

We thank the editor for his useful remarks. We have made the appropriate changes to improve both the manuscript and the supplement according to the notes he gave. In the following, we give a point by point description of the changes we made.

(1) throughout the main text (e.g., lines 119, 153, etc), the reference to the supplement is inconsistently formatted and does not accurately reflect the subheadings in the supplement sections; please correct this to be consistent and accurate

We have reformatted all the references to the supplement in order to reflect the sections of the supplementary material.

(2) please double check to make sure that the figures are uploaded at high resolution and appear correctly in the final PDFs; in some cases, the versions in some of the drafts for review are unacceptably low resolution for final publication (please check the final figure resolution not only for the main text proofs, but also for the supplement which will not be reviewed in detail during copy editing) — actually the most recent version seems ok, but just check these

All the figures have been checked.

(3) A few minor line-by-line notes:

Lines 14-15: reword to "seismic ground motion parameters AND lithologic and topographic features"

Lines 218: the "." should be removed before the citation to Robert, 2011

Line 269: add a "." after "e.g"

Changes made.

In the Supplement

Line S2: subtitle should be "Methods and metrics" to follow formatting of other subtitles (not capital M on Metrics)

Lines S24,S33: the brackets designating the interval range here are opposite the format used in the main text (line 98)

Line S42: "The use of Rp TO remove..."

Changes made.

Lines S46-47: it seems odd wording to say that you want to insure that the landslides oversample a given hillslope portion — presumably you want to make sure that values for $R_p > 1$ represent an oversampling — these are different things, and I think the wording could be improved

The sentence is now: "In other words we want to quantify the null hypothesis that $R_p > 1$ (or $R_p < 1$) is due to random fluctuations around PDF_{topo} and hence insure that we retain only statistically robust cases (macrocells) of landslide clustering."

Line S69: probability should not be capitalized unless there is a reason I don't understand

Line S81: errant space before the first sentence here

Line S124: "THESE parameters"

Changes made.

Figure S1 caption: I think it would help to specify the flow accumulation threshold used for channel delineation for this landscape, and more generally in this study (maybe I missed this elsewhere); also, can you clarify which of the three ridge delineation methods were used in calculating R_p as reported in the main text?

Supplementary material now includes the following statements:

Line S21-S23: “ The thresholds of drainage area we use to define channel heads vary from 0.02 to 0.5 km² in this study. Crests are mapped using a double criterion of null flow accumulation and a threshold of positive curvature (Fig. S1b).”

Fig. S1 caption: “Channel heads are evaluated after Montgomery, 2001, using a threshold of 0.07 km² of drainage area. Crests are generated with three different methods: Crest cells are mapped as a) cells of null flow accumulation (NFA) b) cells of NFA and above a positive curvature threshold (PCT) (used in this study) and...”

Figure S14 caption: It may be worth noting here that the extent of these areas is illustrated in Figure 7

Fig. S14 caption: “The locations of a. and b. are reported in Fig. 7a. “

The authors