

The paper reports the results of a survey done with a terrestrial laser scanner in a mountain cliff near Grenoble, France. The paper is well written and the analysis is well described, however the discussion could be improved comparing the results with similar studies performed with the same technique. I suggest the publication of the brief communication after minor revisions. Detailed comments are reported below.

Line 4, page 125: here, it could be useful to have a picture with the layer sequence.

Line 14, page 125: Table 1 seems to me worthless, since the main and relevant characteristics of the two beams are already described in the text.

Line 22, page 125: "...Application has been..."

Lines 23-24, page 129: the parameter A_{st} needs proper units of measurement ($\text{yr}^{-1} \cdot \text{hm}^{-2}$).

Lines 29, page 129: at line 24 you state that for the Grenoble area $A_{st} = 0.0047 \text{ rockfalls} \cdot \text{yr}^{-1} \cdot \text{hm}^{-2}$. I would expect that this is equivalent to $A_{st} = 0.47 \cdot \text{rockfalls} \cdot \text{century}^{-1} \cdot \text{hm}^{-2}$ instead of $A_{st} = 0.037 \cdot \text{rockfalls} \cdot \text{century}^{-1} \cdot \text{hm}^{-2}$, as you wrote.

Table 1: the rotational speed parameter should be " 0.001 s^{-1} to 20° ".

Figures 2 and 3: I suggest to modify the two figures like in the example below.

