



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	2014_PSIJ_15652
Title of the Manuscript:	Discussion of Time and Tide: analysis of sea level time series
Type of the Article	Commentary

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>The author succeeded to present a thoroughly discussion in a vital field of time and tide analysis of sea level. The used references are highly relevant and findings are acceptable. However, the following minor notes should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some abbreviations are stated within the text without previous illustrations. For example: IPCC, PSMSL, SONEL. The author should write: "that contrary to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, IPCC claim, ..."</li> <li>Some references should be typed otherwise. The following are some examples of these: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>In Sec. 1 – 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph</u>: you should write: "as evidenced by Carter et al. (2014)" instead of: "as evidenced by Carter et al; 2014".</li> <li><u>In Sec. 1 – 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph</u>: you should write: (e.g. Holgate, 2007; Chambers et al., 2012; Marcos et al., 2012; Soon &amp; Legates, 2013; Parker et al., 2013).</li> <li><u>In Sec. 1 – 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph</u>: you should write: (e.g. Pugh, 2004; Yndestad et al., 2008)</li> <li><u>In Sec. 2 – 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph</u>: Line 3; write (Parker et al., 2013) and in line 8, write Parker et al. (2013) and Parker (2014).</li> <li><u>In Sec. 2 – 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph</u>: write "in many papers as Parker et al. (2013).</li> <li><u>In Sec. 2 – 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph</u>: replace as (Parker et al., 2013; Parker, 2014a).</li> <li><u>In Sec. 3 – the top of page 4</u>: replace the refer. as (Parker et al., 2013; Parker, 2014)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Agree. Manuscript will be fixed accordingly.



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>In Sec. 1 – the top of page 2:</u> there is a type in error. Write as "The 60-years cycle recorded in solar activity and earth rotation <u>affects</u> the oceanic ....".</li><li>• <u>In Sec. 2 – Methodology:</u> You state that "the simple mathematics has been proposed in many papers as Parker et al. (2013)". I suggest to mention other references since you held your discussion based on Equations 1 – 3 in that unique mentioned reference.</li></ul>	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	Linear fitting models are used by the author, but what about using least square adjustment models and compare the results.	As also commented by another reviewer, the measured sea level time series suffer of significant inaccuracies difficult or impossible to quantify. This is why the standard practice is to linearly fit the available monthly average mean sea level data mentioning the length and percentage of gaps in the record and the existence of levelling information about a datum. This gives a rate of rise of sea levels and the uncertainty in that value.