

Interactive comment on “Assessing the quality of landslide susceptibility maps – case study Lower Austria” by H. Petschko et al.

H. Petschko et al.

helene.petschko@univie.ac.at

Received and published: 18 September 2013

General reply

The authors thank Referee #1 for the thorough and thoughtful review and the numerous valuable comments to improve the manuscript and the discussion of the results. The revised manuscript was changed and more detailed definitions were inserted to address the questions that were raised in the referee comment. This should prohibit further misunderstanding of the general purpose and intention of the presented study by the readers and should aid to improve the traceability of the study. This author reply will address all comments raised by the referee and will answer these in a step by step manner. Additionally, to each general reply of the comment or question the respective

C1211

text inserted or altered in the revised manuscript is included.

Generally, the introduction, section 2 on the considerations on quality of a susceptibility map, the discussion section and the conclusions were modified substantially in the revised version of the manuscript. Therefore, some references to the page and line in the original manuscript might not be straight forward without the context of the revised manuscript. Where applicable or necessary we inserted the entire section in this author reply to give the reader the possibility to grasp the context.

For the step by step reply to the specific comments please see the supplementary material attached.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/1/C1211/2013/nhessd-1-C1211-2013-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 1, 1001, 2013.

C1212




Fig. 1.