

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

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 28 October 2014

This paper addresses an important topic. I agree with the authors that hazard assessments are of societal importance and because they are the basis for building codes or other laws, they need to be properly tested. The authors clearly point out the difficulties of such tests and do their best to overcome these problems. This paper is an overall good shape and does not need much editing. I only see the need for a few minor changes:

1) The authors state in their completeness analysis that "missing maximum PGA should have occurred on less than 5% of stations, thus not affecting the results obtained." I am not convinced that 5% missing maximum PGA is not changing the results. I am not claiming they are but it would be better if the authors could show what number of missing maximum PGA would in fact change the result. Such an information would

C2349

certainly increase the trust into the results and show their robustness.

2) The authors correctly state that their evaluation requires mutually independent observations. However, it seems that they have used multiple earthquakes from larger sequences. Do they consider them independent. I suggest to only use the mainshock of each sequence to avoid scoring multiple times for essentially the same information.

Finally, I would welcome avoiding the term 'methodology' when in fact 'method' is meant: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Methodology> and <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/methodology>

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