



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

Anonymous Referee #6

Received and published: 15 June 2014

I have checked the "major revision" box, but I am uncertain of what, actually, the appropriate recommendation should be. The manuscript is what I would call a "report", something that I might normally see in website summaries of earthquakes (such as those put out by the USGS). The manuscript is not what I would call a scientific "investigation". Whether or not NHESS wants to publish reports might be discussed by the editor with the executive editor. Reports deserve to be published, yes, but where, I don't know.

If the manuscript is accepted, then I would recommend quite a bit more work on the citation bibliography. A substantial augmentation, stitching different sources, including reports from the popular press and previously published journal articles would, I think, take this a long way towards acceptability. So, for example, the authors discuss previ-

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



ous earthquakes (like the 8 Feb 1990 earthquake), but their magnitudes, their effects are not documented in cited sources. It would be useful, I think, if the authors, who are based in the Philippines, cited local sources detailing number of casualties, building damage, etc. This might include "reports" by local government offices and, even, newspaper reports. I acknowledge that this would be slightly unconventional, but I'm trying to think of ways that the authors could bring something new and unique to their report, information that the rest of us (outside of the Philippines) cannot easily access. In this way, the authors would, then, be providing a service to the global earthquake science community. It is certainly worthwhile documenting the effects of earthquakes on economically developing countries, but that documentation needs to be kind of detailed and backed up with bibliographic information. Mind you, this takes work, so it would not be acceptable to simply toss in a few citations here and there. We need to see something comprehensive.

I wonder whether or not the authors should actually be saying, as they do on page 2109, that the Bohol fault will now be quiet after the 2013 earthquake. Such statements made by authorities can be a problem if they are made on the basis of skimpy amounts of information and simple qualitative inference. What if there was, actually, another earthquake on this fault? The authors would not want to be responsible for implying that there was little to worry about. The wording, in this section, certainly needs to be fixed.

Anyway, I hope that helps.

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

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

