

The changes made to the manuscript “Human displacements from tropical cyclone Idai attributable to climate change” have improved the paper structure and coherence substantially. There are still several open issues that need to be addressed to make the manuscript acceptable for publication:

1. Thank you for adding a sentence to the abstract. Might it be possible to quantify the effect of wind intensification compared to sea-level rise?
2. Figure 3: In the extended text describing the figure on section is missing that is referenced in the response to one of my comments:

“Overall, it is observable that depth differences are higher in less populated parts, especially in Beira, suggesting that a counterfactual Idai of lower intensity leads to only neglectable changes in displacement. Nonetheless, already small differences in flood depth can cause inundation to drop below the critical flood depths, as shown for the west bank of the Pungwe River. In the next section, we turn to this topic in a numerical way by comparing the number of affected people and displacements between factual and counterfactual simulations.”

Should this be added to the lines following line 436? Also, I was wondering whether the differences in flood depths in less populated parts might be related to the DEM data as these surface models are known to overestimate elevations in densely populated locations due to the fact that the first reflected signal is registered by the satellite, thereby resulting in lower flood depths in dense urban settings?

Furthermore, as Fig. 3e shows the difference between 3c and 3d, might it be useful to use a different color scale for depicting these differences?

3. “AER” (l. 583) is mentioned, but not defined in the manuscript. Are those the remote sensing data?
4. L. 611: the sensitivity of results to the choice of population data should be elaborated here, particularly considering the two studies that are referenced along with this statement: which aspects may affect exposure results?
5. L 699-700: the authors allude to changes in population and urbanization in driving future risk. This statement would profit from more specific context, supported by population and urbanization projections for the country under different scenarios (e.g. SSPs), particularly as the authors refer to these scenarios in the preceding lines.
6. My biggest concern are still the uncertainties inherent in this study, stemming from the data as well as the modeling approach and assumptions. Although the authors have done a great job in discussing these uncertainties, I am unsure about the confidence in these findings. Is it really possible to attribute these migrants to climate change? The authors state rather specific numbers which may give a false sense of accuracy, e.g. 2.7-3.2 %. Furthermore, these uncertainties should be stated clearly and discussed explicitly in the abstract as well as the Discussion and conclusion section.