

MS No.: egusphere-2025-2672, posted as preprint on EGU sphere for public review and discussion on 7 Aug 2025, revised version uploaded on 14 November 2025.

Title: Hydrography of intertidal environments in Schleswig-Holstein, Germany.

Authors: Joachim Schönfeld (jschoenfeld@geomar.de), Hermann W. Bange, Helmke Hepach, and Svenja Reents.

Response to Reviewer comments

Dear Editor,

we sincerely thank the Associate Editor Perran Cook and an anonymous Reviewer for their constructive comments and suggestions. We acknowledge that the reviewer found that the revised version of the manuscript, in particular the Methods section, is much clearer. Referee 1 noted that there is still an inconsistency in the description of the data depicted in Figure 7 and the enumeration of Figures cited in the text, and suggested an emendation for the sake of clarity.

We have addressed these issues, include a response to the comments, and provide a revised manuscript that we believe is markedly improved. In the following, the Reviewers' comments or questions on the manuscript are given in black, and our response is highlighted in blue and indented.

Associate editor decision, Perran Cook

Referee 1 has now reviewed the revised manuscript and is generally satisfied with the changes. They do however note there is still an inconsistency with the order of data presented in Fig 7 and the text. I suggest the authors re-order the mention of data in the text to overcome this and also refer to fig xa, xb etc for clarity as suggested by the reviewer.

Reply: we thank the Associate Editor for his suggestion. We have addressed the issues, re-ordered the description of data in Subchapter 4.1 Seasonal dynamics of temperature and salinity in Bottsand lagoon. We also added the panel numbers to the citation of Figures in the text, which indeed provides an easier reference for the reader.

RC1: Anonymous Referee #1, 09 Dec 2025

The revised version of "Hydrography of intertidal environments in Schleswig-Holstein, Germany"-by Schönfeld et al., addressed most of the comments successfully. The methodologies are much clearer now. I am only concerned about one reply against Figure 7 "Reply: as a convention, we always plotted the salinities in the top panel (see Figures 2 and 3)." This can't be an explanation. The text and figures need to follow each other to make it understandable to readers. I would suggest changing it. At least, use the figure and figure panel numbers (Exam., 2a, 5b, etc) when citing in text.

Reply: done, see above.