

Review

Introduction

The problem is clearly defined. It is pertinent and relevant. However, a contextualization of the international context is not made. Although the geographical area where hurricanes occur is limited, it would be necessary to relate (in a very concise way) what approximations or advances have been obtained in such areas.

Study Area

For the general contextualization of the study, basic oceanographic information of the study area should be included: regime and range of tides, predominant wave regime, predominant coastal circulation, among other relevant factors.

Materials and Methods

What would be the expected accuracy for the DGPS? And in turn, based on this value, what would be the value of the error associated with the estimation of the beach profiles? What is the spatial resolution of the pixels of the video camera system? What was the result of the calibration of this system?

Table 1. Sampling time? Or interval sampling?

LUCL was defined previously?

Why were only the results at 24h, 48h and 72h considered?

Results

Pag. 12 -Paragraph 300. The sentence “promoting a sea-level set down (Δn) of 0.43 m associated with Gamm and a 0.30 m set up during delta” is not completely clear for me considering the scale displayed in the Fig. 2a (36 – 51 cm).

Paragraph 325. Regarding the latent heat (Q_e), why are the high values that occur at the end of the time series (10/25/2020) not also mentioned? What factors or phenomena could be associated to these values?

What is the unit of the *x-axis* in Figure 4.a.1? Furthermore, considering Figure 4 and its explanation, the value of 80% for flow towards the west seems excessive. How did you calculate and verify this value?

The editing of Figure 6 is confusing. In subset 1, the area that is presented in detail in subset 2 should be boxed. For example, the jetty is mentioned in the text, but I could not locate it in this figure.

Coastal Aquifer. The increase in the water table is not as noticeable in W5 and W7. Probably due to a figure scale issue. How could the edition of the figure be improved so that this increase can be clearly observed?

Forecast modelling. There is a mention of statistical fit, less bias and significantly high correlation. But the *p-value* is not presented to support these claims. The correlation (C) is the same correlation coefficient (*r*)? If so, wouldn't it be more appropriate to use this denomination?

Discusión

The discussion is excessively short and does not cover essential aspects of the manuscript. For example, what would be the main limitations of the approach used? particularly numerical modeling? What effect does the error associated with topographic measurements (i.e. bathymetry, beach profiles, DTM) have on the overall results of the study? If the geographic location of the population with respect to the path of the hurricanes seems to be a crucial factor in the adverse effects, as indicated at the end by including a comparison with another place, why was this approach not included in the experimental design? It was also repeatedly mentioned that anthropic structures marked the transition in morphological changes; then, could it be said that if the structures did not exist, the changes would be more moderate? Would these morphological changes be permanent (long-term) or temporary? Therefore, the discussion must be expanded and restructured, so that the most relevant aspects of the manuscript are addressed.