Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 1, C2006–C2008, 2013
www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/1/C2006/2013/

Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences
Discussions

Interactive comment on "Assessment methodology for the prediction of landslide dam hazard" *by* S. F. Dal Sasso et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 10 December 2013

Dear Authors, your paper was of great interest for me and, I suppose, for the entire scientific community. The proposed approach seems to be valid and effectiveness. In my opinion, the main issue you have to face to refine your exposition regards the validation of your approach. It is not clear how can you state the validity of your results. It seems that you use the case of Zillona landslide, but it is not clear. I suggest rearranging your paper focusing on the case of Zillona as a test area, demonstrating how basin analysis can be validated considering in depth a single slope case. As suggested by the NHESS guidelines for reviewers, I report my opinion on the following aspects: 1. Does the paper address relevant scientific and/or technical questions within the scope of NHESS? Yes 2. Does the paper present new data and/or novel concepts, ideas, tools, methods or results? Yes 3. Are these up to international standards? Yes 4.

Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and outlined clearly? Yes 5. Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and the conclusions? No (see comment above) 6. Does the author reach substantial conclusions? Yes 7. Is the description of the data used, the methods used, the experiments and calculations made, and the results obtained sufficiently complete and accurate to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? Yes 8. Does the title clearly and unambiguously reflect the contents of the paper? Yes 9. Does the abstract provide a concise, complete and unambiguous summary of the work done and the results obtained? No, abstract doesn't contain the main results. 10. Are the title and the abstract pertinent, and easy to understand to a wide and diversified audience? Yes 11. Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations and units correctly defined and used? If the formulae, symbols or abbreviations are numerous, are there tables or appendixes listing them? Yes 12. Is the size, quality and readability of each figure adequate to the type and quantity of data presented? No (see attached file) 13. Does the author give proper credit to previous and/or related work, and does he/she indicate clearly his/her own contribution? Yes 14. Are the number and quality of the references appropriate? Yes 15. Are the references accessible by fellow scientists? Yes 16. Is the overall presentation well structured, clear and easy to understand by a wide and general audience? No (see comment above) 17. Is the length of the paper adequate, too long or too short? It is adeguate 18. Is there any part of the paper (title, abstract, main text, formulae, symbols, figures and their captions, tables, list of references, appendixes) that needs to be clarified, reduced, added, combined, or eliminated? Yes (see attached file) 19. Is the technical language precise and understandable by fellow scientists? Yes 20. Is the English language of good quality, fluent, simple and easy to read and understand by a wide and diversified audience? I'm not an English mother tongue, but it seems that the paper should be checked by a native English speaker 21. Is the amount and quality of supplementary material (if any) appropriate? ——-

Please, see also comments in the attached file.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:
http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/1/C2006/2013/nhessd-1-C2006-2013-supplement.pdf

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 1, 5663, 2013.