

Dear Editor,

Thanks for your feedback on the latest version of our manuscript.

We definitely agree that it is important to carry out other methods in conjunction with the spring-water temperatures. For this reason, we have stressed in the paper that it is a preliminary/pilot/auxiliary method, not conclusive, which requires other investigations for confirmation.

We report this concept at lines 30-31 in the Abstract, 78-79 in the Introduction, 242 in the Methods, 509, 553 and 557-558 in the Discussion, 637 and 643-645 in the Concluding remarks (line numbers are referred to the latest version of the manuscript (4), track-change version).

Limitations and uncertainties in the spring-water temperature approach are deeply analysed in Section 5.3, with several integrations in response to reviewers' comments. In particular, we discuss the possible warm and cold bias that can affect spring-water measurements, and consequently rock glacier activity classification. We have added further considerations regarding the warm/cold bias and rock glacier classification at the end of Section 5.3 (line 558-560) and additional recommendation for further investigations (and possible examples) in the Concluding remarks at line 640-642.

As suggested, we have added discussions on the importance of the ice storage inside the rock glaciers of our study area, comparing our findings with those reported in the literature (lines 609-619). Additional references have been reported in the References Section.

Finally, we added a data availability statement (line 674-676) reporting the DOI of the open-access repository where the dataset used in this paper has been stored.

Thank you for consideration and kind regards,

Luca Carturan and co-authors.