

Review of the manuscript: **“The acceleration of sea-level rise along the coast of the Netherlands started in the 1960s”** by Iris Keizer et al.

This is my second review of the paper. I want to thank the authors' work and effort answering my recommendations to the first version of the manuscript, which I believe helped to improve the paper. Authors answered to my main comments. First, they included an Appendix with the tide gauge's individual SLR rates, giving a clear explanation of why they decided to use the six tide gauges average through the paper. In addition, at the end of section five, they discuss the differences in the SLR rates obtained from the individual tide gauges when compared to their average, giving the reader the complete information to ponder the paper's results. Second, authors expanded the information related to the nodal effect on sea-level in an Appendix, what I believe also helps to explain some paper's details which might be important to some particular readers. Finally, Appendix C in my view presents a stronger case of the possible drivers of low frequency wind-driven sea level variations in the Netherlands' coasts, found in this research. Therefore, I have no main comments on the new version of the paper. However, I present some specific comments and minor recommendations to the authors for them to consider include into the final version of the paper.

Specific comments and minor recommendations:

- L50. Appendixes are named as “Appendix” and as “App.” (L123). Please use the same naming. Besides, verify Appendixes are organized in the same order as they are mentioned in the main text.
- L56. ...meridional surface wind velocities ...
- L109. Tables are named as “Tbl.” and as “Table” (L149). Please use the same naming for tables and figures.
- L127. ... nodal tide and wind effects.
- Table 1 legend. Third line. “... predictive variables for wind effects.”. Use the same lower case Phi symbol, as in the formulas.
- Figure 2 legend. First line. “... with three sea level time series obtained from the Generalised ...”.
- L220. ... (1988) with ...
- Figure 3 legend. Last row. (d) Detrended and smoothed time series shown in (a).
- Table 2. Please mention this table in the results section. Table 2 is only mentioned in the Conclusions section of the main text (L333).
- L258. Calafat and Chambers (2013) and Steffelbauer et al. (2002).

- L298. In this version is (App. A).
- L330. Fig. 4.
- L333-L335. Consider moving this sentence to the Discussion section as this is not a conclusion from the paper.
- Appendix A. I find the difference between the nodal tide from the GAMs models and the equilibrium tide too large. For clarity, please mention or give a reference to the method used to obtain the equilibrium tide from the individual tide gauge records. In my view, to accurately assess the equilibrium tide, the nodal cycle has to be calculated in each of the most important lunar tidal constituents (e.g. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2009.10.006>). To assess the nodal effect on sea level, these constituents' nodal cycles (amplitude and phase) should be added. I understand that such calculations are probably out of the scope of the paper. However, a reference to the method used to compute the equilibrium tide I think is needed as in my view, the nodal cycle obtained from the GAMs somehow is a novel method to assess the nodal cycle effect in long annual sea level records.

Please verify colors in Fig. A1(a) and its legend. Besides, I found legend in Fig. A1(b) confusing. Consider a different legend (e.g. OSL-TrW; OSL-Nt-TrW; OSL-ET-TrW; OSL-Et; OSL for observed sea level). The last spectra is not mentioned in the legend.

In the appendix text the spectra from "Et" is not mentioned but it is shown in Fig A1(b). I do not understand why the "Et" residual spectra has low energy in the nodal period, while the "TrEtW" residual spectra has much more energy in this period.

L356 – 357. Please rephrase the sentence. I understand that the TrNtW and TrEtW models use the trend and wind as predictive variables, but they differ because the former uses the nodal tide obtained from the GAMs, while the latter uses the equilibrium tide. However, this is not what the sentence indicates.

-Appendix B. Consider including in Figure B1, the SLR obtained from the six tide gauge average using the TrNtW model, as shown in Figure 4e and f (orange line). This would be useful to the reader to observe individual tide gauge sea level rate differences from the average. In Figure B1 legend, second line, replace TrNtZw for TrNtW.