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The manuscript deals with an interesting case study about the effect of topography on soil wetness measurements collected in situ for early-warning purposes. The paper is well structured. The obtained results are sufficiently discussed. Even if dealing with a potentially very interesting topic and its general good writing, in the opinion of this reviewer I recommend minor revision. There are only general comments/questions to the authors:

- The introduction part needs to be refined, by adding other specific references in a broader context of the international literature.
- The final conclusion to reflect the essential results of the paper is too thin. Please, try to expand this part to give a wide idea of what you learned from the paper, limitations and recommendations of this research should be highlighted.
- Authors should discuss also the geographic uncertainty of precipitation data, as both sizes receive roughly the same precipitation amounts (but not exactly the same) even at different elevations.

Regarding the flat monitoring site powered by a solar panel, are there any problems related to low temperatures and exposition?

- The data was transmitted via the mobile phone network every hour. My question regards the reception of the data. Did you use a specific internet channel for both sites?
- Try to add a sketch of the installed sensor instruments and a schematic representation of the monitoring stations.
- Do you think adding different piezometers regarding the rising of the groundwater table for both sites can add the same information in a landslide early warning?