

I 33: please write the retreat rates as given in your author's response

Sure: we explicated the retreat rate in the paper text, as requested (see l. 44)

I 38: please describe the fallen volumes as given in your author's response

We do not think that this should be necessary: we already have described them in the text, as you can see on l. 89 and l. 105 and we think this could be a redundant information

I 79: please, remove the bracket & please add a bracket

Done (see l. 90). Sorry for the mistake

I 97: a discussion should refer to existing papers

You are right: this section simply aims at concluding the brief communication, so it has been renamed into "Concluding remarks" (see l. 109)

fig. 2: please, add date and location of the point of view on images to be more understandable

Thank you for your suggestion. We added the information requested on both the fig. 2 and its caption. Moreover, we also modified the caption of the fig. 1 to underline the existence of the Raspberry Camera Module, mentioned in the paper text

I 163: fig. 1 ?

You are right: in the previous version of the paper, the reference was right ("fig. 1") but, after the latest correction, it has been wrongly changed by the word processor. Now it is correct again, sorry for the typo

fig. 3: please, add date on images to be more understandable & could you please locate on the top image where we are?

Thank you for your suggestion. We added the information requested on both the fig. 3 and its caption

I 168: fig. 1 ?

You are right: in the previous version of the paper, the reference was right ("fig. 1") but, after the latest correction, it has been wrongly changed by the word processor. Now it is correct again, sorry for the typo

AC: First of all, we have to say that the data recorded with the crackmeter until now is not sufficient either to derive a clear displacement trend or to predict imminent failures. Moreover, the purpose of our monitoring system is to obtain an indication of a relationship between the displacement trend measured by the crackmeter and on-going cliff failures, to be related with the information gained from the digital images. In other words, we are using optical images for monitoring rock cliffs where crackmeter measurements represent a sort of validation through conventional devices.

This should maybe be clarified in the paper as in l. 28 you say: "In our study, we want to pursue a monitoring approach mainly based on the integration of conventional geotechnical sensors with digital images and videos processing, aiming to recognize potential precursor signals..."

So, is the main aim to recognize potential precursors or to connect displacement/crackmeter data to digital image data?

Thank you for your right suggestion. Since we have two main aims, we have modified the sentence to be clearer on our goals (see l. 28)

AC: Laboratory testing carried out by the authors on rock samples taken from the study area (or of the same typology) has confirmed that even rock of low mechanical strength can exhibit brittle failure (Lollino & Andriani 2017, Perrotti et al. 2020).

This information could help the reader to a better process understanding.

Sure: we explicated it in the paper text, as requested (see l. 45). Moreover, we added the corresponding reference (see l. 156)

-----REMARKS FROM FILE VALIDATION-----

With the next revision, please add the copyright icon to figure 1 as follows: © Google Earth

Done, thank you for your suggestion