

Dear authors and editors,

Thank you very much for the opportunity to follow the process of this evolving manuscript.

The revised manuscript addresses the main points of our first review:

- 1) Validation dataset: the acknowledgement in the discussion improves the manuscript and explains why a small dataset in this case is valid and useful.
- 2) Dataset description: *Table 1. Overview of the avalanche events used in this study with the time given in CET* provides a logical overview of the dataset and makes it easier to follow and understand as a reader. Including the years for each event now in the methods section improves the clarity when the authors refer to the validation dataset and when to the additional dataset. I would recommend using these terms continuously throughout the manuscript and avoid terms such as “case study” (L345) to further reduce potential confusion. L145 still mentions 4 historical avalanches, but again only three are documented in table 1 and only 3 are described. Also, here the word “test” might be misleading if that is the validation dataset. Since this is a sort of complicated dataset structure, the manuscript would benefit from consistent distinction between validation dataset and additional test dataset based on consistent names/labels.
- 3) MAE for data sparse areas: the authors explanation makes total sense.
- 4) Frequency and Stability approach: the improvements that were made in the methods, results and discussion section were necessary and clarify the reasoning behind. Particularly, the paragraph in the discussion section explains the choice for the frequency approach over the stability approach well, and is therefore helpful for the broader community. Great to read that reviewer 2’s comments led to an internal discussion with a resulting revision of the stability approach.
- 5) Artificial vs. Natural releases: The additional consideration of the trigger in the discussion allows to justify the interpretation of the maps as conditional scenario maps. This strengthens the results and applicability for practitioners.

We also support the title change. However, we would like to point out a typo in traffic-rout, which should be spelled “traffic route”.

Overall, the improvements to version 1 were necessary and helpful. We think this is a valuable manuscript and relevant advancement for operational decision-making along road corridors. Please consider our two minor comments before publishing.

Best regards,

Andrea and Erich