The author's response is shown below in blue text.

Anonymous Referee #1

I do like the revised version of the paper. The novelty and usefulness of the described approach is more clear now. I did not see that so clearly in the previous version, which might be a) my fault as being ignorant or b) the new version is a significant improvemtn or c) both. I do like the heatmaps and I think they are useful as is the new experiment in Haiti.

We thank Referee #1 for their review of our manuscript. We are glad to hear our effort to revise the manuscript based on previous reviews has led to an improved contribution.

I only have a few minor comments:

Line 48: Delete 'freely available' because the statement you make hear does not depend on the free availability of the data.

Good point. We will delete this from the revised manuscript.

Line 60: "...in densely vegetated mountainous areas where landslides tend to occur." I don't think this statement is correct, as many landslides also occur in not densely vegetated areas. I even believe that vegetated areas have potentially less landslides.

Another good point and we agree. We will remove the statement about vegetation and modify the sentence to “However, backscatter change detection methods can outperform coherence-based methods in densely vegetated mountainous regions, because in these areas…”

Line 119: "...the dominant scattering is away from the satellite..." - I suggest to delete this statement. It is unnecessary here and probably not true in all cases -> dominant scattering might be back to the satellite but very weak or, even more likely, there is no dominant scattering direction.

Agree. We will delete this from the revised manuscript.

Line 271: I think EOI was not introduced before

EOI (event of interest) is introduced on Line 135.