

I see that the authors provide an improved manuscript, with the revised version being much more concise, clear and descriptive. I may thus only mention a few minor issues that may be taken care of.

I. 27, may want to briefly explain why such a distinction between flow and flood is relevant
A short sentence was added

I. 30, sure the Takezawa reference is a valid one?
Yes, even though is a conference paper we think it is worth to report it

I. 50, use “estimate” instead of “predict”
Corrected

I. 50, use “based on data from seismic” instead of “based on seismic”
Corrected

I. 62, mention the parameters of the STA-LTA method
As STA/LTA is not the topic of this paper, we do not think it is neither necessary nor useful to add these parameters here

I. 67, quantify what “reliably” means. There are plenty of measures out there
We have rephrased this sentence, eliminating the term “reliably”

I. 76, use “These” instead of “This”
Corrected

I. 100-101, better explain how you substitute distance by time, and what the consequences are, i.e. what is the minimum velocity of debris flows and – using a reference – how realistic that is
The procedure is described in I. 105 and I. 110. A reference has been added at line 105.

I. 108, the threshold of a ratio of 6 is arbitrary. Ideally, you provide some results on the quality loss for higher or lower thresholds. However, if that seems too much effort, at least write that you arbitrarily chose that specific threshold.
This aspect is already mentioned at I.107 - "Analyses of the seismic data of twelve events..."

I. 110, what is “lowes”?
It was an error, now corrected to “lowest”

I. 114, 0.8 is another arbitrary threshold. See suggestion above.
This threshold was selected by a trial and error procedure. We added this information in the text.

I. 122, “determined manually”, this needs more detail. Based on which criteria?
We added “..based on the signal shape.”

Table 2, “internal report” needs more detail. Which institution? Which date? Ideally, a name or DOI.
We now provide a clear reference for this report

I. 147, explain briefly why the velocities might be overestimated
We have added a short sentence

I. 185, not sure that “benefited” is a useful word in this context
We think it is, as our work took advantage of unique field datasets from diverse environments

l. 185, “different distances between the geophones”, this stands in direct contrast to the statement made in line 129. Please clarify.

We clarify that here the distance between two geophones is of concern, in contrast to the transversal distance from channel banks to geophones mentioned earlier at line 129.

l. 204, double “the”

Corrected

l. 246, Sentence seems to have a fragment. At least it does not make sense when reading it.

True, there was a mistake.

We have rephrased it and simplified it.

There are numerous further grammatical glitches which I hope Copernicus’ editorial and type setting team will spot and fix.

