to morphodynamic changes in the Wadden Sea, *Ocean Dyn*, 66, 671–690, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10236-016-0949-8>, 2016.
- Kang, S. K., Foreman, M. G. G., Lie, H. J., Lee, J. H., Cherniawsky, J., and Yum, K. D.: Two-layer tidal modeling of the Yellow and East China Seas with application to seasonal variability of the M2 tide, *J. Geophys. Res. Oceans*, 107, 3020, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2001JC000838>, 2002.
- Katavouta, A., Thompson, K. R., Lu, Y., and Loder, J. W.: Interaction between the tidal and seasonal variability of the Gulf of Maine and Scotian shelf region, *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, 46, 3279–3298, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JPO-D-15-0091.1>, 2016.
- Marcos, M., Puyol, B., Wöppelmann, G., Herrero, C., and García-Fernández, M. J.: The long sea level record at Cadiz (southern Spain) from 1880 to 2009, *J. Geophys. Res. Oceans*, 116, C12 003, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JC007558>, 2011.
- Mawdsley, R. J., Haigh, I. D., and Wells, N. C.: Global secular changes in different tidal high water, low water and range levels, *Earth's Future*, 3, 66–81, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014EF000282>, 2015.
- Mudersbach, C., Wahl, T., Haigh, I. D., and Jensen, J.: Trends in high sea levels of German North Sea gauges compared to regional mean sea level change, *Cont Shelf Res*, 65, 111–120, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2013.06.016>, 2013.
- Müller, M.: Rapid change in semi-diurnal tides in the North Atlantic since 1980, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 38, L11 602, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011GL047312>, 2011.
- Müller, M.: The influence of changing stratification conditions on barotropic tidal transport and its implications for seasonal and secular changes of tides, *Cont Shelf Res*, 47, 107–118, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2012.07.003>, 2012.
- Müller, M., Arbic, B. K., and Mitrovica, J. X.: Secular trends in ocean tides: Observations and model results, *J. Geophys. Res. Oceans*, 116, C05 013, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010JC006387>, 2011.
- Müller, M., Cherniawsky, J. Y., Foreman, M. G. G., and von Storch, J. S.: Seasonal variation of the M2 tide, *Ocean Dyn*, 64, 159–177, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10236-013-0679-0>, 2014.
- Pan, H., Zheng, Q., and Lv, X.: Temporal changes in the response of the nodal modulation of the M2 tide in the Gulf of Maine, *Cont Shelf Res*, 186, 13–20, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2019.07.007>, 2019.

- Pawlowicz, R., Beardsley, B., and Lentz, S.: Classical tidal harmonic analysis including error estimates in MATLAB using T_TIDE, *Comput Geosci*, 28, 929–937, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0098-3004\(02\)00013-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0098-3004(02)00013-4), 2002.
- Pickering, M., N.C.Wells, K.J.Horsburgh, and J.A.M.Green: The impact of future sea-level rise on the European Shelf tides, *Cont Shelf Res*, 35, 1–15, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2011.11.011>, 2012.
- Pickering, M. D., Horsburgh, K. J., Blundell, J. R., Hirschi, J. J.-M., Nicholls, R. J., Verlaan, M., and Wells, N.: The impact of future sea-level rise on the global tides, *Cont Shelf Res*, 142, 50–68, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2017.02.004>, 2017.
- Pouvreau, N.: Trois cents ans de mesures marégraphiques en France: outils, méthodes et tendances des composantes du niveau de la mer au port de Brest, PhD thesis, University of La Rochelle, 2008.
- Pouvreau, N., Miguez, B. M., Simon, B., and Wöppelmann, G.: Évolution de l’onde semi-diurne M2 de la marée à Brest de 1846 à 2005, *C. R. Geoscience*, 338, 802–808, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crte.2006.07.003>, 2006.
- Pugh, D. and Woodworth, P.: *Sea-Level Science: Understanding tides, surges, tsunamis and mean sea-level changes*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, U.K., 2014.
- Pugh, D. T. and Vassie, J. M.: Tide and surge propagation off-shore in the Dowsing region of the North Sea, *Dtsch. Hydrogr. Zeitschrift*, 29, 163–213, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02226659>, 1976.
- Ralston, D. K., Talke, S., Geyer, W. R., Al-Zubaidi, H. A. M., and Sommerfield, C. K.: Bigger tides, less flooding: Effects of dredging on barotropic dynamics in a highly modified estuary, *J. Geophys. Res. Oceans*, 124, 196–211, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JC014313>, 2019.
- Ray, R. D.: Secular changes of the M2 tide in the Gulf of Maine, *Cont Shelf Res*, 26, 422–427, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2005.12.005>, 2006.
- Ray, R. D.: Secular changes in the solar semidiurnal tide of the western North Atlantic ocean, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 36, L19601, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009GL040217>, 2009.
- Ray, R. D. and Talke, S. A.: Nineteenth-century tides in the Gulf of Maine and implications for secular trends, *J. Geophys. Res. Oceans*, 124, 7046–7067, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JC015277>, 2019.
- Schindelegger, M., Green, J. A. M., Wilmes, S., and Haigh, I. D.: Can we model the effect of observed sea level rise on tides?, *J. Geophys. Res. Oceans*, 123, 4593–4609, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JC013959>, 2018.
- Simon, B.: *La marée océanique côtière*, Institut Océanographique Ed., Paris, France, https://iho.int/iho_pubs/CB/C-33/C-33_maree_simon_fr.pdf, 2007.
- Simon, B.: *Coastal tides*, Institut Océanographique Ed., Paris, France, https://iho.int/iho_pubs/CB/C-33/C-33_maree_simon_en.pdf, 2013.
- Slivinski, L. C., Compo, G. P., Whitaker, J. S., Sardeshmukh, P. D., Giese, B. S., McColl, C., Allan, R., Yin, X., Vose, R., Titchner, H., Kennedy, J., Spencer, L. J., Ashcroft, L., Brönnimann, S., Brunet, M., Camuffo, D., Cornes, R., Cram, T. A., Crouthamel, R., Domínguez-Castro, F., Freeman, J. E., Gergis, J., Hawkins, E., Jones, P. D., Jourdain, S., Kaplan, A., Kubota, H., Blancq, F. L., Lee, T., Lorrey, A., Luterbacher, J., Maugeri, M., Mock, C. J., Moore, G. K., Przybylak, R., Pudmenzky, C., Reason, C., Slonosky, V. C., Smith, C., Tinz, B., Trewin, B., Valente, M. A., Wang, X. L., Wilkinson, C., Wood, K., and Wyszyński, P.: Towards a more reliable historical reanalysis: Improvements for version 3 of the Twentieth Century Reanalysis system, *Quart. Journ. Roy. Meteorol. Soc.*, 145, 2876–2908, <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.3598>, 2019.
- Talke, S. A. and Jay, D. A.: Nineteenth century North American and Pacific tidal data: lost or just forgotten?, *J. Coast. Res.*, 29, 118–127, <https://doi.org/10.2112/JCOASTRES-D-12-00181.1>, 2013.
- Talke, S. A. and Jay, D. A.: *Archival water-level measurements: Recovering historical data to help design for the future*, Tech. rep., Civil and Environmental Engineering Faculty Publications and Presentations, 412., 2017.

- Talke, S. A. and Jay, D. A.: Changing tides: The role of natural and anthropogenic factors, *Ann Rev Mar Sci*, 12, 121–151, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-marine-010419-010727>, 2020.
- 625 Talke, S. A., Orton, P., and Jay, D. A.: Increasing storm tides in New York harbor, 1844–2013, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 41, 3149–3155, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GL059574>, 2014.
- Talke, S. A., Kemp, A., and Woodruff, J.: Relative sea level, tides, and extreme water levels in Boston (MA) from 1825 to 2018, *J. Geophys. Res. Oceans*, 123, 3895–3914, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2017JC013645>, 2018.
- Thompson, D. W. J. and Wallace, J. M.: The Arctic oscillation signature in wintertime geopotential height and temperature fields, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 25, 1297–1300, <https://doi.org/10.1029/98GL00950>, 1998.
- 630 Thompson, D. W. J. and Wallace, J. M.: Annular modes in the extratropical circulation. Part I: Month-to-month variability, *J. Clim.*, 13, 1000–1016, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442\(2000\)013<1000:AMITEC>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442(2000)013<1000:AMITEC>2.0.CO;2), 2000.
- Thompson, D. W. J., Wallace, J. M., and Hegerl, G. C.: Annular modes in the extratropical circulation. Part II: Trends, *J. Clim.*, 13, 11018–1036, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442\(2000\)013<1018:AMITEC>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442(2000)013<1018:AMITEC>2.0.CO;2), 2000.
- Tian, T., Su, J., Boberg, F., Yang, S., and Schmith, T.: Estimating uncertainty caused by ocean heat transport to the North Sea: experiments downscaling EC-Earth, *Clim. Dyn.*, 46, 99–110, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-015-2571-8>, 2016.
- 635 Wikipedia contributors: Brest Arsenal, Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brest_Arsenal, [Online; accessed 2-Nov-2020], 2020.
- Winterwerp, J. C. and Wang, Z. B.: Man-induced regime shifts in small estuaries - I: theory, *Ocean Dyn*, 63, 1279–1292, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10236-013-0662-9>, 2013.
- 640 Winterwerp, J. C., Wang, Z. B., van Braeckel, A., van Holland, G., and Kösters, F.: Man-induced regime shifts in small estuaries - II: a comparison of rivers, *Ocean Dyn*, 63, 1293–1306, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10236-013-0663-8>, 2013.
- Woodworth, P.: A survey of recent changes in the main components of the ocean tide, *Cont Shelf Res*, 30, 1680–1691, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2010.07.002>, 2010.
- Woodworth, P. L., Shaw, S. M., and Blackman, D. L.: Secular trends in mean tidal range around the British Isles and along the adjacent European coastline, *Geophys. J. Int.*, 104, 593–609, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-246X.1991.tb05704.x>, 1991.
- 645 Woodworth, P. L., Pouvreau, N., and Wöppelmann, G.: The gyre-scale circulation of the North Atlantic and sea level at Brest, *Ocean Sci.*, 6, 185–190, <https://doi.org/10.5194/osd-6-2327-2009>, 2010.
- Wöppelmann, G., Pouvreau, N., and Simon, B.: Brest sea level record: a time series construction back to the early eighteenth century, *Ocean Dyn*, 56, 487–497, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10236-005-0044-z>, 2006.