

Reviewers' Notes

General Answers

We thank the Editor-in-Chief and the Reviewers for their time, their thorough evaluations, and the valuable comments they provided throughout the review process. Their observations and suggestions contributed significantly to the improvement of the manuscript, allowing us to clarify methodological aspects and refine the presentation of the results. We believe that the manuscript has become substantially more robust and clearer because of the contributions we received. All comments were carefully analyzed and incorporated into the revised version.

Manuscript validation review

Thank you for pointing that out. The figure credits have been included in the caption, identifying the authors as the copyright holders.

Responses to Reviewer 01

1) We appreciate the pertinent observation. Yes, the values of 2.975 m and 3.454 m refer to projected astronomical tide levels for a 20-year return period, as indicated in the text. This information is also shown in Figure 5.

2) Thank you. This is a spelling error in Table 4. Where it says “ATtr20,” the correct term is “ARrp20.” The nomenclature has been corrected in the revised version of the manuscript.

Responses to Reviewer 02

1) Thank you for your comment. The flowchart has been revised to improve its clarity and readability by simplifying the graphic elements, better separating data, methods, and outputs, and reorganizing the arrows to avoid overlaps. We have also kept the definition of risk highlighted in the figure, as it aids in the immediate understanding of the methodological structure presented.

2) Thank you for pointing that out. The numbers correspond to the codes assigned to the different land-use and land-cover classes used in the study. However, we recognize that this notation may cause confusion when interpreting the figure. Therefore, the codes have been removed from the revised version to make the figure clearer.

3) Thank you for your comment. The data presented in Figures 3c and 11 are not the same. Figure 3c shows the original (raw) classification of land use and land cover, while Figure 11 presents the validated and corrected dataset used in the analysis.

The legend for Figure 11 follows the same sequence of classes as that used in the bar chart, where the classes were arranged in ascending order according to their percentage of the occupied area. Therefore, the order differs from that in Figure 3c. We agree that the numbering shown in Figure 3c was unnecessary and was removed to avoid confusion.

In addition, the readability of Figure 11 has been improved by increasing the size and resolution of the bar chart, and the y-axis legend has been revised to clearly indicate “area (%)”.