Anonymous in acknowledgements of published article: Yes No

Recommendation to the editor

1) Scientific significance
Does the manuscript represent a substantial contribution to the understanding of natural hazards and their consequences (new concepts, ideas, methods, or data)?

Excellent Good Fair Poor

2) Scientific quality
Are the scientific and/or technical approaches and the applied methods valid? Are the results discussed in an appropriate and balanced way (clarity of concepts and discussion, consideration of related work, including appropriate references)?

Excellent Good Fair Poor

3) Presentation quality
Are the scientific data, results and conclusions presented in a clear, concise, and well-structured way (number and quality of figures/tables, appropriate use of technical and English language, simplicity of the language)?

Excellent Good Fair Poor

For final publication, the manuscript should be
accepted as is.
accepted subject to **technical corrections**.
accepted subject to **minor revisions**.
reconsidered after **major revisions**:
    I am willing to review the revised paper.
    I am **not** willing to review the revised paper.
rejected.

Suggestions for revision or reasons for rejection (will be published if the paper is accepted for final publication)
Dear Authors,
I've carefully read the revised version of your manuscript.
Overall, the paper has been improved during the review phase. It gained homogeneity and clarity. All comments and suggestions made by both reviewers were addressed. There are a few last correction suggestions listed below.
I'm still doubtful about using the Factor of Safety directly as an index for landslide hazard. I see that in the mentioned references, in some cases of deterministic analysis, is suggested to determine landslide hazard using slope stability models, resulting in the calculation of factors of safety.
Therefore, I accept the answer proposed by the Authors and I leave the decision to the Editor.

List of minor corrections:
Title: I would say "changes"

Down

Page 1, line 18: I would say "emission scenarios"

Down

Page 1, line 22: I would say "statistically significant"

Down

Page 1, line 28: I would say "increasing rate"

Down

Page 2, line 4: I would say "changes"

Down

Page 2, line 10: I would say "Climate change affected and will affect…"

Down

Page 2, line 13: a point is missing

Down

Page 2, line 14: I would say "types" instead of "typologies" here and elsewhere in the text.

Down in elsewhere in the text

Page 3, line2 1-2: I would sort the references chronologically, as in the other cases.

Down

Page 4, line 27: please define "FoS" since it is the first time it is mentioned in the text (do not consider the abstract)

Down

Page 5, line 1: here you can use only "Fos"

Down

Page 6, lines 18 onward: these indices should be defined. Alternatively add some references. However, the whole section 2.4 is not very clear. I would suggest another check.

Down – other references have been added

Page 7, lines 2-20: I think this part could be shortened again.

Down – some elements have been deleted

Page 8, line 5: I would say "346 landslides" instead of "different landslides"

Down

Page 9, Table 2: again, landslide type is not a predisposing factor so I suggest removing this row from the table.

Down

Page 11, line 6: not clear the meaning of "narrative"

Down

Page 13, Figure 3: the sum of the values related to Scenario 2 and 2100 is 100.1%. Please correct.

Down

Page 15, lines 12-14: not very clear.

Down

Page 27, line 26: "occurrence frequency landslide events" is not clear. Please check.

Down

Page 29, line 13: please correct "succion"

Down

Page 30, line 14: please correct "It imply"

Down

Page 30, line 21: I would say "the evolution of FoS variations range from…"

Down

Figures: In some figures, comma is used instead of point as decimal separator (e.g. in the scalebar, 2,5 km). I would suggest correcting it.

Down in all figures