1- However, the problem statement that need to be solved here is well know hypothesis. Also, the research carried in this article dint come up with interesting facts. More or less the outcome was highly expected.

2- I wish to see a clear sentence that stress on the validity of using the applied method, or compare to current methods that might need to be improved using the presented approach.

3- Some prosaic sentences were mentioned: “the island suffered persistent and abnormal precipitations”, “In this work, ordinary kriging (OK) has been chosen as it is better adapted to the problem under study.”

4- fig. 4 with table 1. you mentioned the wet years, like 2003 but the amount of landslide compare to following years (average to wet) clearly saying different story “dry to wet”

5- fig. 5 However, when there are a significant number of stations where the cycle has not been detected, a dichotomous transformation has been chosen, i.e. observed (1), not observed (0), as in the case of ENSO (6.4y) and Sunspot (11.2y)!!!
6- What about the false negative and false positive of landslide occurrence within the climate cycle??

I prefer to stop here, as i tried to get along with article searching for significant findings. But, I think due to the poor structure of the manuscript and presented figures, the idea behind it was difficult to follow.

Unfortunately, my decision is against the publication and I recommend to reject the article. In meantime, I ask the authors to have more time to develop the current approach by consider more robust problem statement and methodology.

All the best,

Omar AlThuwaynee