

Dear authors, thank you for reworking the manuscript. It became more understandable with additional figures and tables.

There are several minor points, which on my opinion still should be clarified:

1. Am I right that Figure 3 and Figure 7 “Present day” are the results from the same “real TC” modeling? In this case, please check Fig.7d, because it does not correspond to Fig.3d. Namely, at Fig.3d modeled water levels overestimate observations consistently, at Fig.7d modeled water levels underestimate observations and fit for the storm peak. Which one is correct? Moreover, for TC Aila the dates at Fig.3 (c,d) and Fig.7(c,d) are shifted by one day.
2. Table 6: in the sensitivity experiment, it still would be interesting to see the change as percentage of applied SLR. What the authors showed is the changes as percentage of “present day” water level. This is also interesting to see, however, this does not say much about (non)linearity of surge and SLR interactions. If one looks at changes as % of SLR, an interesting pattern shows up: for TC Sidr and both considered locations the water levels are almost linear addition of “present day” levels and SLR (changes between 88% and 103%). For TC Aila the surge/SLR interaction becomes non-linear, the changes there are about 111%-124% for Barisal and 219%-253% (!) for Charchanga. Why the same SLR for the same location (say Charchanga) causes such different changes for two different TCs? I’m not expecting the authors to answer this question in the paper, but it is interesting.
3. In Section 3.4, caption of Figure 7, caption and text of Table 6 the authors write “storm surges”. However, in reality it is total water level that is discussed and not storm surge (which is normally defined as difference between total water levels and normal tides). Please reformulate throughout the text or describe what is understood under “storm surge” in this paper, in the present form it is misleading.
4. p9. Line 296: typo – “present-day” two times