



Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “A proposal for a new parametrization of historical intensity data providing a better handling of uncertainties” by M. Mucciarelli

M. Mucciarelli

marco.mucciarelli@unibas.it

Received and published: 28 July 2014

Reply to referee 1

Thanks for the advice about references to be added. In doing so, I will also clarify that while previous papers are focused on the uncertainty in assigning macroseismic intensity, my paper deals mainly on the consequences of this uncertainty in performing PSHA estimates. As for the math details, the suggest description is a better formalisation of what was actually done. I will also correct the text following the suggestions given as minor remarks.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Reply to referee 2

Thanks for the advice about references to be added

As for the five-values conversion table, this is just a suggestion considering typical verbal definition that can be easily found in description of macroseismic intensity. With some colleagues we are now exploring the effect of multiple expert elicitation, but it will take some time before the study is completed.

I agree on the observation about the difficulty of handling relative uncertainties for a ordinal, non-metric intensity. I will clarify that this is just a proxy given to compare this uncertainty with the much more studied uncertainty on GMPEs

I can re-do the calculations to see if there is any significant difference between the two simulation exchanging the data set.

In fig 6 there is a mistake in description and legend, what it is plotted is the variance

Comment by Ina Cecic

Thanks for highlighting the misprintS, I will correct them in the revised version.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, 3561, 2014.

NHESSD

2, C1719–C1720, 2014

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

