

Dear Editor

I think the quality of the manuscript has much improved; the revised paper is much clearer.

However, please note there are a few comments that the Authors have not yet addressed:

- Line 6: the paragraph in the Authors' reply does not match that in the revised text, i.e., "historically observed circumstances" vs. "antecedent circumstances"
- From line 23 on: I still believe that the examples about wildfires and landslide are not relevant for the research, which is indeed about sea levels and coastal hazards. Anyway, if you want to leave those in the text, please at least add "[...] from days to months or even years, depending on the event considered"
- Figure 1 is too busy. I know I am being picky about this, but it is crucial that it is clearer to fully understand what is being discussed further on in the paper. Perhaps the close-up's size could be increased, and Authors could use different colors to label cities, islands, and straights
- Authors claim they modified Figure 1 (now Figure 2) according to my suggestions, but it doesn't look so. Same for Figure 5 (Figure 4 in the first version of the manuscript), which has not been modified
- Perhaps it would be easier to understand Figure 3 if Authors clearly specified why they used different preconditioning periods between the scenarios FLs and S in Sect. 2.2.1.

Besides, I still think that the English grammar still needs a thorough check before the paper is accepted for publication. See below a few typos:

- At line 4: you cannot say "may influence" as the event occurred in the past, rather you should say "[...] different prior conditions may had influenced peak [...]"
- The term "precondition" is widely used and recurrent in the text, though I have never heard it before in the context of geophysical studies. As such, I wonder whether it is appropriate (if so, just overlook this comment and move ahead but please check this out)
- Line 8: was the increase modelled, or it was observed? You say that it "occurred" after saying "simulated", which is totally confusing
- Line 65: I am not sure that "propose" is well suited there. Perhaps "suggest"?
- Line 135: "during the original experiment, i.e., for" should be replaced with "for". Actually, you did not make an experiment, so the term is not appropriate
- Line 167: remove commas after "we" and "therefore"
- Line 309: this whole sentence is still unclear to me: "we assess the entire observation period (1886-2021) and each scenario for the occurrence pattern between elevated sea levels and their corresponding duration". What is that you are assessing?

I am not a native speaker so the list above is very limited, but as I said the whole text should be reviewed.