

We thank the anonymous referee #1 for the constructive comments on the present manuscript. We were very pleased that the topic tackled by our study was judged as “very interesting” and “very important whenever a landslide susceptibility model is included in an urban or regional land planning” and that the paper was considered to be “well organized” with accurate figures. We were also delighted that only “very few corrections” were considered as necessary prior to publication. For details, please follow our point-by-point replies:

- **RC1: Original comment of referee #1**
- **AR:** Response of the authors (black) and changes/changed text segments (blue)
- Page and line numbers refer to the revised version of the manuscript (e.g. p.2 line 8)

**RC1: No abbreviation, please.**

**AR:** Corrected. We dropped this bracket “(n = 591)” (p.1 line 15), because this information is provided within Sect. 3.1 (p.4 line 21) and within Figure 1.

**RC1: “.”**

**AR:** Done (p.2 line 4).

**RC1: Replace Fig. 1 with Fig. 1B**

**AR:** We changed the arrangement of the figures (i.e. slope map above lithological map) as suggested by the referee to allow a consequential description of the maps. The color ramp of the slope map was adapted (i.e. ramp without red) to ensure visibility of the landslide points (red). The color ramp of the slope map shown in Fig. 3a was as well changed in order to ensure consistency with Fig. 1. The abbreviation “Fig. 1” was replaced with “Fig. 1b” as suggested.

**RC1: Replace Fig. 1B with Fig. 1C**

**AR:** Done. Changed to Fig. 1c.

**RC1: Replace “Fig. 1B” with “Fig. 1C” and “Fig. 1C” with “Fig. 1B”**

**AR:** Done. Changed to Fig. 1c and Fig. 1b respectively.

**RC1: Which type of analysis? Could you add a reference here?**

**AR:** Thank you for the comment. We extended this paragraph to clarify our approach.

Furthermore, we included an additional reference (p.5 line 31, p.6 line 1f):

*“Within this analysis, 65 of the 681 analyzed landslide database entries of the Building Ground Registry (more information refer to Schwenk, 1992 and Steger et al., 2016) contained a quantitative estimate on the positional accuracy of the respective landslide point location. The derived mean positional error of 120 m (standard deviation of 84 m) was directly adopted to specify the inaccuracy of the most erroneous inventory.”*

**RC1: “pixilated” (check, please)**

**AR:** We changed this expression to “noisy appearing grid files”. (p.8 line 29)

**RC1: Labels of panels must be included with brackets around letters being lower case: (a)**

**AR:** Corrected for all figures. All cross-references in the text and figure captions were adapted accordingly.