

Dear authors,

Thank you for responding to the referee and editor comments and revising the manuscript accordingly. I feel that the responses and revisions are overall satisfactory. I am therefore accepting the manuscript subject only to technical corrections, which I trust you address reliably without needing another round of my approval as handling editor.

A note of reassurance to the referees: As the authors argue in their response, some of the good ideas shared by referees go beyond the study design and could not be included after the surveys and meetings had already been conducted. However, the Knowledge Hub on Sea Level Rise will duly take note of these ideas for consideration in a possible second assessment cycle and report.

The technical corrections I am asking the authors to carry out are the following:

[Thank you for dedicating your time to review the manuscript and for comments and suggestions provided. They have been addressed as detailed below.](#)

---

Throughout: As mentioned before, please use British spelling with s instead of z given it is a European report, for words like emphasise, organisation, categorise, and many more.

[Done: Checked throughout the entire manuscript.](#)

Line 28: "academia/research". Please replace the slash (the meaning of which is ambiguous) with a word or decide for either academia or research.

[Done: academia and research.](#)

Line 68: Please replace "Member State representatives" with "member country representatives", just to avoid confusion with EU Member States and their terminology.

[Done.](#)

Line 73ff Sentence "While this chapter focusses on the first two components, ..." Unclear to what "the first two components" (namely the online survey and the sea-basin specific workshops) and "the other components" (conference and member countries consultation) this refers to. Also, please improve the logic of the end of this paragraph with the beginning of the subsequent paragraph. The original cohesion has suffered after text has been injected.

[We have removed the aforementioned sentence \("While ..."\) and now the transition to the following paragraph is more natural.](#)

Line 97: "In total, we received responses from 200 participants ..." Did you receive responses from exactly 200 participants? If not, please give the exact number. If not possible for some reason, indicate that responses were from approximately (or almost or more than, or ...) participants.

[We received 200 responses.](#)

Line 99: Is the first reference to Figure 2 correct or did you actually want to refer to the sea basins map of Figure 1?

It is correct, it refers to Fig 2 left.

Lines 101/102: Can you please be consistent with rounding between the two groups to close the 100%? Or is the missing 1% due to those respondents that didn't disclose their organisation type? If so, please indicate this to close the 100%. Also, if you give percentage values like 64%, there is no need to use "about".

Done: 94% and 6%.

Caption Figure 2: Correct from "colour" to "black" and be consistent with either singular or plural "bar/s": (a) Breakdown of respondents by sea basin (solid black bars: % government respondents; cross-hatched bars: % research respondents).

Done.

Figure 2: Here, the author response has partly rebutted the former request by myself and by referee #4 to add meaningful title keywords (and potentially legends) into the figure boxes, with the argument that the information can be found in the caption. I once again ask to consider whether more title keywords can be added into the boxes for easier readability given that the assessment report tries to reach different stakeholders for whom we wish to make the information comfortably accessible; e.g. Figure 2 box a could be labelled "(a) respondents by sea basin" box b could be "(b) respondents by organisation type". Thank you for having added such keywords in figure 6. Please also consider title keywords for figures 3 and 5, although I appreciate that it might be harder to find sufficiently succinct ones there.

Done: Keywords have been included in Figs 2, 3 and 5.

Line 155: Replace "both ... and" with "either ... or".

Done

Line 467: Spell out GNSS.

Done: Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS)

Line 537: Write "European" or "Europe's" instead of "Europe".

Done: European

Line 569: Replace international (which has in Europe a specific meaning limited to collaboration beyond Europe) to "trans-national".

Done

Figure 6: The author response says that authors would assess the feasibility of adjusting the colour scale to minimise perceived confusion. I see no change in the figure and ask the authors to check whether this is because no better solution could be found or whether it has been forgotten to look into alternative colour scales.

As we informed the former reviewer, the colours in the figure represent percentages. We used a consistent scale (included in the figure) throughout the manuscript to minimize confusion. Changing the colour scale, whether to red or another colour (tested) would not solve the issue, as both positive and negative responses are depicted using the same colour scheme.