

Interactive comment on “Review “On the relation between the seismic activity and the Hurst exponent of the geomagnetic field at the time of the 2000 Izu swarm”” by F. Masci and J. N. Thomas

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 21 May 2013

To review this paper, it was crucial to read a long collection of works mainly by Hayakawa and his group in addition to the all comments by Masci's group which appear in correspondence to the most of magnetic precursors claimed previously by the Japan group. Since I am the 3rd reviewer I would like to point out that the comments of Reviewer 1 has to be taking seriously into account since they will improve the paper and to create new and helpful science which is the main target all of us. We agree to the long stated principle that authenticity of earthquake precursors needs to be carefully checked. In addition we have to state in our comments the 10 years time distance between the original publication and the reply presented now is enough time to see

C226

old data with some new and creative views. In my opinion and it is a suggestion to the Editor to invite the authors of the Original work [Hayakawa et al.,] if they like to present their view in NHESS. In addition to the comments of Reviewer 1, which I have the opinion that they need a much more clear response from authors, I have the following comments: 1. I invite authors to clarify the possibility any preseismic anomaly to influence the Kp index. This will be helpful for the non familiar with geomagnetism and electromagnetic precursors reader. 2. In the introduction authors say "...field are just normal signals...". What's your definition of "normal" ? When you define it will be good to comment on the anomalous signals presented in other works. 3. In the discussion you note on the absence of any signal during the evolution of seismic swarm. In laboratory has been demonstrated that at least electric signals rapidly decreased in amplitude after repeated loading cycles. It is seems that similar behavior followed by the magnetic field too. 4. How the running average [which could be smooth any variation] alter the results?

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 1, 681, 2013.

C227