

Here are my remaining doubts/comments:

- At lines 32-36, the authors introduce 3 research questions:
“1) What is the historical record of natural-hazard events that have affected the Garrotxa region between 1900 and 2023? 2) How do these events relate spatially and temporally, indicating potential interactions (e.g., rainfall-induced landslides or earthquake-triggered rockfalls)? 3) How does the resulting dataset compare with existing national and international repositories, and what added value does it offer for future multi-hazard risk assessment?”
It would be very useful to recall these three questions at the end of the manuscript, in the discussion or conclusions, and provide a synthetic response, highlighting how this research has helped in answering these questions. This is partially already done, but the link with the initial research questions is not explicated.
- Line 160 – “their potential interactions in a multi-hazard framework”: what does this mean? The authors should explain this selection criterion better.
- Section 3.2 (Variable classification) is presented very briefly. I encourage the authors to provide more detail, particularly on how the classification “provides a conceptual bridge between raw observations and modeling frameworks, clarifying which variables act as drivers versus descriptors.” Furthermore, the terms drivers and descriptors are not defined, nor are they referenced in Table 1, so clarification would be helpful.
- Section 4.2 (Preliminary analysis of hazard interrelationships) needs some clarification.
 - The authors state that “heuristic assumptions regarding potential temporal and spatial relationships between triggering hazards and subsequently triggered hazards were defined. These assumptions were informed by a preliminary inspection of the dataset and by prior geological knowledge of the study area.” What does it mean? A more detailed explanation of how these assumptions have been made is required. What about referring also to existing literature to identify potential interaction mechanisms to investigate? See, e.g. Gill, J. C., & Malamud, B. D. (2014). Reviewing and visualizing the interactions of natural hazards. *Reviews of geophysics*, 52(4), 680-722.
 - The authors state that “Interrelationships are more readily identified for well-documented episodes, such as major storms (e.g., the Gloria event in January 2020), highlighting the importance of data completeness for robust multi-hazard analysis.” Does this imply that some records can be considered directly as multi-hazard events, i.e., events documented as involving multiple hazards? While the current database structure is single-hazard, the authors might consider discussing how multi-hazard information could be incorporated directly into the database in cases where such events are documented.

- Section 5.4 (Challenges and limitations) is now extremely synthetic. I do not understand why the authors decided to significantly modify this part of the manuscript, since it was more detailed and developed in the previous version.
- In the introduction, the authors mention that one of the outcomes of this research is “defining a reproducible workflow for data validation.” However, the manuscript does not discuss the reproducibility of the approach. I encourage the authors to address this in the discussion.
- Additionally, the manuscript does not discuss how the proposed methodology and workflow for database construction, population, and validation could be applied in other contexts. Which methodological choices and solutions could be generalized and adopted in different settings?
- Figures 1,3,4,5 and 6 seem to be of very low quality. Please, check.

As a general (and final) comment, the paper is written in a very concise manner, as if the authors were cautious about being too wordy or providing too many details. I realize this touches on stylistic, and therefore somewhat subjective aspects, but at times the result is sentences that leave much open to interpretation and do not go into sufficient detail. This is particularly true for the discussion section, which is very brief compared to the potential depth of discussion regarding the implications of this work, especially in relation to its replicability.