We thank the referee for positive evaluation of our work and useful comments and suggestions. Below we give the point-by-point response to the referee's comments and indicate the changes made in the manuscript.

1) The denomination of deep/shallow/coastal freak waves is a little bit misleading. Indeed, the classification is only based on the location of the rogue wave (whether it happened in waters of depth greater or smaller than 50m). This denomination is a little misleading, since it has no direct connection to the classical kh (dispersive) parameter. Maybe using "deep area" and "shallow area", or something similar, would facilitate comprehension of the reader.

Answer: We agree. "Deep water" and "shallow water" are now replaced by "deep area" and "shallow area".

2) The beginning of section 3 would probably benefit from a more detailed description of the ERA5 data, and their processing. For example, I could not understand how the values of Hfr are obtained (Although it is pretty clear for Hs). The same remark can be made for the values of the gustiness. Yet, the findings in figures 7 to 12 are pretty good.

Answer: In fact, Hfr was substituted by Hmax since Hfr which is the freak wave height cannot be obtained from the ERA5 data. Here Hmax (the maximum individual wave height) is the estimation of the highest waves according to the reanalysis.

We have also added the following clarifications in the text:

Line 139: "The maximum individual wave height (H_{max}) is an estimate of the expected largest individual wave height within a 20 minute time window, which is derived statistically from the two-dimensional wave spectrum. The wave spectrum can be decomposed into wind-sea waves, which are directly affected by local winds, and swell, the waves that were generated by the wind at a different location and time. This parameter takes account of both."

Line 193: "Wind gust is the maximum wind gust at the specified time, at a height of ten meters above the Earth surface. It is defined as the maximum of the wind averaged over 3 second intervals. This duration is shorter than a model time step, and so the ECMWF Integrated Forecasting System (IFS) deduces the magnitude of a gust within each time step from the time-step-averaged surface stress, surface friction, wind shear and stability. Care should be taken when comparing model parameters with observations, because observations are often local to a particular point in space and time, rather than representing averages over a model grid box."