Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, C1741–C1743, 2014 www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/2/C1741/2014/

© Author(s) 2014. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribute 3.0 License.



Interactive comment on "Seismic vulnerability and risk assessment of Kolkata City, India" by S. K. Nath et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 30 July 2014

The authors are trying to bring out the Seismic Risk of Kokata City based on Geological, Geotechnical and Stractural analysis. The overall approach of the manuscript is good. However it need some minor revisions.

General Comments: All figures since bar scale used the text scale 1:25,000 can be removed.

Page No.2 Introduction - English correction needed. Page No. 3 Since its a international journal, its better to have a location of study area in the India map so that the readers can understand the seismic hazard of the study area.

Page no. 3. Line 18. The population details give as 11 and 14 million is has not match with the data given in 3.1 Demograpahy please check which is correct?

C1741

Page No.3. Line 8. The Kolkata citry is among the or One among the? Check Page No.3. Line 22 and 23. 80% of the city has buildings are high rised building? is there any proof or literarture in this regard? It has mentioned that congested business districts? how districts will form in cities?

It would be better to give area of the city so that its easily to calculate back the density of poulation.

Page No.6 Line 11/ It has mentioned Congalton et.al in the text however in the refrence only one author name is given which is correct?

Page No.8. Line 9. It has given ten major LULC unites in the text however in the figure 5, in the legend there were only 9 classes. Please check? Also the match the legend and text.

Page no.10. Line 25-28 on what basis the building categories are classified, Is there any reference on no of storey and building category?

Page 19. Conclusion. The objective of the manuscript is not rightly justified in the conclusion part. The authors are advised rewrite the conclusion part correlating with the objective part.

Page 19. Line 8.It has mentioned artificial non engineered filled up regions. Where is the evidence of lakefill/marshy land filled up area? match with the landuse land cover area.

Page 23. Table 1. 2011 population is 14.11 million but in the figure 4. its has mentioned in the legend >150000. how?

Page 41. Figure 8. In legend the building year range can be added.

PAge . 48. Figure 15. The Risk intervel calculation what is the engineering base behind the intervel. Explain?

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, 3015, 2014.