

Dear Referee 2,

Thank you very much for your professional comments on our manuscript. These comments are all valuable and helpful for revising and improving our manuscript. The main corrections in the manuscript and the point-by-point responses to your comments are as following (the page number and line number in this letter refer to the revised manuscript):

This paper is the application of several existing methodologies to a given case study. I don't recommend publication of this paper for the following reasons: 1) it does not fit the requirements for the scientific paper since I did not identified scientific novelty, 2) the relevance of the complete approach is questionable.

Response: Thank you for your comments. 1) This case study is taken based on the previous studies. Meanwhile, we created an improved way to minimize the uncertainty of source area susceptibility both considering slope angle and important controlling factors of rock falls. It is proved by the study that the potential source area grids reduced from 160,823 to 4,002 with only 1.4 percent loss of historical rock fall samples. The simulation efficiency increased about 40 times, which highly reduced the burden of trajectory simulation. 2) Detailed field investigation was taken by the authors to understand the mechanism of rock fall and related risk along the road. Also, the methodology is based on previous public approaches and applied for the study area where rock fall hazard is an important risk source. The local government needs quantitative risk assessment result to guide their management work. If detailed explanation is needed, please refer to our response to the Referee 1.

Sincerely,

Lixia Chen