

Dear editor

Thank you for all your comments and suggestions. Hopefully, all your questions and remarks will be answered in following text, or last version of manuscript. Answers to the comments follows.

- Thank you very much for considering GI to publish your work. After receiving two reviews, for which I am very grateful, and receiving the revised manuscript the study can be considered for publication after minor revisions.

- The main issues are regarding the usage of the English language and the figures and tables. I suggest a thorough proof reading by a native speaker as there are typos and grammar issues throughout the manuscript making it sometimes not possible to understand what is meant (e.g. line 446-447). I tried to revise some, but I am also not a native speaker.

Answer: Thank you for your suggestions and made revisions. We have rewritten the manuscript once more to improve English. Especially, changes were made in Discussion. Hopefully, these changes will make the manuscript more accessible for readers.

- In its current form the manuscript still contains too many tables. Please, decrease number of tables and instead consider, which ones could and should be moved to the appendix or replaced by diagrams.

Answer: Two tables were removed and two figures were merged. This revisions should help the manuscript, to be more comprehensible.

- Please, check the captions of the tables and figures. They should enable that the figures and tables can be read by themselves, without looking into the manuscript. Furthermore, please, revise the tables and figures regarding their font size, as they are partly too small (e.g. tables 1 and 3 or figure 1, 2 and 6). And in general, please, thoroughly check the numbering of tables and figures, also in the text. For instance, figure 7 should be figure 9. And what table 7 are you referring to in line 325?

Answer: Captions tables and figures were revisited and enhanced. Also tables font was enlarged in necessary cases. Hopefully now it is ok.

- In table 2, I am wondering if the sampling rates of TLS and GB InSAR should be increased because measurements are also possible at minutes' intervals. Also, aerial photogrammetry can be measured with higher temporal resolution (hours-days if UAVs are considered). Furthermore, terrestrial photogrammetry enables minutes-days data capture if time-lapse systems are used.

Answer: The table was updated according to your suggestions.

- In figure 1, please remove the dots from the numbers in the figure.

Answer: dots were removed and font was enlarged.

- At the end of the introduction (line 55-77), please, reorder the paragraphs/sentences, e.g. based on geometric and environmental observations, because at the moment it seems to be a bit mixed up of mentioning of different monitoring options. Furthermore, please, rephrase the study site description because many sentences repeat (word by word) in each study site chapter. Also, please, explain the methods mentioned in line 235-237 in some more detail for readers not originating from geology. Finally, please, use consistent terminology and abbreviations, e.g. considering the geographic directions.

Answer: Thanks for the suggestions. The paragraphs in introduction were reordered and we hope, that now the introduction is clearer. Also, description of monitoring sites was shortened and

rewritten. Same for the methods descriptions, which were enlarged. Terminology and abbreviations were revisited in final manuscript version.

Hopefully, revisions of manuscript will fulfil the expectations and standards of the Geoscientific Instrumentation, Methods and Data Systems Journal.

In the name of all authors.

Ondřej Racek