Response to Comments of Editor (Blue font in the manuscript)

Comments:

(1) Line 47. Could omit "have been".

Response: Thanks for your comment. Done.

Comments:

(2) Line 51. "homogeneous coastal area" –> "unstratified coastal sea"? ["homogeneous" needs definition; "area" might be on land.]

Response: Thanks for your comment. "area" has been replaced by "zone". Yes, we should use "unstratified" in the manuscript.

Comments:

(3) Line 52. "it could be classified into" –> "the response could be classified as"?

Response: Done.

Comments:

(4) Line 167. ". . are the surface and bottom stresses . ."

Response: Done.

Comments:

(5) Line 171. "a nondimensionalized could be" –> "scaling is"?

Response: Done.

Comments:

(6) Lines 224-225. Please check. Better "where J2 is the second order Bessel function of the first kind."?

Response: Done.

Comments:

(7) Line 227 (Equation 17). I think you need to state where J0 and J2 are evaluated.

Response: We have added the sentence as suggested.

Line 227: "J_0 and J_2 are known and balanced by the characteristics of CSWs and topography."

Comments:

(8) Lines 252-253. ". . . Nodes for Mode 2 appear . . ."

Response: Done.

Comments:

(9) Line 296. "main reason" for what?

Response: Many thanks. The main reason for the former sentence. I have added explanation into the manuscript.

Line 227: "That is, these signals are not so significant compared with the signals with large

amplitude."

Comments:
(10) Line 306. “pointed out” –> “pointing out” or “showing”
Response: Thanks. Done.

Comments:
(11) Line 307. “The thick line . . .” I think this refers to 5(a) only; please say so.
Response: Thanks. I have revised the sentence as suggested.
Line 307: “The thick line in (a, c, d) is a 5% significance level against red noise”

Comments:
(12) Line 325. “propagating” –> “propagation”
Response: Done.

Comments:
(13) Line 336. “these” –> “such” unless Csanady (1978) studied this area (I don’t think he did).
Response: Done. Thanks for correction.

Comments:
(14) Line 409. “. . . wind-forced and . . .”
Response: Thanks. Done.

Comments:
(15) Line 433. Omit “the trapped characteristics as”?
Response: Done.

Comments:
(16) Table 2. Please ensure that the final version does not split (Distance)** or Outlier(m) between rows.
Response: Thanks for reminding. I have changed font of the text.

Comments:
(17) Line 465. Better “, which shows that” –> “:” ?
Response: Thanks. Done.

Comments:
(18) Line 470. Better “That” –> “SLA”
Response: Done.

Comments:
(19) Line 479. “. . Fig. 3a; they explain 25.1% . .”
Response: Done.

Comments:
(20) Lines 482-483. ". . 3b; it only . ."
Response: Thanks. Done.

Comments:
(21) Figure 10 and caption. Lines 507-508 "Red curves represent the along-track SLA . ." does not match the figure with wind stress in red and SLA in blue.
Response: Thanks so much. We have revised as suggested.

Comments:
(22) Line 522. ". . the cross-shelf structure . ."
Response: Done.

Comments:
(23) Lines 543-546. You already used "α" as a wavenumber (line 186 et seq.) so different notation is preferable. Please also define Ekman number here since you do not have viscosity or a single length scale.
Response: Thanks. I have changed the letter from "α" to "e".

Comments:
(24) Line 577. "neglective" –> "neglect of". Omit "wind stress and" – you discuss wind stress!
Response: Thanks so much. We have revised as suggested.