

## Report #1

Suggestions for revision or reasons for rejection (will be published if the paper is accepted for final publication)

I would like to thank the authors for improving the quality of the manuscript, following the indications provided by the reviewers. Despite this, I still have concerns, about the lack of innovation of the research, relying on standard applications and methodologies. In particular, the use of interferometric and coherence change techniques is a solid and standardized practice, and the assessment of the deformation through optical imagery is insufficient, without providing any quantitative information to be compared with the other sources.

Despite this, the case study is interesting. Another concern is related to the manuscript, which can be significantly improved: The introduction section is very synthetic and does not describe the importance of the research in the framework of the existing literature, as well as the discussion section is a mere geomorphological description of the deformational events and a summary of the results obtained. In this section, in particular, a critical analysis of the results should be given, comparing the results obtained with those of similar works, raising the significance and the innovation of the research, if any

All comments and remarks raised by the referee are taken into account.

## Report #2

The manuscript presents an overview on the use of SAR-based interferometry, using ESA Sentinel 1 images, for landslide delineation and analysis. The Authors focus on some case studies located in north Algeria. Overall, the manuscript is interesting and clear, however, I think the main issues of this manuscript is its target, since it is not clear if it is the application of the methodology. In particular, the procedure used by Authors for image processing is described in details, whereas the analyses case studies seem to be simple examples. For this reason, the geological interpretation of the results is generic and poorly detailed. I would encourage the Authors to shorten the description of the methodology, enhancing the geological interpretation of results. Finally, there is a very minor issue at page 1, row 27, where the Authors cite "Del and Idrogeologico, 2012", as well as in the reference list. I suppose the name of the Authors are wrong, as far as I deduced, this should be: "Mazzanti et al., 2012". Given the aforementioned points, I recommend to consider the manuscript after a moderate review.

All comments and remarks raised by the referees are taken into account and changed in the manuscript.