

Referee n°1

*Dear Referee n°1*

*We are kindly grateful for your accurate revision of our work. We have appreciated your hints and suggestions and we thank you for your contribution to the improvement of our work.*

*Best regards*

*The Authors*

Referee n°2

*Dear Referee n°2*

*We are kindly grateful for your accurate revision of our work. We have appreciated your hints and suggestions and we thank you for your contribution to the improvement of our work.*

*Best regards*

*The Authors*

The manuscript has been reworked and improved in several parts. This reviewer recognizes that authors have accomplished the most important observations, such as the reformulation of the MI Index and to not consider, in the I/D graph, the distance between points and the reference curve as a direct indicator of the return period.

Notwithstanding these advances, this reviewer indicates some remarks whose accomplishment is needed for definitive improvements of the manuscript.

The first one is terminological. Authors still use the adjective “hydrogeological” to indicate indistinctly flood and rainfall-induced landslide phenomena, by simply translating the equivalent term from the Italian, which is itself improper and just popular. As it is well known, “hydrogeological” is used in the scientific literature to indicate groundwater flow phenomena and their relationships with hosting rocks and soils. The unifying term (adjective) for indicating floods and rainfall-induced landslides could be “hydrogeomorphological”.

*We have substituted the word “hydrogeological” in “geo-hydrological” as suggested also by Editor.*

The second regards the Fig. 10b in which the inversion of the dependent variable (SLPT Index) with the independent one (MI Index) is suggested to make the inherent empirical relationship usable for predicting MI Index by the SLPT Index.

*We have changed the figure according to this indication, showing the estimation of the MI in function of the SLPT.*

The third is an accurate revision of the English language which in several parts of the manuscript still presents grammar errors and construction of sentences too similar to the Italian language.

*We have corrected some grammar errors, typos and improved the readability of overall the paper*