

Authors response to the Reviewers' #1 comments

The authors have addressed my comments and I am satisfied with the improvements. Still, I have a few minor comments.

Authors: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript again.

The most important is that with the additions and alterations quite a few new language errors have been introduced. I will not list all of them, but the authors should carefully reread their manuscript, or have it corrected.

Authors: The revised manuscript has been carefully crossed-checked again; additional copy editing has been also done.

2.4 Study period and data availability

line 200: wind-induced maximum: as the surge is (mainly) due to wind, also the other maxima must be wind-induced. What the authors are explaining here is that there is a difference between a locally generated surge and a surge that is generated further away and propagates to the study area.

Authors: We agree and the suggested revision has been done.

line 230: Should DD be DDA? Actually, in 254 there is a link between SAR and DDA. That should be made here already.

Authors: The suggested revision has been done.

3.2 Altimeter-model comparison

line 281: You might want to avoid the abbreviation SWH altogether. It is introduced here, again in line 375, and very often you still use significant wave height which looks perfectly natural.

Authors: We agree and the suggested revision has been done.