Dear Referee #1,

Thank you so much for reviewing our paper.

The manuscript will be, therefore, modified to consider your constructive comments. In the following, a point-by-point response to your comments will be presented.

Specific comments:

1		
line	comment	response
39	The definition of SSSs is lacking in the	We agree with referee #1. The following sentence was
	introduction.	added in $\$2$ – section 1 (introduction): lines 42-44
		"For convenience, we would like to recall here the
		definition of a skew surge: it is the difference between
		the maximum observed water level and the maximum
		predicted tidal level regardless of their timing during
		the tidal cycle (a tidal cycle contains one skew surge)."
39	'Bernardara et al, 2001' not 'Bernardara,	Corrected.
	Andreewsky and Benoit, 2011'. Note	
	that this also appears in other places in	
	the paper. Please, correct it because	
	when more than two authors are referred	
	in the text the Latin expression 'et al.'	
	needs to be used.	
77	'in section 5.' Not 'in section 5'.	OK.
98	the sentence appears with different text	Fixed.
	size.	
147	the definition of lambda, λ , is lacking.	We agree with referee #1. The following sentence was
		added to the text (line 171): " λ is the average number
		of storms per year at each site."
155	the work of Weiss (2014c) is mentioned	That's right. The reference was added to the references
	several times in the paper but it is	list.
	missing in the references.	
166	1- The observation period ranges	1- the following sentence was added at the beginning
	between 1846 and 2011. Why recent	of §2 section 2.5 (line 204): "For convenience, the
	years are not considered?	same observation periods as those used by Weiss
		(2014c) have been used in the present study.
		2 the following contance was added at the and of \$2
		2- the following sentence was added at the end of §2
		section 2.5
	2 What about climate changes in the	"It is also noteworthy that the impact of climate
	2- What about children with projected	change on the estimated return levels and associated
	San Loval Pisa? Is the astimated return	uncertainties is not covered by this paper. The use of
	period affected? Should this affect the	projected see level rise could however be the object of
	results and its confidence? This should	another paper "
	be introduced and discussed in the text	another paper.
191	Many times the word neighbours or	We agree with referee #1
171	related words (e.g. neighbouring	Writing made uniform
	neighbourhood) are mentioned in the	
	text Sometimes it is written	
	'neighbours' and other times	
	'neighbors' Please make the writing	
	uniform in the paper	
1	unitorin in me paper.	

215	Figure 3 is mentioned in the paper. The quality of figure 3 must be improved because the name of the sites are difficult to read. The figure caption should contemplate the meaning of the brackets	Ok. Quality of figure 3 improved.
216	The authors mention Figure 6 instead of	Done.
	Figure 4. Please correct it because this	
	mistake appears several times in the text.	
220 and	'Dunkirk" or "Dunkerque", "Saint-	Done.
others:	Malo" or "St-Malo", "Saint- Servan" or	
	Servan, Saint Heller of Jersey.	
	and 3 appear different in the text. Please	
	avoid it because this might confuse the	
	readers.	
261	the heterogeneity measure H (equal to	We agree with referee #1. Verified.
	0.53) was already ok. Probably the	
	authors want to provide the new value of	
	Dc because that was the discordant	
	parameter. Please, verify it.	
280	'The distribution parameters' not 'The	Done.
200	distributions parameters'	1 771 0
289	1- The paragraph should be rewritten.	1- The § was rewritten.
	2- The definition of KLS is facking.	2- Return level defined. Please see 2 nd sentence - \$1 -
		section 1 (Introduction): lines 27-28: "The <i>T</i> -vear
		return level can be defined as a high quantile for which
	3- What are the results in brackets int	the probability that an extreme value (the annual
	Table 2? The results and the link to	maximum for instance) exceeds this quantile is $1/$ "
	Table 2 values should	T
	be better explained because it is	
	confusing.	5- Results in brackets are confidence interval width
		(lixed in the fifte of table 2)
1		