

Dear,

Thanks for implementing my comments in the manuscript. The manuscript shows clear improvements and seems nearly ready for publication. I have just a few minor additional comments that I believe could further strengthen the text in some parts.

Abstract:

- In my opinion, I would like to see some clarity on the fact that the methods work on larger landslides just like you have in the conclusion that will directly imply that the results are based on larger landslides as well

Line 12: You have to mention the uncertainty for the precursor in line with your discussion. Use word like '**potential**' or '**possible**'

Line 14: I assume you mean the sensitivity related to size. Therefore I think you should be more explicit. This can be rephrased to something like: 'Overall, we demonstrate that, although they are more sensitive to larger landslides, Sentinel-1 amplitude and coherence' .. etc

Introduction:

Line 38: I would add (in bold): 'medium resolution **optical** imagery such as .. ' and potentially remove 'medium resolution' since your reply emphasize the point of difference in what it can capture rather than the spatial resolution.

Line 44: Typo in 'introducing noise in a and coherence'

Line 54: INSAR acronym already defined, not needed again.

Line 55: Brackets needed for references.

Data and Methods

- I would like to see a one sentence addition that highlights how noise factors are differentiated from a landslide in the coherence matrix. This would make it much clearer. Now you say that it provides a more reliable indicator (line 184-185 and 193-197 but it does not seem fully clear how), even after paragraph in line 195-206. Just a one sentence addition could clarify this I think. This puts everything a bit more in perspective and allows to understand better where potential inaccuracies would come from.

Line 76: Regarding my initial comment. This sentence is a bit confusing. On the one hand there is no possibility to map landslides, but on the other hand you say that they agree that there is a few landslides. That is confusing. I would adapt it to something like: 'cloud cover prevented **from comprehensive** landslide mapping'.

Line 85/86: make sure km² is in superscript

Line 116 Brackets needed for the references

Line 128: Deijns et al., 2022 also uses amplitude to define the timing of landslides. Although they don't use it to identify the timing of **individual** landslides. Perhaps this is what you mean, but it requires some clarification.

Line 205: I would relate this to landscape since it is likely more vegetated in contrast to the bare soil after the event. This will make it clearer as to why this is visible.

Line 208: I would really like to see explained shortly what differentiates coherence loss due to landslide activity from other noise factors (like mentioned in line 186) in the coherence matrix. That would really ease the understanding of the figure. You explain it in your reply but it is not clear from the text.

Results

Table 1: 05-07 should be changed to 05-08.

Line 322: There still seems to be too much confidence from this. Especially given your sentence after that. You should add something like **'likely'** or **'potential'** reactivations.

Line 333-334: Maybe add comma for thousands. E.g., 10,000

Line 338: Explanation of 'main' failure is not needed anymore since you explained this earlier.

Fig 4. I have to say that 4c reactivation is not that clear. (blue outline on green)

Discussion

Fig. 5.: 1% dashed line is lighter in panel a than panel b, this should be homogenized.

Line 461: I would like to see mentioned some examples of these inaccuracies for clarity and interpretability of the method.

Line 472 I would use **'could'** or **'would'** suggest that these 29' etc. to add nuance.

Line 491: Section 4.2 highlights that the precursory motions are quite uncertain. I would be a bit more cautious in phrasing this here. Better to phrase it as 'possible precursory movement, just like you mention in the section 4.2 title.

Line 565: **'Potential'** or **'Possible'** precursory activity to be in line with your discussion