

Interactive comment on “Airborne geophysical mapping as an innovative methodology for landslide investigation: evaluation of results from the Gschlifgraben landslide, Austria” by R. Supper et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 12 August 2013

Dear authors,

Your manuscript entitled “Airborne Geophysical Mapping as an Innovative Methodology for Landslide Investigation: Evaluation of Results from the Gschlifgraben Landslide, Austria” deals with an interesting application of the airborne geophysical for landslide investigation. This technique has been applied to Gschlifgraben Landslide and surrounding areas.

I consider it worth of publishing in NHES journal with minor revisions since the

C812

manuscript is properly structured, the language is quite fluent, the geophysical techniques are well described and the pros and cons of the technique are sufficiently highlighted. My major concerns are related to the figures, which in some cases are not readable and clear enough. Here below my specific comments:

In section 4.1.1 and following ones please provide a description of the geological abbreviations. It's quite difficult for reader to follow the description of the results without knowing what is RFZ, NCA and son on.

Figure 3: I suggest you to make a bigger figure as a two columns one.

Figures 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14: The numbers inside the figure are too small.

Figure 5: The flight lines are not very visible, I suggest you to make a black and white figure with only coloured flight lines.

pp2282, l. 4: applicability instead of usability

pp2282, l. 21: ground-based

pp2288, l.15: investigated instead of investigation

I hope that these few comments can help to improve the quality of the manuscript, Kind Regards

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 1, 2281, 2013.