

Dear authors,

Thank you so much for your efforts. I have included my suggestions below.

Best.

The paper shows a substantial archival effort, and a database covering multiple hazards over several centuries would fill an important gap for the island. The mortality data on sailors, enslaved people, and river-crossing drownings are genuinely interesting. However, the manuscript reads more like a descriptive project or thesis report than a research article. It lacks a research question or hypothesis, and the results are only counts and percentages without any statistical analysis. It would be more suitable as a brief report or review paper.

More detailed major comments;

The core contribution of the paper cannot be evaluated. The database, which the title claims is the main contribution, is under embargo. It has no repository or DOI, yet the conclusion says it has “open source functionality”. The paper does not provide the data model, the 29 source parameters, the decision-tree questions and weights, or the index components. Consequently, the results cannot be verified or reproduced.

The analysis is not defined, and the main numbers do not match. The abstract and conclusion report 1,266 events. Section 3.3 lists 3,519 recorded events. Section 4.2's hazard-specific counts add up to 3,568 events. Floods alone account for 1,612 events, which is more than the total reported. The likely reason, counting cascading events in several tables (p. 7, L166–168), is never explained. Because an event is not clearly defined, all counts, frequencies, and index comparisons are ambiguous. It is also unclear whether the 11.1 % of mentions that fall below the 60 % reliability threshold were excluded, even though the conclusion states that all 2,823 references were validated.

The significance index is biased when comparing events over time. Missing data are given the lowest score. Because documentation drops sharply as we go back in time (Fig. 4), older events are consistently scored lower, so the trends shown in Figs. 5 and 9 partly reflect documentation artifacts. The mortality criterion also saturates at more than 10 deaths (Fig. 3). For example, the 1829 and 1846 cyclones, which caused 260 and 350 deaths, are not among the five most significant events, while the 1913 cyclone, with only 15 deaths, is. The method used to estimate return periods and damage in euros for historical events is not described, and the use of a flood-specific grid for other hazards has not been validated.

The trends have not been adjusted for source density or exposure. Press coverage accounts for 50.2% of mentions, yet it has not been thoroughly examined since the mid-20th century, the same period when the decline in impacts is interpreted. Mortality is reported only as absolute deaths per year, even though the population grew from about 1,500 to over 900,000 (L87L71). To interpret any trend, we need rates per capita, uncertainty estimates, and a sensitivity analysis of source coverage. The same requirements apply to the spatial ranking of municipalities.

The conclusions are not supported by the analysis. The authors claim that risk-management policies, building standards, and administrative status have reduced

impacts, but they do not show how these factors relate to the data. Their reasoning is inconsistent. the increase in permanent housing raises the significance in lines 391–393, yet it also lowers impacts in lines 399.... The statement that the results confirm rising economic damage is unsupported by Figure 9, because the figure normalizes the data and hides absolute values. Because the authors do not compare their results with existing catalogues, they cannot prove that the reliability goal has been met.

Minor comments;

Line 42-43: Leroux 2024 is cited, but in the reference list it is 2021.

Line 220: Before 1800 are said to include “telegrams” which is anachronistic please revise.

Line 234-235: It said “wind and lightning exmanined seperately below” but no such analysis appears.

Line 301-303: After 1948...stable is followed by began to decline from 1946... 1848 intended?

Line 342-357: Desarthe 2018, Perotin 1957 are cited but missing in reference list.

Duplicated sections numbers: 3.3 twice, identical titles for 4.3 and 4.4. There are frequent language errors, Thorough English editing is needed.

As I mentioned before, this paper contains important information, but the problems are fundamental and cannot be fixed in a normal revision cycle. I recommend rejecting it. I encourage the authors to submit a new manuscript once the data are ready, perhaps first as a data-description paper and later as a hypothesis-driven analysis or review.

Regards.