

Dear Authors,

The papers present an interesting study to map and assess landslide susceptibility in an area where it is difficult to have detailed data both from the field and remote sensing.

The last version improved from the previous versions, and the question of the previous reviewer where addressed.

However, Some critical points, sometimes already evidenced by other reviewers, need to be clarified. In particular, the description and the discussion of landslide classification and the effect of anthropic activity.

General comments

Q1: Do you have only hillshade from Tandem-X DTM or the full data? In the second case, why did not use Tandem-X DTM instead of SRTM, especially for the shallow landslides? In addition, a figure showing the Tandem-X hillside should be added, for instance, in some panels of figure 4

Q2: The classification of landslide should be made in different ways, in fact, there are at least three types of classification:

1. One based on landslide depth: shallow/deep-seated
- 2 The second one is related to natural/anthropic (mining or road) causes
- 3 The third is based on landslide occurrence time recent/historical (pre-1955)
- 4 The landslides type (e.g., Cruden and Varnes), as shown in figure 4, should be another classification parameter at least for deep-seated landslide

Thus, the five categories of landslides presented in this way, in my opinion, it is not the best solution for analysing the results and also for the discussion sections (5.4 should be removed and some parts included in the previous section).

A flow chart, table or multiple figures with of landslides classifications will also help the work on inventory.

Q3: The papers should focus more on distinguishing 1) shallow landslides related to rainfall events from 2) deep landslides, because the two categories have pretty different suscetibility models. Then, you can consider the road, the land-use change (deforestation) and mining activity as predisposing factors (when necessary) for landslides and their weight in susceptibility models, as shown in Tables 4 and 5.

The impact of human activity should be alos shown with some more specific figures or plot, showing for instance, the comparison of shallow landslides trigger points density for different land-use conditions.

Q4: The deep-seated landslides should be classified in pre- 1955 and post- 1955 rather than recent/ancient.

Q5: Lines 615-625 consider that several recent deep-seated landslides are, probably, in several cases, close to a shallow landside depth and were easily detected on hillsahde and Google Earth images. While the pre- 1955 landslides detection is based on low-resolution aerial photos, which could have introduced a bias in their different characteristics (the area). ?

Q8: As most of the shallow landslides were triggered by 2014 event, is it possible to have a more detailed description of the event? Such as rainfall data and distribution (from satellite data such as GPM)?

Q7: Conclusion should be rewritten based on previous points with the most significant numerical results

Specific comments

Figure 2 and Figure 3: These figures should be mixed: the forest cover is not necessary in figure 3. At the same time, it should be better to show a map that compares forest cover change overlapped with landslide distribution.

Figure 8: In the caption, better details the contents of each sub-figures