This paper examines the impacts of future sea level rise and a changing wave climate on shoreline positions of two beaches in the western Mediterranean. The authors' analysis is sound; however some details in the methodology were omitted and need to be clarified. This is an important topic that fits the scope of NHESS and I suggest publication after moderate revisions.

1. Section 1: Additional papers that could be referenced:

   Passeri et al., 2015, doi: 10.1002/2015EF000298
   Gutierrez et al., 2011, doi 10.1029/2010JF001891
   Plant et al., 2016, doi: 10.1002/2015EF000331

   While the authors are neglecting coastal erosion in their projections, I think it is important for them to mention that this study goes beyond "bathtub" approximations of sea level rise (see Passeri et al., 2015) – a bathtub approach would simply assume that future coastal retreat would be at the 1 m contour for 1 m rise in sea level. Rather, the authors are dynamically simulating waves and water levels under a changing climate and SLR to determine the future shoreline position. This provides additional novelty for the paper.

2. Section 2.4: What is the overland extent of the SWASH model? Does SWASH resolve wave runup? This would be necessary to accurately compare the wet-dry shoreline with the video footage. Since you are looking at the wet-dry interface as proxy for the shoreline, how does SWASH resolve wetting and drying processes? This should be mentioned in the model description.

3. Section 2.5: Is the SWASH model forced with tides? How is sea level rise incorporated into the models?

4. Section 4: A brief description of the PETRA model should be included. I would also consider moving this to the methodology since it is what you are basing your assumption of a constant beach profile on.

5. Section 4: This is the first mention of the wall backing the beach. A better description of the study area is needed at the beginning of the manuscript. Also, do the beaches have dunes/what is the elevation of the dune or berm? Dune height has been linked to long-term shoreline change (see Plant et al., 2016) and would affect the inundation extent. The authors conclude that coastal retreat is lower in Playa de Palma due to a steeper beach slope – again, this is the first mention of the beach slope. By moving the discussion of the PETRA model to the methodology, this would help to better describe the study area. Lastly, are these beaches nourished? If so, this could help to justify neglecting coastal erosion.

Minor edits: I suggest the authors review the paper carefully for grammatical errors.

Page 2 Line 32: Should be "SOM graphically display".

Page 3 Line 27: Define IMEDEA acronym.

Page 3 Line 28: Morphodynamics is misspelled.

Page 7 Line 1: I think this is incorrectly referenced to Figure 7 when it should be Figure 6.

Page 7 Line 3: Since your plot is in degrees, you should define what N and SE are in degrees to make it easier for the reader.

Page 7 Line 16: Should be "over 0.9".

Page 7 Line 24: Use the exact number for the correlation coefficient rather than rounding to 0.3 – should match the correlation coefficient in your table.