Reviewer #1

Nice study. Nicely and well written. Everything's fine.

R: we thank Reviewer #1 for his/her kind comments.

Very small comments:

- The first two lines in both abstract and introduction theoretically could be left out. These sentences are found in almost every rockfall publication.

R: We thank for this comment. Nevertheless, we would prefer to leave these generic statements to introduce the topic and the potential hazard of rockfalls in the wider framework of rainfall-induced mass movements.

- Line 88: you could add a reference to Fig. 1 here as well.

R: Done.

- Section 3.2: how were the occurance times of the rockfalls been detected? Was it the date of the road inspection? How often took the inspection place? etc.

R: We thank the reviewer for the question that allowed us to clarify the item. We added now the following text in Section 3.2: "*After a rockfall occurrence, a quick action is required by local authorities to remove boulders from road, and to repair the damage. The average response time for these emergencies is down to one day, and therefore the date of the rockfall occurrence is the same of the road inspection.*"

Apart from scheduled inspections, a survey is carried out whenever a rockfall occurrence is reported.

- Section 5: is there a reasonable approach to see rainfall intensity changing due to climate change and therefore to use this study to predict rockfall activity?

R: This is an interesting topic, indeed. Following the indications of the World Meteorological Organization, which reads: "a 30-year period is long enough to filter out any inter annual variation or anomalies, but also short enough to be able to show longer climatic trends", we believe that the number of years available to us to assess a reliable climatic trend is inadequate.

- References: You could add Contino et al, NHESS 17(12), 2017.

R: Done.