



Interactive  
Comment

***Interactive comment on* “Brief communication:  
Rapid mapping of event landslides: the  
3 December 2013 Montescaglioso landslide (Italy)”  
by A. Manconi et al.**

**B. D. Malamud (Editor)**

nh-malamud@kcl.ac.uk

Received and published: 18 April 2014

Dear Drs. Manconi et al.:

We have now received two reviews of your manuscript on rapid mapping of event landslides. Both referees are very positive about the significance of the science itself, with a number of line items of suggested corrections and comments, which I invite you to address (please also see below, before beginning) both in a revised manuscript and in a reply online.

Please note that referee 1 has questioned a couple of major items to do with the writing:

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



(a)The depth of the literature review (b)More depth in methodology (c)More depth in geologic interpretation

I believe the reviewer did not realize that this was a 'brief communication' ([http://www.natural-hazards-and-earth-system-sciences.net/submission/manuscript\\_types.html](http://www.natural-hazards-and-earth-system-sciences.net/submission/manuscript_types.html)) and as such has a limit of 2–4 journal pages, three figures and/or tables, and a maximum of 20 references. I will highlight this if it again undergoes review, in my comments to the reviewer(s).

Currently you have 17 references, and should you decide to go over 20, e.g. up to 25 (or even 30) this will be fine. However, an in-depth literature review would be inappropriate for a brief communications, but it is fine to mention in passing something such as (please write as you feel best): "Alternative techniques such as \*\*\* (references), \*\*\*\* (references), and \*\*\*\*\* (references) exist."

In terms of methodology, it is important that the methodology is clear what is done, and if this is 'detailed' and long, you are welcome to add supplementary information. Although it does not need to be lengthy, it would be good if the reviewers agree that it is clear what has been done, and if you feel it already is, please state this in your reply.

For the geologic interpretation, I leave this to you to reply as to the appropriateness of doing this within a brief communications, and how to do this. Should you go slightly over the 2-4 pages, this is fine, but do try to keep within the spirit of brief communications. Should you decide to change the manuscript 'type' please let me know.

I therefore invite you to reply to the authors online, and also to upload a revised manuscript, including a detailed track changes documents of what has changed since the last version.

Regards, Bruce D. Malamud [NHESD Executive Editor]

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, 1465, 2014.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

