

The authors considerably modified the manuscript to address suggestions by all three reviewers. The study is placed in a wider context and the environmental factors are explored in more detail. I only have few comments (lines refer to the clean version 3 of the manuscript):

- Line 28: What was the time period for the Canadian Beaufort Sea study that gave different rates from those in the database?
- Line 69: I would suggest re-phrase this sentence. Many rock coasts were shown not to respond directly to drivers (storms) and often the response is lagged (e.g. Trenhaile, 1987). However, what the short-term studies weak side is (compared to the longer term studies) is the fact that they may not include high-magnitude low-frequency cliff failure events (under-estimation of 'general' erosion rates) or, conversely, include them (over-estimation of the rates). This makes extrapolating erosion to longer periods and predicting future uncertain.
- Line 72: What changes do you refer to as 'these changes'?
- Line 252: This comment is also relevant to a few other lines listed below. Abrasion is one of the mechanisms of bedrock erosion by waves which requires a tool (such as sand) to hit the rock with. Pneumatic and hydraulic wave action also cause erosion by waves. Therefore, I urge you not to use the term 'mechanical abrasion through wave action' or similar, but refer to it as 'erosion by waves' or 'wave action' depending on the context.
- Figure 5: Provide the total number of cross-sections in the plot or caption.
- Figure 6: Colour scheme is hard to follow. I suggest using a single colour scale starting from white at the lowest rate and increasing darkness. Alternatively blue-to-red will work better than green-to-blue.
- Line 312: It is subject to erosion above threshold of detection.
- Line 350: see comment to Line 252
- Line 379: see comment to Line 252
- Line 383: see comment to Line 252
- Line 384: Do you mean weathering by decreasing resistance to erosion?
- Line 390: Add 'Hornsund' after 'Veslebogen'.
- Line 391: A 100 m transect where?
- Line 397: In space AND time rather than IN?
- Line 404-6: I am not sure if this is a satisfactory reason for higher rates than elsewhere. Be more specific – higher rates may be partly caused by the polar location where in situ bedrock disintegration occurs due to the frost weathering, increasing temperatures contribute to bedrock weakening (permafrost thawing, change of efficiency of thaw/freeze cycle) and increasing exposure to larger waves (effect of storminess increase and sea ice decline).
- Line 419: see comment to Line 252. Perhaps 'wave action and thermo-abrasion'.
- Line 422: see comment to Line 252. Perhaps 'erosion by wind-generated waves'.
- Line 438: Somewhere (perhaps earlier) you should mention that the two metrics you use – distance from the sea ice for the fetch and the wind speed – are not the only ones that play a role in wave action at the Svalbard coasts. The other determinants on the coastal wave energy are for example waves generated on the Greenland Sea far from the study area that arrive there as a long oceanic swell regardless of the local wind conditions, bathymetry and characteristics of the sea ice which impact wave attenuation (density, extent, floe size...). As you do not have direct wave measurements, the two metrics you use may be a good enough.
- Line 440: see comment to Line 252.
- Line 497: Put in brackets the timespan and coastal length.