Most of Referee#4's recommendations will be followed in the last review phase, after having received Editor's response.
However, a reply to some of the Referee#4's comments is given below.

1) With reference to the required "detail" in paragraphs 4 and 5: in the first version of the manuscript we had provided detailed geostructural and kinematic paragraphs, as well as tables and figures, but, during the reviewing phase, Anonymous Referee#1 said: *The authors should give more emphasis in presenting the hazard and thus it is proposed to reduce the geostructural survey paragraph. It is proposed to remove Table 1 or report not with all the detail. Additionally, Fig 4 could be removed and only Fig 5 presented.* So, since the manuscript was considered suitable for publication in NHESS following minor revisions, we have reduced the geostructural survey paragraph and removed Table 1 and Fig. 4, so the dataset.
2) In paragraph 4, cohesion and internal friction angle have been calculated through the equations proposed by Bieniawski (1989) (we will better specify this in the text), so "exact" values are welcome as results of mathematical operations.
3) With respect to the block's mass: we have accurately checked the simulations and found out that, actually, we had set a value of 250 kg, so there is a mistake in the text which will be corrected.
4) With reference to the coefficients of restitution, table 2 shows all the coefficients that were taken into account. We will specify where the "neighboring area" is located.
5) Referee#4 asked us to indicate *where should measures be placed.* This is not the aim of the paper, since it deals with the assessment of rockfall hazard.