

Dear editor,

Apologies for the miscommunication in the previous revision round and thanks for your useful comments. Please find a full response to both comments below. We have furthermore double checked the manuscript for typos and believe it's now ready for a final assessment by the editorial team.

Kind regards,

On behalf of all authors,

Dirk Eilander

*The two selected case studies are clearly relevant in terms of dynamics and intensity of the floods. However, they lack in situ observations of the water level. Please add in section 2 a short sentence to justify your choice in spite of this limitation. Could you have considered other locations where the flood analysis would have been supported by an in-situ observations?*

We have added a small paragraph to the end of section 2 to justify the selection of the case studies:

“These events were selected because they provide a unique case study of two different compound flood events in the same study area, allowing for a comparison of the compound flood dynamics between both events. Furthermore, the lack of compound flooding in global models has been identified as a key limitation to support decision making in this area (Emerton et al., 2020).”

*Referring to figure 2, you have maintained the terminology " model observation locations " that I suggested to replace with "model points". Please, explain why.*

We agree with the editor and have renamed “model observation points” to “model output points” in the legends of Figure 2 and 5 and any references to these figures.