

Thank you for addressing the previous questions and comments.

On my second reading of this manuscript, I was thinking about where this methodology may fit within the context or workflow regional scale – debris fan identification and susceptibility mapping. It was only in the conclusion where I found the important and well-expressed point that even after a regional susceptibility assessment has been undertaken “there is a danger that their risk may be considered negligible”. It would be helpful for this to be woven throughout the narrative of the text with one or two additional sentences in appropriate parts of the manuscript.

Given the need for precautionary but realistic assumptions, the analysis should state that with an assumption of $P_{s:h} = 1$, the risk values represent a better estimate/upper estimate for the fan apex rather than the fan periphery. Was there any thought given to running two examples, such as the Fan Apex and Fan Periphery from which a range of risk results could be calculated? This approach could help mitigate concerns that the analysis is overly pessimistic, especially since in the manuscript it is stated that $P_{s:h} = 1$ is a “very conservative approach”, while also emphasizing the importance of not doing so in risk analysis elsewhere in the risk analysis.

Additionally, it was unclear which risk value is being compared against the individual risk criteria. Are you comparing the individual risk value or the "object risk to people in buildings"? If it is the latter, also known as Total Risk, this cannot be used to compare against risk threshold criteria. Summing probabilities together, as is done with the multiplication of risk by E, does not yield a probability and therefore cannot be compared directly against criteria. Instead, it can be used for relative comparisons, where low sums (less than about 10^{-3}) are roughly equivalent to societal risk calculations. This concept is supported by binomial approximation.

Specific Comments

Line numbers refer to tracked changes manuscript version

Line 49: Remove colloquial reference of “landslips”

Line 56: Delete sentence starting “In contrast, potentially catastrophic...”. I don’t think this sentence is needed and the same issues of non-recognition for debris flows apply to other landslide types

Once again, thank you for considering these suggestions. The revisions you've made have already improved the manuscript, and I appreciate the effort you've put into refining it further. I recommend that the manuscript be accepted subject to minor revisions