Interactive comment on "Regional rainfall thresholds for landslide occurrence using a centenary database" *by* Teresa Vaz et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 22 November 2017

The paper by Vaz et al. deals with the identification of landslides triggering thresholds. The paper is well written, even if the topic is highly studied and some drawbacks are found. The most critical issue is due to the fact that landslides are not classified in terms of mechanism, material or volume (3.1 paragraph, line 23). I don't know if the authors could provide at least one these, but I think that an effort in at least one of them could affect the final results. In fact, antecedent rainfalls are very important for landslides affecting soils, but they could be less relevant for rockfalls... Most of the adopted landslides are located in urban area, where the fall of walls and some artificial cut could have been termed landslides. Several other landslides are located close to the sea, affecting the sea cliff, are the authors sure that they were not triggered by waves? I understand the attempt to find a filtering criterion in Page 6 lines 15 -19, but

as the authors say it is arbitrary and it is in contrast with the analysis they perform within 10 km, where most of them could be anthropic-induced (pag. 8 lines 23-25). Maybe, thresholds could be evaluated in the range 5 - 10 km, excluding urban landslides. All the performed analyses and the considerations carried out are reasonable and well-described, but main drawbacks are the input data.

minor issues: pag 2 line 8 change depth with height pag 3 line 6 change quantity with quantify pag 4 line 3 remove brackets for April etc pag 4 line 24 change along with In pag 9 line 13 most rainy pag 9 line 27 change detaches with identifies Fig 1 it is better to categorize the elevation Fig 3 some labels are wrong , i.e. Dez