

I would like to thank the authors took all the comments into consideration and made a detailed revision of the manuscript. However, some issues/sentences are still needed to be revised before the publication.

- (1) [Page 12, Figure 2] How to decide the threshold of yellow, orange and red? Is it manual? If yes, what is the rule and how to make it more objective?
- (2) [Table 4] The summations of percentage are not 100% in 2013, 2014, 2016, especially, 100.2% in 2016.
- (3) [Page 24, Line 7-8] The authors said that “The results of the preliminary analysis conducted at the national scale for the period 2013-2016 and using all days in the years, shows that over 95% of the days assessment are considered as correct.” However, the percentage of correct prediction in 2013 and 2014 are 94.2% and 92.9% respectively in Table 5.
- (4) [Page 11, Line 26] It is suggested that “Figure 2 a shows the first version of thresholds” might need to revise as “Fig. 2(a) shows the first version of thresholds” for not confusing “(a)” from “a”.
- (5) [Page 11, Line 26-27] “Figure 2 a shows the first version of thresholds at national level, however, defined using three major landslide events. However, there are regional differences in the prevailing types” It seems to be a little weird when two “however” show successively.
- (6) [Caption of Figure 4] “chapter 6” might be “section 6”?
- (7) [Page 23, Line 22] “Challenging days” -> “challenging days”
- (8) [Page 24, Line 19 and 21] “km2” should be superscript.