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I think the authors have properly addressed my comments in the previous version. I wish to thank the authors for their efforts in producing a paper that will actually also be useful in the classroom. I suggest accepting the paper after the minor comments below have been addressed:

- line 380: please check this sentence, I think it is the other way round, MAE is more robust. See the small numerical experiments here: https://towardsdatascience.com/comparing-robustness-of-mae-mse-and-rmse-6d69da870828

- Section 3.3.3 - I think it would be good to clarify in this section and maybe also earlier when introducing the different applications, that flood inundation in this paper refers to mapping applications (in contrast to forecasting of flood inundation based on some meteorological input, which will yield much lower scores)

- line 570: The logical flow does not make sense. You start outlining limitations of the methodological approaches and then suddenly jump to new applications. It's not clear how these are connected. I would say these text blocks belong into separate subsections

- line 804 - 809: Maybe this can be formulated a bit more soft. Initial suggestions for accounting for changing terrain etc. have been published, but there certainly is more work to be done in this direction.