Report on revised manuscript "*Time forecast of a break-off event from a hanging glacier*" by J. Faillettaz, M. Funk and M. Vagliasindi

Over the four main major points I raised in general comment, the authors only really gave answers to one (overall recommendations for the prediction method) in this revised version of the manuscript.

The discussion about the value of lambda and its impact on the prediction time was not improved.

The authors have not made any effort to adopt a probabilistic approach arguing that uncertainty on the data are insignificant in comparison to uncertainty on the fitting method. But why uncertainty on the fitting method could not be included in the probability calculation? Authors also argue that a probabilistic approach in too complex for real time estimation. I think it is not true, the problem is quite simple (fitting data with an analytical model…).

The transferability of the method to another glacier is still not really discussed. The authors argue that all hanging glacier have similar geometry and the method already works for three of them. I think it is not enough when we know that the dependence of λ to geometry, grain size and loading are still unclear.

I still think the manuscript deserve publication in The Cryosphere but I am disappointed by the effort made by the author in this revised version. I would not recommend to reject the manuscript but I think this manuscript could be improved. It could be more that only a validation of a method already developed in Failletaz et al. [2008] if the author would make some effort on the treatment of the rupture time using the fitting method and better analyse the role of λ in the prediction (see also specific comment n°2).

Specific comments

- Table 2 : why uncertainty on tc decrease when adding nose on the data ??

- Section 5.2 and figure 7 : Is the spectral peak at λ=2d still exist after the first break off ? It seems that the lomb periodogram for stakes 13 and 2 have been calculated on a time windows that include the period before the first break off. It means that the peak at λ=2d arise from this pre-break off period and is maybe totally absent after the break off. It would mean that λ depend totally of the geometry and loading rate. The author have to clarify this.

- Line 96-98: Same comment. I would say something here about "the correction technique".

- Line 165: Say why and how you are accounting for flow direction?

- Line 216-218: The sentence is still unclear. "Scale" is repeated five times in one sentence …

- Line 234: Fig 7 (not Fig 7b)