

## ***Interactive comment on “Calibration of FARSITE fire area simulator in Iranian northern forests” by R. Jahdi et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #3**

Received and published: 29 October 2014

In general, the manuscript is a valuable contribution to the fire modelling knowledge in a country like Iran where studies on this topic are still very limited. However, in terms of methodology I note the presence of a critical issue that, in my opinion, justifies a minor revision since from it also depends the statistical evaluation of the simulator performance and then the final results. I refer to the criterion of combination of standard fuel model in order to simulate with FARSITE. I give an example for clarity: in YekeBermagh simulation V (which is also the best result for this site) the combination (GR4, SH1, SH2) exclude GS type models but in YekeBermagh vegetation type description (table 1 and 3) there are grass-shrublands affected by the fire. The question is: why they are excluded from YekeBermagh simulation V? And also, what is the reason why some combinations were not considered (for example for Toshi site GR6-FM5-FM6-

C2364

TU2?) Other minor comments: 1. Fig 1: the figure is not very useful if the location of the two areas is not identified more precisely 2. Fig. 5: if these are vegetation maps, the classes relating to fuel types categories (timber litter)should not be included 3. Par. 2.6: Table 5 is probably Table 4 4. Par. 2.7: Table 5 is probably Table 4 5. Par. 2.7: Table 6 doesn't exist 6. Table 3: There are some fuel models not mentioned in the text and not considered in the simulations (GR5, GR1, GR2, TL2, TL8). Why? 7. Table 4: in the Toshi simulation VI FM10 is reported twice 8. Table 4: in the Malekroud simulation V FM9 is reported twice 9. Table 4: in the Gharangi simulation VII FM10 is reported twice

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, 6201, 2014.