

Response to Editor Olaf Eisen:

L21: removed “just”

Figure 1: fixed citep command

L45: changed “predictions” to “projections”

L51: we chose “credible” based on the comment by ISMIP6 authors:

To be “accurate” implies comparison to observation. Projections are of the future, so it is impossible to assess their accuracy now. We suggest a different phrasing.

However, after some reflection, we agree with the editor that “accurate” is more appropriate than “credible”. It is true that the accuracy of projections cannot be assessed now, but we do not see the “assessing now” as a requirement. Changed back to “accurate”. Also changed line 59 back to “accurate” for consistency.

L 62: “here it is really important to consider the rate of change. In your response you stated:

"In addition, we would like to point out that from a societal impact point of view it is the cumulative mass loss number that is of relevance, not the rate."

So this is not consistent, as especially for coastal planning the SLR rate is very important. I would therefore suggest you extend the sentence:

"preparing for future sea-level rise and rates"

-> Fair point. When writing our response to the question why using cumulative changes rather than rates, we may have not thought our response through enough. Rates do matter. However we would prefer not to change the sentence structure as “preparing for future sea level rise” is a general statement that does not exclude the rates.

L 210: changed “predictions” -> “projections”

L 287: we stick with “querying”.

L 342: removed as suggested.

Figure 1 and 2: the 2-sigma of the observations are hard to see because the variance of the simulations is so large. We’ve tried to improve the readability of the figures by changing from green to blue (while sticking with a single hue colorscheme from colorbrewer2.org), and by changing the vertical extent.

Supplement: This figure can be found at the end of the main manuscript under Data Availability.