

## Responses to Reviewer 1:

We would like to thank Charlie Kerans for providing comments on this manuscript and for the constructive criticism.

Below we respond to the points raised:

- (1) Note about reference to include on flank margin caves.  
*This reference will be added.*
- (2) Keystone vugs – cautionary note that some keystone vugs can be substantially higher than the range mentioned here (-0.4 to +0.4 m).  
*Thank you for emphasizing this point. We agree, which is why we noted in section 2.5 that “the lowest occurrence of keystone vugs is typically taken as the best estimate for the position of sea level.” In each of the sites, we followed this convention of using the lowest occurrence of keystone vugs to mark the position of sea level to avoid bias from keystone vugs formed during storm surges. We have clarified this by adding a sentence in section 2.5.*
- (3) Patch reef versus fringing reef distinction is lacking  
*Here the point is made that some of the reef outcrops may have different paleowater depths (not always -3 m) and may be fringing reefs with coralline-algal caps. We agree that -3 m is an estimate that we used where other information is lacking with respect to paleowater depth or extent and type of reef deposit based on existing reports. The sites mentioned in this comment do have more detailed analyses of paleowater depth (Grotto Beach, Devil’s Point, Cockburn Town, and West Caicos). In all of those cases, we used the published information to further refine water depth at those sites. This approach was described in section 2.1 as follows: “Here we adopt an estimated paleowater depth (or RWL) of -3 m relative to mean sea level, with a possible depth range (IR) of 0 to -6 m for patch reefs in this region unless there is more specific information available that can be used to refine this range.”*
- (4) Should mention wave-cut notches for completeness  
*Good point. We have added section 2.7 on wave-cut notches.*
- (5) Summary of Bahamian stratigraphy may not be entirely correct, despite the fact that this is an accurate reflection of the published stratigraphy.  
*We have modified this section to remove references to the relative position of the Cockburn Town and French Bay members, which is not clearly demonstrated in the literature.*
- (6) Suggest to remove Titus, 1980 reference as it is from ‘grey literature.’  
*This has been done.*
- (7) Suggest to include the name of ‘Hole in the Wall’ in Abaco island description.  
*Good idea. This has been done.*
- (8) An additional reference was noted that is relevant to Andros Island  
*We have included a reference to the sedimentology in Hazard et al., 2017*
- (9) Exuma Cays – comment that beach dune elevation does not represent sea level position  
*We agree. Our wording was misleading here and we have modified the wording to clarify that the series of dune ridges was interpreted by Jackson (2017) to represent shoreline migration.*
- (10) Great Inagua – some confusion over why there is a larger uncertainty here  
*We have added wording to clarify that the additional uncertainty for the lower reef unit here stems from having to estimate how much material was removed during erosion.*

- (11) West Caicos – comment to revise description of Boat Cove unit  
*Thank you for this clarification. This is done.*
- (12) Something missing on line 478  
*Thank you. Sentence fragment was removed.*
- (13) Typo on line 72 corrected.

**Responses to Reviewer 2:**

We would like to thank Blake Dyer for his constructive comments on this manuscript. Responses to specific comments are listed below.

[Comments in regular font, responses in italics]

The discussion of uncertainty in tidal datum comes late in the manuscript  
*We have called out this section earlier in the manuscript now to alert the reader of these uncertainties before the individual sites are discussed.*

Suggest to include additional references for Cockburn Town U-series dating  
*Good suggestion. Citations for Chen et al (1991) and Thompson et al (2011) have been added.*

Suggestion to clarify original data source  
*We have added a citation to the original publication at the appropriate spot in this sentence to make this clarification*

Please make tidal adjustment more clear  
*Done.*

Typo on Line 210.  
*Corrected.*

Line 270: include Thompson et al., 2011 citation.  
*This citation is included above. In this line we are describing an interpretation of the age data that was described and interpreted by Skrivanek et al., (2018) so this is the appropriate citation to explain where that interpretation comes from.*

Line 293 – Typo.  
*Corrected, thank you.*

Section on New Providence Island is missing keystone vugs from Garrett and Gould that were at higher elevations.

*The elevations published by Garrett and Gould (1984) were corrected for 3 m of subsidence and measured relative to a different datum. All elevations here are relative to mean sea level as noted at the beginning of Section 3. Once the G&G elevations are corrected, these match the elevations reported and re-surveyed by Jackson (2107). This example highlights the importance of compiling all of these sea level data within the same framework.*

Line 343- why is this erosional surface recorded as a terrestrial limiting point?

*In the following sentence, we referred the reader to the analysis in Skrivanek et al. (2018) which explains the sequence in more detail, including a justification for subaerial exposure. To make this connection more clear, we have combined these two sentences together so that the Skrivanek reference can provide the reader with more details on this as needed.*

Line 500 – Suggest to add a citation for Dyer et al. 2021

*This citation is now included.*

Line 508 – Not clear why this statement is attributed to Mullins and Lynts.

*The citation to Mullins and Lynts was removed.*

