

Dear Julius Kunz and co-authors  
Dear editor

The authors have done a thorough job addressing the (quite numerous) reviewer comments from the first round, covering reformulations (including the title) and an additional analysis (IMCOR). This additional analysis (IMCOR) has been well inserted in the existing structure of the paper, rather than merely appended. Where the authors pushed back, notably on the choice of the resistivity classes, they did so carefully, with well-reasoned justification and discussion (L415–420). The two thematic threads/scope, the case study and the methodological implications, are retained, introduced (L90-94), and properly discussed (Sect. 5.3), making the paper more coherent now. I appreciate these decisions and recommend acceptance. Thank you very much for the work.

Minor comments:

Figure 7c–d now shares a common y-axis, which aids interpretation. The decision to plot seasonality in relative terms (%) is appropriate. I would, however, suggest cropping the y-axis at perhaps 200–300% to better support the authors' claim that seasonality is weaker on the investigated rock glacier compared to the thrust moraine (L476), as the full range may obscure this contrast visually.

Please ensure that the title of Sect. 4.3 is styled as a proper section heading.