

Dear Editor,
Dear Referees,

first of all we would like to thank very much the two referees for professional comments and constructive suggestions. As usual (and is our policy), we have given careful consideration to all general and single comments. Our response is provided using blue italics font.

Referee #1

Thank you for the interesting article. This study provides valuable insights into sediment transport in semi-enclosed water bodies with limited fetch and depths.

Thank you, we are of course happy with this valuation.

Although I have only minor comments, I hope they will help make the article easier to read and understand:

1. Introduction

- The terms divergence area (line 34) and sediment flux divergence area (line 48) are not well-defined. For readers unfamiliar with this approach, these terms might be confusing and should be explained more clearly. What do you mean by using these terms? Even if they are explained in detail later, a brief clarification in this section would be helpful.

Our apologies for being too compact in these locations and forgetting to say that it was divergence/convergence of sediment flux. We have added short explanations: "persistent sediment flux divergence areas which are most likely erosion hotspots" on lines 39–40 of the revised version, and expanded the explanation on lines 53–54 of the revised manuscript (the version with all changes shown; the line numbering may change after the adjustments have been finally integrated).

- Line 74: It is unclear what the main aim and objectives of the article are. What is the primary purpose of this research? While this is mentioned in Section 4, it should also be highlighted in the Introduction section.

Thank you. The too compact formulation of the aim and objectives was also highlighted by Referee #2. We have considerably expanded this description (lines 83–90 as well as the insight into the existing results (lines 76–81)).

2. Methods and Data

- Figure 3: Including information about when the picture was taken (spring, autumn, or summer) would be valuable for evaluating the scale of erosion.

This is a good idea. The photo was taken on 24 August 2013. The trees have fallen several months earlier, most likely during autumn-winter storms 2021/2013 or even earlier as pine needles have evidently dried up some time ago and some vegetation has appeared on the sand.

- Section 2.2 - **The SWAN model data for the nearshore of the study area**: The explanation of why wave data from the SWAN model is needed begins on line 160. This should be moved to the beginning of the section for better clarity

Thank you; we have done so. We have also reorganised Section 2, split the material into more subsections and added a description of wind and wave regime in the study area as suggested by Referee #2, so that this section is now Section 2.3.

- Line 198: The number of grids and their location are shown in Figure 4, not Figure 1.
Yes, Figure 1 only shows the overall nesting of grids and more detailed information is provided in Figure 4. We have adjusted the text accordingly.

3. Alongshore Sediment Transport Patterns

- This section might be better renamed Materials and Discussion since, along with presenting the sediment transport pattern analysis, it also include comparisons with previous works. Also part of the section 4 should be moved here, like fig. 13 and it's description.

We have carefully considered this recommendation but it still seems to us that the original title better represents the content of this section. However, we reviewed the section headings and overall structure of the paper addressing concerns of both referees. See also the comments under Discussion

and Conclusions below. To make the flow of thoughts smoother, we have inserted cross-references to Fig. 13 into captions of Figs 7, 9, and 10.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

- This section should be reshaped into a Conclusion section, as much of the discussion already appears in the previous section.

We admit that we have, somewhat untraditionally, placed large parts of discussion directly after the relevant results. Our justification is twofold: (1) several results are counter-intuitive and probably needed some comments immediately, (2) properties of transport in different coastal stretches are greatly different, and we decided to help the reader by providing an immediate comparison wherever relevant and necessary. However, we are reluctant to rename this section as it still contains a large portion of overall discussion of presented results.

- Figure 13 presents one of the main results of this article and should be introduced earlier in the text.

Thank you; we have inserted early references to this figure in captions to Figs. 7, 9, and 10 and hope that doing so is acceptable with the policy of the journal.

On behalf of the co-authors

Tarmo Soomere, 02 January 2025