

The authors answered to my comments and requests. The paper is clearer compared to the previous version and I want to congratulate with the authors for the work. I haven't seen improvements under the point of view of the content, but the authors answered to my comments. All the knowledge is strictly limited to the information obtained from the aerial images, so without any integration of other data of different nature (e.g. sedimentation rates) interpretations are necessarily limited. However, this is probably the point of the study, to keep it simple. I only have these last observations/comments to point out. Here I refer to the points you named in the author response:

- **Point 3.** Ok, I appreciate that you will take a step further in sedimentation analysis in the future. However, are there any values regarding sedimentation from literature? Although you cited Gabet (1998) saying “that local sedimentation rates in marsh-block gaps were approximately 1.5-2 times higher than on the adjacent salt marsh platform”, it does not help to understand the magnitude of the sedimentation of the study area. It can give an idea of the typical rates of this area and, most importantly, it gives a meaning to the sentence you added; otherwise, without any reference value, it is not comprehensible.
- **Point 6.** I beg to differ since the definition of “marsh” necessarily needs the presence of vegetation; if there is no vegetation, then it should be called tidal flat. However, in this part of the paper you are talking about the spatial changes of vegetation, hence I suggest to simply change as follow:
L29: “Marshes are dynamic environments and the area ~~of vegetated marsh~~ **colonized by vegetation** can change over time, not only as the result of progradation or retreat of the open-fetch marsh edge...”

Here I add some more comments (referred to the clean version of the paper):

L100: “Images used in this study were cropped from larger images (Lynn et al. 2023). Briefly, these images...” High repetition of the word “image”. Maybe you can use other terms, maybe “orthophoto”? Also, I think it is correct to the say “**The** images used in this study...”

L304: “...although most slump blocks submerge over time,...” This is not correct, since you showed that most of the blocks reconnected while just a part submerged (652 vs 234 m²). I understand that you do not want to suggest that the block submergence is not important, but I would avoid to use this sentence.

It would have been nice to improve this analysis with the use of DSMs or sedimentation rates, but as you said, it can be the next step of the study.

Kind regards.