Natural Hazards
and Earth System
Sciences

Open Access

Discussions

Interactive comment on "Uncovering the 2010 Haiti earthquake death toll" *by* J. E. Daniell et al.

J. E. Daniell et al.

j.e.daniell@gmail.com

Received and published: 24 September 2013

Many thanks for your thorough review of the paper and for the constructive comments. We have attempted to remove a lot of the wordy and inexact language in the paper in line with your review by cutting out unnecessary and narrative comments which did not add to the overall goal.

The abstract comment has been cleared, with a different method of explaining the death toll rather than using the previous approximate method, it is now explicitly stated what the median death toll and what their range is.

References: Each statement has been edited in order to provide evidence and references for each source of the evidence, rather than the unsubstantiated comments that were in the previous version.

Introduction: The introduction now includes an explicit guide to the paper and tells what the goal of the paper is. In addition a map is introduced.

Acronyms: All relevant acronyms have now been added into the text and/or reference list.

Background section: This has been now been brought in through the death toll estimate section rather than at the beginning. An attempt to join the chapters has been done, by changing the order and adding an explicit population estimation chapter. We hope that this clears this problem up.

"The realistic and justified range " comment has been removed as you are definitely right that it cannot be substantiated. These types of comments have been attempted to be removed throughout.

Section 3: a. the paragraphs have been changed around, and the beginning of each section has been given an introductory sentence to what it is about.

- Precision has been set to coarser numbers in all cases.

- The section and methodology has been made simpler by focussing on the Haiti MTPTC study as the basis for building damage assessment. This hopefully makes it much easier for the reader.

Section 4: The section (now section 5) has been subdivided, like Chapter 6.

Explanations have been made for each of these values.

The black approach has now been removed with simply the full range being used thus giving an idea of the weighting distribution rather than just the median average output as shown previously. This removes the problem.

You are right : "logic tree weighting" has now been used – Section 5 (now 6), the unsubstantiated narrative comments have 1 been removed. Subheadings have also been added.

The uncertainties hopefully have been cleared up by the reworking and changed description of each methodology as well as the description in the conclusion.