

Interactive comment on “The slope seismic response monitoring of Wenchuan aftershocks in Qingchuan” by Y. H. Luo et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 17 June 2014

Dear editor, please, find below my comments :

Rems: General: The content of the manuscript fits for a scientific journal paper but I recommend a full English review of the paper. Many sentences should be rewritten to be clear. Therefore, only some corrections were made in the abstract. Further, just as the review missed the core problem : the origin of topographic amplification, the paper also missed to handle this core problem.

1 Introduction: Always use ‘Arias Intensity’ or ‘Arias intensity’ but not ‘arias intensity’
The introduction is not really introducing the core question of the paper : the origin of topographic amplification. Also, mostly old references are used for the very small review of the problem.

C1106

2 Study Area There is obviously a problem with Q9 NS records.

3 PGA amplification effect The lower amplification at Q6 (compare to Q4) is likely to be due to the concave profile curvature – it is not related to its height. The analysis in the frequency domain is not comprehensive. Not only the height but also the width of a mountain influences the amplified frequency range. Interest of Fig 8?

4-5 no comments 6. Discussion : rewrite. 7 Conclusions : The conclusions are weak and mainly valid for this specific site while they could not be easily generalized. One major issue was missed : the changing S-wave velocity over depth and along the topography.

8 References The short list of references reflects the missing depth of the analysis.

Corrs: Abstract: First sentence of abstract unclear : rewrite. (...‘rock slope inside seismic response.’ ???) ..had been analysed (not ‘analysis’) ... of amplification effects (drop ‘presence’) ..shows that the curves (+ ‘that’) ...

...no further corrections – English review needed.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, 4135, 2014.

C1107