

## Reply to the Comments (RC2) of Reviewer No.2

Dear reviewer,

We sincerely acknowledge the reviewer for the careful reading, helpful comments, and constructive advises. The manuscript would be revised according to all the suggestions in order to improve the quality. Responses to each comment could be found in the following part.

### Major comments:

1. The introduction section can be better structured. Instead of listing the historical records and previous studies, some scientific questions/current issues could be raised in the very beginning. In the end of the introduction, readers may expect a brief explanation of the content in the following sections.

Reply: We acknowledge the reviewer for the constructive suggestion. We would restructure the introduction and add a brief explanation of each section's content in the revised manuscript.

2. The authors mentioned the possibility of storm surges could not be ruled out, one paragraph reviewing the most serious impact posed by past storm surge events could be very helpful for readers to understand the potential magnitudes.

Reply: We thank the reviewer sincerely for the suggestion. Helping the readers to have a picture of how catastrophic that storm surge events could be is important. Following the reviewer's suggestion, the paragraph reviewing the storm surge cases would be added in the introduction for the new revision.

3. After reading the newly added historical records in German, the possibility of volcanic eruption cause should be more carefully reevaluated, especially after the Tonga volcanic tsunami which occurred in Jan 15, 2022.

Reply: We agree with the reviewer. We would consider adding the volcanic part in the introduction and address it in the discussion part more carefully in the new revision.

Minor comments:

1. Line 32, a more detailed historical records should be added in the reference, Lau et al., 2010, NHESS, Written records of historical tsunamis in the northeastern South China Sea – challenges associated with developing a new integrated database.

Reply: We acknowledge the reviewer for sharing the relevant literature. We would include the research of Lau et al. (2010) for historical tsunami records with greater details.

2. Line 40 in the Introduction, “Qin dynasty” should be “Qing dynasty”

Reply: We apologize for the typo. The sentence in the line 40 would be corrected accordingly.

3. Line 120, “boarder”-“broader”

Reply: We apologize for the typo. The sentence in the line 120 would be corrected accordingly.