First of all, thank you very much for your valuable comments. According to your comments, all the authors have carefully discussed them item by item. Each comment is replied as follows:

（1）The Authors have cited a new research paper numbered [40] in their response to the comments. A discussion on the differences using the methods in [40] and Goda's method has been provided in the Response, which is helpful in addressing the uncertainties arising from using a 2D wave decomposition method in a 3D case.

I think this discussion, including the results such as 8%-15% error, should be included in Section 3.1 where the new Table 4 has been added. It is important to show the limitations of 2D assumptions, and this may contribute to the overall underestimation of impact forces of the empirical equations as well.

In addition, I didn't find where the reference [40] has been cited in the revised manuscript.

Reply: Thank you very much for your comments.

In fact, this paper has been submitted three times in total. The first time it was the result of Table 4 of this paper. However, during the review process, one of the reviewers proposed that the composite wave height measured in the breakwater transition zone must be used, and the wave height after reflection separation must be substituted into the corresponding formula for calculation, and then the deviation coefficient between the test results and the calculated value should be compared, Therefore, there is a discussion on the separation method of high-input reflection of synthetic waves in special areas. Of course, this also deviates from the purpose of writing this paper. This paper mainly aims at carrying out tests in special areas and comparing the test results with the design calculation values to finally obtain the correction factors of the test results and the design values. For the selection of calculation conditions, according to the provisions of the specification, the wave elements under the conditions of the uncompleted project are used, that is, the results in Table 1.

In addition, in fact, during the design, (1) the designers are also unable to know the reflected wave height in front of the building in advance; (2) In view of the complex wave shape in this region, it is also quite difficult to separate the incoming and reflected waves, and the separation results may deviate.

Therefore, based on the above reasons, after the discussion of our project team, we still did not adopt the expert's opinion, and still used the results of Table 4 of the first submission of the paper to delete the relevant content.

We hope to get your understanding, thank you again.