

Journal: Ocean Science\_ Discussions (Copernicus)

Paper for Review: Recent sea level rise on Ireland's east coast..... Ocean Sci. Paper\_ os-2020-81

Authors: Nejad, A.S, Parnell, A.C. et al.

Review Comments:

Potentially, this could be a good paper and a discussion of significant issues of tides analysis for Ireland (the whole island), with the focus on the apparently anomalous tide gauge records and relatively long data sets from Dublin.

Regrettably, the paper is not satisfactory and acceptable as is. I started to produce a line by line editing/ review of the paper, with anticipation of something really good developing and emerging in the text, but am afraid, gave up. Sorry! At the end of the discussion/ conclusions, I remain unclear as to whether the data from the 4 Dublin area tide gauges are all, or only partly (spatially &/ or temporally) anomalous and what the significance of their data is for future of sea-level rise on Ireland's coasts (locally to internationally).

In brief, I found the paper to be poorly laid out, confused and confusing in its writing. Important issues of existing tide gauge datasets and sea-level changes (past and future projections) are raised, but their presentation, in both the description and discussion, is wordy and unclear. The algorithms for the statistical analyses used for the data are not well explained and presented, nor a convincing case made for the conclusions reached, which seem also to fizzle, with no real 'punch line'.

There are lots of problems with the text throughout; it is poorly written, not well structured, often inaccurate and somewhat contradictory in the findings reached and with spelling errors/ typos common\_ poor proof reading. The text does not communicate well to the reader the core points of the work/ analyses undertaken. There is an unnecessary use/ overuse of thesis type section headings, which break up the flow of both the basic data, ideas and their outcomes. Overall, the paper seems to be a rushed product; full of stylistic, grammatical, text structural and accuracy issues. The paper would benefit from an objective (clinical) re-writing, to help focus and shorten it. It would also be better to anchor the Dublin data into a review of the tidal records for the whole island, as one of the key objectives, rather than this being a partially addressed theme. The graphics are just bad: too many (data sets overlapping and perhaps even contradictory), the axes not well labelled and the captions far too short and lacking in helpful explanation.

Robert Devoy