



Interactive  
Comment

## ***Interactive comment on “A scoring test on probabilistic seismic hazard estimates in Italy” by D. Albarello et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 15 October 2014

#### General comments:

The paper is an important contribution to testing of seismic hazard assessment. The text is well structured and all relevant information is given. Some sentences can be difficult to understand and therefore are recommended to rephrase (see editorial comments below).

#### Editorial comments:

Page 5723, line 12: It is correctly stated that outcomes of different “approaches” may present strong differences among each other. Here “approaches” can be understood as PSHA procedures (deterministic or probabilistic or combinations of both). Probably it is meant “PSHA outputs”, influenced not only by the PSHA procedures itself but also

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



by the applied models their interpretations and the data used. This should be clarified.

Page 5722, line 3: “mandatory” might be replaced by “significant”

Page 5722, line 17: “time-by-time” might be replaced by “each time”

Page 5722, line 21: “Being in essence a forecasting of future ground shaking” could be changed for better understanding to “Basically it predicts future ground shaking”

Page 5723, line 19: “Being hazard estimates ultimately the combination of relevant uncertainties (and complementarily of lack of uncertainty about deterministic elements) ... “ is difficult to understand, please rephrase.

Page 5723, line 23: “on purpose determined” might be replaced by “applied”

Page 5727, line 5 and 19: “forecast” might be replaced by “prediction”

Page 5737, line 5: Point 5 of the conclusions is difficult to understand and should be rephrased.

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, 5721, 2014.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper