Anonymous Referee 1 (nhess-2016-44-RC3.pdf):

General comments

1. **C**: To me, the paper needs to be expanded to describe in a better way the methods used, and needs a deep revision of English language.
   R: I agree. Modified accordingly. Please see the new version of the manuscript.
2. **C**: The author does not describe, for instance, the 'rotating calipers method' (page 3, line 10), or AUROC (not even the meaning of the acronym). A revised version of the manuscript needs a clear description of the methods used.
   R: I agree, although the rotating method is a standard method in computational geometry and GIS (is implemented in several GIS packages), and it would be spurious to include a detailed explanation on how the bounding box is oriented. Please see the new version of the manuscript.
3. **C**: The figures could be improved as well. 3D views like Fig.1 are not always the best way to show the geomorphology of the area (and I don't see a need for two views of the same area).
   R: In my view a 3D view is the best way to grasp the morphology of a terrain; both views show the same area; the top view has the 3D view of the satellite image from Google Earth, while the bottom has the 3D view of the LIDAR DEM shading; both have overlayed the inventory; I used them for reference to the geomorphologic situation of the landslides discussed in the text, so I consider them important to understand the case of long vs. wide landslides.
4. **C**: A schematic cartoon showing the differences of wide and long landslides, as well as some ones that could be misclassified would be much more informative.
   R: I agree. Introduced new Fig. 1. Please see the new version of the manuscript.
5. **C**: Fig.2 has so much information that is hard to read it. A simple map of Romania (written 'Romania') is sufficient. No need for hypsometry or the global map. Using a square as a scale bar is not usual, and the analytical shading scheme is not needed. Try to simplify as much as possible.
   R: I agree; I use the hypsometric map of Romania in all my papers, so it's a matter of flavor; please see the new version of the manuscript; the square refers to the pixel size.
6. **C**: In Fig.3 I would rethink the use of colors and gradients. Think of people printing your paper in a black and white printer.
   R: I agree; I introduced a legend which will help people printing in BW to understand the different shapes/colors. Please see the new version of the manuscript.
7. **C**: Fig.4 could be merged with the new Fig.1.
   R: I consider that this figure is needed, and I extended it to include long vs. wide landslides geometry. Please see the new version of the manuscript.
8. **C**: Fig.5 needs a scale bar. To what elements, the color bars refer to? Are both color bars for the MFD-D8 pictures? Of so, they are the same, and you can use only one.
   R: Since the dimensions of the bounding box are displayed I do not consider there is a need for a scale bar. I modified the color scales for the flow length maps. Please see the new version of the manuscript.
9. **C**: I don't see the reason for Fig.6, and if you don't explain in the methodology what is AUROC and why you used it, then Fig.7 might not be understood by some readers.
   R: I agree. Modified accordingly. Please see the new version of the manuscript.