Second review of manuscript: "*Flood risk assessment due to cyclone induced dike breaching on coastal areas of Bangladesh*".

Overview and general remarks

The second version of the manuscript is better than the first one. The authors put obvious effort in editing the text after the referee´s comments and suggestions. There are significant improvements in the Methods and Discussion/Conclusions section in terms of the content required for the study and readability. The Figures and Tables are clear. Most of language mistakes are corrected. Nevertheless, there are some improvements should be done, mostly related to refining some description in the Methods and Conclusion sections, missing/wrong reference and language. Therefore, I suggest to return the manuscript for minor revisions.

Specific remarks

Figure 12 and 13 miss a scale bar.

p.2 line 10. Were *recently* designed.

p.2 line 20. The intensity of tropical cyclones is *likely* to increase.

p.3 line 7. The land use is mainly ….. this sentence needs to be rephrased.

p.5 line 8. …(a company from Finland). In my opinion this information is unnecessary.

p.6 line 1. As was pointed out in the previous round of reviews, "model development" brings ambiguity to what is described. In the majority of cases "model development" means you worked and modified the source code of HEC-Ras in a certain way, if this was not the case I would recommend to change it to "set-up" or "build".

p.6 line 7. "Computationally efficient" needs references on other studies which prove the point.

p.12 line 18. Information missing on satellite image source and the way it was processed.

p.12 line 25. "However, *when* the flood level …"

p.12 line 30. "Further research …" such statements should be moved to the Conclusion section.

p.13 line 8. The reference (Helm, 1996) doesn't belong to the statement. The study of Helm gives the definition of the risk used in this manuscript at line 11. Klijn (2009) and Van Manen and Brinkhuis (2005) used already existing definitions for their research. This has to be corrected.

p.14 line 27. The indicator of error has to be specified.

p.20 line 17. "poor" is a rather vague definition, some numbers or indicators would bring more clarity.

p. 21 line 2. "risky" is recommended to be removed.

p.22 line 20. "Probabilistic flood maps…" is not clear, recommended to be rephrased.

p.23 line 5 "…, the data provided…" this part of sentence should be rephrased.