

Reviewer response

General comments :

Thank you to the authors for their thorough responses to the comments and questions in the previous review. The paper has improved significantly in clarity and detail concerning the incorporated datasets, as well as overall objectives and added value of this work. I have listed a few suggestions here to finalize the work.

Thank you for your comments.

The datasets listed in Table 1 are all open source datasets, so should L97 read « much » or « all » ? Or can you specify the other, non-open source datasets used ?

The flood maps are the only data source which is currently unavailable. The text has been amended to reflect this.

In the authors' response, it was stated that the alongshore resolution of the datasets was indicated where possible. It seems like this should be possible with the coastal structures/infrastructure database. Can it be added (even if it is only an approximate spatial scale)?

The coastal structures were identified partially from the EuroSION database but mainly through visual interpretation of satellite images and referenced to the existing coastal segments. The resulting data therefore has the same resolution as the coastal segments. We have reviewed the text and feel this is already explained see Section 3.2.3 ' Coastal segments that are associated with visible human engineered structures, both onshore and offshore, are identified.'

I am not sure to understand well the caption in Figure 7: The figure shows the percentage of floodplain coast that is constrained by structures or has no structures, separated by the land cover types, so if I am understanding this correctly, could the caption be adapted to state this? Also, am I interpreting this correctly that the total sum of the figure is 100%? Perhaps rephrasing the caption could clarify these two points.

Thank you for the suggestion, the caption has been amended to clarify the interpretation of the figure.

Technical corrections:

Several small suggestions are listed here :

L28: rephrase "structures are occur" **Corrected**

L49-50: a bit long and difficult to read, perhaps remove "as an issue" and replace "which" with "that", and think if this can be split into 2 sentences ? **Text has been revised into 2 sentences**

L57: explorative => exploratory ? **Corrected**

L58: "on a more recent shoreline... than Euroasion" ? **Text has been amended to indicate the shoreline used is an updated version**

L91: "but did not cover » **Corrected**

L96-7: CoasTER was defined in the previous section and does not need to be defined again here **Text has been amended to reflect this**

L110-111: "other spatial analyses such as..." **Corrected**

L156,159,485: which => that **Corrected**

L172: "expected by (?) 2100" **Amended**

L173: "and identifies" **Corrected**

L217: includes **Corrected**

L242: please clarify what is meant by "of the guidance"? **Text has been amended to read ' ... the reporting process was prone to sporadic errors due to variable and inconsistent interpretation of the Euroasion collection methodology'**

L247: replace (;) with a colon (:) **Corrected**

L258: "restored), which..." **Corrected**

L260: "are (?) not covered" **Corrected**

L294: figure caption displaced **Corrected**

L364: "exists seaward" **Corrected**

L369: "major ports" (since minor port and harbours is in plural, or change all to singular) **Figure caption amended to make major ports plural**

L373: extra space in reference **Corrected**

L386: "interact" **Corrected**

L387: "or (?) much larger impacts"? **Text removed to make sentence clearer**

L389: "provide" **Corrected**

L439-440: "of data, and coverage..." **Corrected**

L462: "compute" => computing ? computational ? **Corrected**

L479: drilling ? **Sentence has been revised to clarify its meaning**

L488: "occur, and" **Corrected**

L492: "an improvement" **Text amended**

L499: shoreline ? (it seems the word "coastline" was otherwise removed from this revision) **Text amended to 'shoreline' for consistency**