Supplementary Information

Sea level reconstruction reveals improved separations of regional climate and trend patterns over the last seven decades

5 Shengdao Wang¹, C.K. Shum¹, Michael Bevis¹, Xiaoxin He², Yu Zhang³, Yihang Ding⁴, Chaoyang Zhang⁵, Jean-Philippe Montillet⁶⁷.

¹Division of Geodetic Science, School of Earth Sciences, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, 43210, USA ²School of Civil and Surveying and Mapping Engineering, Jiangxi University of Science and Technology, Ganzhou 341000, China

³Space Systems Analysis Inc., 5190 Hampton Ln, Columbus, OH 43220, USA
⁴Department of Hydraulic Engineering, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China
⁵Center for Space Research, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712, USA
⁶Institute Dom Luiz, University of Beira Interior, 6201-001 Covilhã, Portugal
⁷Physikalisch-Meteorologisches Observatorium Davos/World Radiation Center (PMOD/WRC), CH-7260 Davos,

15 Switzerland

Correspondence to: Shengdao Wang (shengdaowang123456@gmail.com)

Table of Contents

Fig. S 1: Comparisons of tide gauge data gap-filling statistical methods (Autoregressive (AR) Modelling, Probabilistic Principal Component Analysis (PPCA), and Regularized Expectation Maximization (EM)). Addressing short (12 months), medium (36 months), and large (108 months) data gaps in tide gauge records (Group-1, 10-tide gauge simulation case). Each record has been randomly placed with three types of gaps to mimic realistic tide gauge data missing scenarios. The red line in the time series represents the "true" observations. Additionally, the PPCA method reconstructs the entire time series rather than just filling gaps, allowing a full reconstruction visualization. In contrast, the results from the other two methods only visualize the filled gaps.

25

Fig. S 2: Comparisons of 10-tide gauge data gap-filling statistical methods for the Group-2 simulation case, addressing data gaps of 12, 36, and 108 months, and with an additional 120 random missing months, to assess the respective performance of the three data gap-filling methods. Each record has been randomly placed with the above-described simulated data gaps to mimic realistic tide gauge data missing scenarios.

30

Fig. S 3: Comparisons of 28-tide gauge data gap-filling statistical methods for the Group-3 simulation case, with 120 months of randomly distributed missing data points.

Fig. S 4: Spatial distribution of 287 tide gauge stations from January 1950 to January 2022, improved via gap-filling using the Regularized Expectation-Maximization (EM) method (red circles). 225 stations (yellow squares) were selected for the final reconstruction. A subset of 48 near-complete stations (blue triangles, average gap rate at 1.1%) was used to evaluate and compare different statistical methods for tide gauge data gap-filling.



Fig. S 1: Comparisons of tide gauge data gap-filling statistical methods (Autoregressive (AR) Modelling, Probabilistic
Principal Component Analysis (PPCA), and Regularized Expectation Maximization (EM)). Addressing short (12 months), medium (36 months), and large (108 months) data gaps in tide gauge records (Group-1, 10-tide gauge simulation case). Each record has been randomly placed with three types of gaps to mimic realistic tide gauge data missing scenarios. The red line in the time series represents the "true" observations. Additionally, the PPCA method reconstructs the entire time series rather than just filling gaps, allowing a full reconstruction visualization. In contrast, the results from the other two methods only visualize the filled gaps.



Fig. S 2: Comparisons of 10-tide gauge data gap-filling statistical methods for the Group-2 simulation case, addressing data gaps of 12, 36, and 108 months, and with an additional 120 random missing months, to assess the respective performance of the three data gap-filling methods. Each record has been randomly placed with the above-described simulated data gaps to mimic realistic tide gauge data missing scenarios.



Fig. S 3: Comparisons of 28-tide gauge data gap-filling statistical methods for the Group-3 simulation case, with 120 months of randomly distributed missing data points.



Fig. S 4: Spatial distribution of 287 tide gauge stations from January 1950 to January 2022, improved via gap-filling using the Regularized Expectation-Maximization (EM) method (red circles). 225 stations (yellow squares) were selected for the final reconstruction. A subset of 48 near-complete stations (blue triangles, average gap rate at 1.1%) was used to evaluate and compare different statistical methods for tide gauge data gap-filling.