



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

A. M. F. Lagmay and R. Eco

mlagmay@noah.dost.gov.ph

Received and published: 14 August 2014

Comments can easily be addressed:

1) On p. 2 it is stated that the earthquake, initially pegged as MW = 7.2, was later revised to MW = 7.1, however throughout the paper the authors refer to MW = 7.2. What is the correct value? Answer: this was a difference between the USGS and Phivolcs values but can be addressed with an added reference to Phivolcs. Phivolcs was used throughout for consistency.

2) On p. 3, l. 10 it is written that 2779 aftershocks were recorded, 75 of which were felt. What is the magnitude/depth threshold that makes the difference between a perceived and a not perceived earthquake? Or on what other basis is the earthquake described

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



as felt (when it is perceived by 1 man at least?) answer: Felt means that shaking was experienced by people and reported to government agencies. The number of aftershocks has been corrected.

3) On p. 4, l. 14, the number of aftershocks is 3198, 94 of which were felt. Are we talking about the same events of item 2)? Were the aftershocks 2779 or 3198? answer: This was a revision update after the quick review before publication to NHESSD. The 3198 , 94 of which were felt was the updated version. This is already corrected in the latest version of the manuscript.

4) Section 3: past earthquakes. Apparently this section has little to do with the rest of the paper (included the title) and does not seem to be relevant. answer: I disagree. It is definitely relevant.

5) Section 4. Tectonic framework: maybe this section ought to be the in, rather than the last one. answer: This was also the comment of the 2nd reviewer and we will rearrange accordingly. Thank you.

6) Conclusions: quite incredibly the authors seem to support the time-predictable model (panel b below, from Shimazaki and Nakata, 1980) for earthquake occurrence which was abandoned long time ago (as well as the characteristic, slip-predictable and many other models). The fact that an earthquake releases some stress does not imply that the same fault is safe for a long time: this was an old conceptual model, abandoned for the simple reason that it does not work. Stating that that fault is safe for a long time might create wrong expectancies in the readers. The fact is that we do not have any working predictive model for earthquakes, therefore sentences like “will be quiet and will not pose imminent danger” should definitely be avoided. answer: We did state "in most probability". But, we avoided that statement and scrapped it totally. We have also improved the conclusions section.

7) In conclusion, I think that the contents of this brief communication are too poor for a scientific journal and – at the present state – they are also confusing and questionable.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



I cannot recommend this paper for publication answer: The statement that it is too poor is highly dismissive, disregarding the fact the 2 weeks after the Bohol earthquake event, there was little that was known about the earthquake and the consequences to future hazards in the area, including landslides and sinkholes was important to address.

Questionable? We do not find anything in the reviewer's enumerated comments that is really questionable or that can't be easily addressed. We follow the editor's decision which is based on the response of the other reviewers.

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

NHESSD

2, C1826–C1828, 2014

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C1828

