

Comments to the authors of the revised manuscript under discussion entitled “***Assessing the effect of lithological setting, block characteristic and slope topography on the runout length of rockfalls in the Alps and on the La Réunion island***”

The presented manuscript deals with the four analysed talus slopes and a thorough mapping of lithological characteristics, being deposited rock shapes and sizes and its influence on runout length. The revised manuscript presents itself substantially improved and presents the complex findings in a more concise way.

I do thank the authors for their effort in revising the manuscript thoroughly, especially in the large effort in remaking the figures. IMHO it increases readability and significance and the revised manuscript is suitable for publication.

#### **Only technical remark**

Use of or ambiguity of rock shape and axial ratio: I am a bit confused by the statement “ We used the block shape as a term to describe the axial ratio.” (l159). Eq. 2 *is* the axial ratio and you term it also block shape (l 158).

Basically, the axis determine the axial ratio via Eq. 2 and thus describe the block shape (but are not able to catch the roundness of the block). Correct? Maybe rephrase this a little.

#### **Use of it in Table 4:**

How is the parameter block shape calculated for the numbers in the table? It is the “Axial ratio” according to Eq. (2) with  $b = 1$ ? Maybe note that in the table title or change to Axial ratio for consistency reasons.