

Firstly, I would like to thank the authors for thoroughly addressing my comments. The revised manuscript is a really interesting read and helps to better understand the response of the Elbe estuary to SLR and topographic changes. While reading the revised manuscript, I only stumbled upon some minor (technical) issues that the authors might consider to address before publication. Nevertheless, I am happy to endorse the manuscript for publication. My comments/suggestions are listed below:

- 1) Line 72: Suggestion: “This can in turn lead [...]” instead of “This can in turn led [...]”.
- 2) Line 87: Shouldn't it be “time-dependent” instead of “time-depended”?
- 3) Line 110: Suggestion: “[...] estuary [...]” instead of “[...] estuariy [...]”.
- 4) Some of the figures seem to have rather low resolution. The authors might consider to use a higher resolution for their figures. If this issue was only caused by the compression of images during the generation of the pdf-file, this comment might be neglected.
- 5) Full stops are missing at the end of many figure/table captions.
- 6) Figure 5: Why is the station “Scharhörn” shown in this figure? This station is never mentioned in the entire manuscript. Accordingly, the station shouldn't necessarily be highlighted in this figure.
- 7) Line 247: Suggestion: “[...] key parameter [...]” instead of “[...] keyparameter [...]”.
- 8) Line 373: Suggestion: “[...] a SLR [...]” instead of “[...] an SLR [...]”.
- 9) Line 472: Suggestion: “[...] changes in intertidal [...]” instead of “[...] changes in of intertidal [...]”.
- 10) Line 477: Suggestion: “[...] in the estuary.” instead of “[...] in estuary.”.
- 11) Line 481: Suggestion: “[...] in estuary cross-sections [...]” instead of “[...] in an estuary cross-sections [...]”.
- 12) Line 531: Suggestion: “[...] gradual convergence [...]” instead of “[...] gradually convergence [...]”.