

## ***Interactive comment on “Comment on “Non-inductive components of electromagnetic signals associated with L’Aquila earthquake sequences estimated by means of inter-station impulse response functions” by Di Lorenzo et al. (2011)” by F. Masci and G. De Luca***

**Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 16 March 2013

Review of Masci and De Luca (2013).

In this ‘comment’, Masci and De Luca (2013) discuss a paper published by Di Lorenzo et al. (2011) on electromagnetic signals associated with the L’Aquila earthquake sequence. In recent years, there has been a large number of ‘earthquake prediction’ papers submitted to the literature, and therefore I believe a paper such as this is important to discuss some of these earthquake ‘claims’ in proper perspective. I am therefore

C31

strongly in favour of a paper such as this one by Masci and De Luca to be published, as the points made are very good. I have made some suggestions below, mostly regarding flow of the text and organization.

My comments, not in order of importance, are given below.

(a) I suggest, as has the editor overseeing this ‘comment’, that this becomes a rapid communications or a paper.

(b) Please give it a suitable title, so that people in the community might find it. For example “Some comments on the potential seismogenic origin of magnetic disturbances and whether they can be used in the prediction of earthquakes” or “On recent claims linking magnetic disturbances to seismogenic origins”

(c) Please expand the abstract, bringing in specifics and not generalities of what has been done in the now paper. Instead of referring directly to Di Lorenzo et al. (2011) you can state something like using phrases such as “In this paper we provide comments about the potential seismogenic origin of magnetic disturbances.” And “We do this in the context of a recent study making such claims.”

(d) Introduction is a bit abrupt. Put in a beginning couple of sentences, explaining that this paper will explore claims of links between magnetic disturbances and seismogenic origins, a brief history of some of those who have claimed such links, and any papers which have ‘deconstructed’ such links, and then tell us how the paper will be organized. This is probably the only ‘major’ part to add to the paper, to give it appropriate context, and will make it a much more highly cited paper, putting things into context, and then stating you will investigate in depth one such particular claim.

(e) The comments are broadly fine (and some excellent points made), but they need more organization, a slightly clear structure, and slightly less ‘abrupt’ at the beginning. Use subheaders to help you if necessary, and I suggest you break it into two sections. Currently they read much more like a series of ideas, one after another, almost stream

C32

of conscious. There are very good points, but the organisation is important. Telling the reader before hand the several main points that will be made. Then making the points. Then recapping (with the conclusions).

(f) In the conclusions, I would suggest rewriting them slightly, so that you start off with "In this paper we have made three comments regarding the seismogenic origins of magnetic disturbances, particularly within the context of the 2009 l'Aquila earthquake and a study conducted two years after by Di Lorenzo et al. (2011). We have shown that \*\*\*\* and believe that \*\*\*\*\*. In summary, \*\*\*\*\*"

(g) Figure 1 is excellent, but in the figure caption make it clear where the information for the figure is obtained from.

(h) Figure 2. (i) Does one normally go Y then X then Z? My naivety here. (ii) The y-axis labels are too small to read, make them double the size. (iii) The 'text' sentence in the upper panel is in italic. I suggest you make it non-italic, as it will be clearer in the final figure. (iv) Hmm. If this is a reproduction of Di Lorenzo et al. (2011), you might not be able to do anything about the comments I've just made.

(i) Figures 3 and 4. Make the figure captions more self-standing, so that one does not have to go back to the text to figure out what data is being discussed, what CADO, AQU mean, etc. Other: Does "Up" in Fig. 3 mean "Vertical"? In the text you use vertical. Other: Fig. 4. Y-Axis, somewhat strange to have 2 and 0, but not " $1 \times 10^7$ ".

(j) I have made 39 grammar comments using track changes in the attached PDF.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/1/C31/2013/nhessd-1-C31-2013-supplement.pdf>

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 1, 193, 2013.