

We thank the reviewer once again for their time reviewing our manuscript and offering insightful comments. We hope that our minor revision as recommended by the reviewer address the issue they raised. Please see below for a more specific response.

I am glad that my comments helped identifying a number of mistakes/typos in the revised manuscript. In the new version, the authors explain more extensively several aspects of their methodology. I however found some of the new elements, and in particular the part explaining how the nearshore IG wave heights (and reflection coefficients) are estimated, very confusing. I do not understand how the iterative process described in a few lines in the new manuscript is conducted (i.e. how do we make H converge) but, even more problematic in my view, I do not understand at all the underlying reasoning (e.g., why defining the new H as $R \cdot H_{max}$, with R the reflection coefficient?). Maybe I am missing something but to me (in its current version) it does not make sense at all. This needs to be addressed before publication.

We understand and agree that the explanation on method of obtaining IG wave height was confusing. In the new revision, we explain how $H = R H_{max}$ is used, what is assumed, and why it is needed. We also made clearer the description of how H is solved iteratively and what we mean by converging. Please see lines 351-358 in the new revision.