

Reviewer: 3

Comments to the Author

I'm happy that some of my comments have been taken on board, and I am prepared to concede that the coastal visualization Figures can stay in. There are some improvements in that the introduction has slightly better justification.

However, I note that the author(s) have made only the bare minimum of requested changes, and have done so largely by copying and pasting with little critical assessment of the full range of requested revisions. As a result I still have concerns about the following:

1) Standard of English: even from a quick read there are typos and poor sentences. This will need editing.

The reviewer's suggestion was taken into account

2) Still insufficient explanation for the 1936 shoreline detection method. Therefore I am concerned as to whether one inaccurate dataset has been replaced by another inaccurate dataset.

The reviewer's suggestion was taken into account

3) Changes have simply involved deleting or moving highlighting sections identified by myself or other reviewers with no critical assessment of the required changes. This results in 2 problems:

The reviewer's suggestion was taken into account

Firstly, there has been no real attempt to improve the paper's readability. The results are still very information-dense, and very hard to read.

Secondly, and more importantly, the discussion now reads as follows: a chunk of short explanations for local shoreline changes (cut and pasted from the first version of the manuscript), then a list of more observations (with minimal explanation) and finally a list of other research for elsewhere in the Arctic. There is no real consideration of the significance of the results, how they integrate with other Arctic studies and therefore how the presented research is actually helping to improve understanding of Arctic coastal changes and moving science on. The result is that this manuscript is still more like a technical data report than a scientific paper.

The reviewer's suggestion was taken into account

Therefore, in my opinion, the paper is still not suitable for an international peer-reviewed journal. Nevertheless, I am not familiar with the general format of submission to Marine Geodesy, and it may be that the information-dense report style is acceptable. I leave it to the editor to decide whether this style is acceptable for publication.

The text has been thoroughly refined - as suggested. . Some chapters have been shortened and others expanded and completed so that the article is not a report. The text was also checked out by a native speaker from Great Brittan. We hope that this time our manuscript will meet the reviewer's expectations.

Thank you very much again.

Authors