General comments

There have been some improvements of the manuscript related to validation and the citation of state of the art methods. However, some of my comments of the first round of review have not been considered.

Specific comments

- In my view the focus of this contribution is still not clear. The method for detecting flooding based on SAR data is already published by the authors. Therefore, the focus of this publication should be on the huge flood event on the Bahamas. However, only Sentinel-1 data on two dates in early September has been analysed. By integrating other Earth Observation data sets acquired during this event (e.g. in the frame of the International Charter Space and Major Disasters) and also additional Sentinel-1 data acquired in September 2019 (e.g. on September 14) the evolution of this flood event could be better described (the RAPID approach could be of course a component to complete the description of this event) (see also my comment of my first review).
- Line 49: Replace (EMS) by (CMES)
- Line 74: Please replace Alos-2 by ALOS-2/PALSAR-2 (see also my comment in the first review)
- Line 83: I think 10 meters is the pixel spacing and not the spatial resolution. I would suggest to use the abbreviation "m" instead of "meters"
- Line 85: X-band data can be affected by adverse weather conditions. I would suggest writing "SAR images are nearly not affected…"
- Line 110: I do not understand the meaning of "dry overpasses". You mean acquired during dry conditions? Perhaps it is better to use the term "non-flood conditions"? What is the meaning of noise-free? Is this derived by combining the data of 5 overpasses? If yes, it would be perhaps better to replace this term by "noise-reduced".
- Line 113: Please specify "DFO" and "DSWE"
- Line 143: The comparison with Charter-based products is only conducted on a visual basis, correct?
- Line 147-154: In order to perform a validation, the validation data should be correct. If there are errors in the CMES products I would suggest not to use the data as basis for validation or just to perform a comparison between the results (and not a validation).
- Line 175: Without any information about the performance of RAPID I would strongly suggest to remove the sentence: "We believe RAPID system's ability to map such a large area of inundation as soon as SAR observations were available makes it the fastest fully automated method for assessing flood extension and providing situational awareness". It

would be better to prove this statement. This was also my comment in the first round of review.

- Figure 2 and 3: it would be important to describe which data source was used to separate between normal water conditions and flooding. It would be helpful to visualize layers of normal water extent in the figures. This was also my comment in the first round of review.