**Natural Hazards
and Earth System
Sciences**

Open Access

Discussions

Interactive comment on "Brief communication "The magnitude 7.2 Bohol earthquake, Philippines"" *by* A. M. F. Lagmay and R. Eco

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 4 June 2014

I have found very interesting and relevance the Brief communication entitled "The Magnitude 7.2 Bohol Earthquake, Philippines" and I suggest its publication after improvements of few points and a general revision to fix small inaccuracies into the text.

Here the main points to fix:

1) The organization of the paper appears unusual, first the data (seismological and field data), then the previous earthquakes and, last, the geodynamic setting. Is it possible to change and to anticipate geodynamic setting and past earthquakes? For me it is more logical.

2) Introduction: the authors are using only the USGS data for magnitude and location (page 2104, lines 15-20), but there are also local data, from the Philippine Institute

of Volcanology and Seismology, data cited later in the text. Why do not you add also those data here?

3) Tectonic framework of the Philippines: interesting paragraph, but without any relation with the described earthquake; please, add some sentences to explain how the studied earthquake is set in the geodynamic framework

4) Conclusion: I suggest to strength it, avoiding the atomic bombs, and suggesting a mapping project of capable faults and a study of the recurrence time related to the strongest earthquakes. Some sentences are useless, as lines 1-3 (page 2109) and lines 4-8.

5) Figure 1: not so clear, most elements described in the caption are not visible, as the largest circle of M 7.2, and the lineaments. In addition, please, locate fig. 1a in the 1b. Finally, 1b should be located in fig. 5

6) Figure 5: please improve the readability of this figure. Too many information and letters

The specific comments follow:

1) page 2104, line 2: 12 km

2) line 6: US$ 52.06

3) line 21: PEIS, please, add a reference

4) page 2105, line 7, please use a rough estimation, as 2.257 million Philippines Pesos

5) line 17: can you add also any field data to support the fault kinematics

6) lines 18-21: repeated, please rephrase

7) line 25: earthquake, . . .

8) page 2106, lines 4-5: . . . there were recorded several aftershocks

9) line 6 and following: please, change "wall" with "scarp" (also in the caption of fig. 4, p. 2114)

10) lines 3-9: there are no witnesses or observers that can describe when the scarp has been formed?

11) Lines 13-14. This sentence is a repetition of lines 10-11 of page 2105, but with different data and numbers. Please, uniform and avoid the repetition

12) Lines 19-20, lineaments found

13) Lines 23-24: matter is normally . . .

14) Line 25: . . . is located where . . .

15) Line 26: the fault, as the Inabanga Fault

16) Lines 27-29: can you add the geographic coordinate of the archetypal fault location?

17) Page 2107, line 1: M 6.8

18) Lines 1-2: please locate them in fig. 1

19) Page 2108, line 18: mapped or unmapped?

I hope these comments may be useful to the authors

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, 2103, 2014.