Electrical Resistivity Tomography surveys for the geoelectric characterization of the Montaguto landslide (southern Italy)

Pag.3 line 49

I think that translation of Puglia Region in "Apulia" Region is not completely correct when, in the same phrase, Campania is written in Italian language.

Pag.3 Line52/53

I think that for a completely explanation of the studies in the Montaguto Earthflow, is necessary to insert a citation of the complex monitoring activities according with (*Giordan et Al. 2013, Lollino et Al. 2014*)

Pag.3 Line59/60

According with the plane of the ERT surveys (fig.2) , I think that is more correct: "...was focused on the upper portion of *the landslide channel area*" because the upper part of the landslide body (from about 750 to 900 m asl) was not covered by ERT surveys

Figure 3

On the ERT 3 picture, we observe the S4 borehole but in the legend is not present. The Piezo 1 (P1) is instead present.

Figure 4

I think that 6 ERT sections in one A4 page are too many. I think that the correct number can be 3 or 4 (as in Figure 3).

Figure 3,4

To increase the comprehension of the drainage channel effects, the pictures are too small. My suggestion: create a zoomed box centered on the drainage channel.

The S4,S6,S7 piezometer explain the water table or pore water pressure? The difference between W.T. and P.W.P. is very important on this type of terrains

Pag.9 - Conclusions - Line 251/252

Regarding the effectiveness of the drainage system, I'm not completely sure that with this surveys is possible to make this important and critical information. I think that the your data explain the first effects of the drainage systems but just with many multi-temporal surveys is possible to explain the effectiveness of the complex drainage systems installed in this terrain. Therefore, my suggestion to modify the phrase.