**Natural Hazards
and Earth System
Sciences**

Open Access

Discussions

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on "Comparison of event landslide inventories: the Pogliaschina catchment test case, Italy" *by* A. C. Mondini et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 11 February 2014

This paper describes a quite innovative approach for the preparation of landslide inventory maps triggered by a specific event. Methods and procedure adopted are well detailed. The paper, mainly for the relevance of the topic and the novelty of the approach, is interesting and should be recommended for publication, even if it requires minor revisions. The good level of written English is appreciated. Surprisingly, many lacks and/or mismatches are present in citations and reference paragraph. Benefits of the used methods are appropriately discussed while the analysis of costs is limited. In fact the time required for the preparation of the two inventories is described in the conclusions, while no description is available about the costs. For example, the purchase of satellite images is often a big issue that could motivate the selection of different methods. Some few consideration about it in the conclusions would be of interest.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

Other requested corrections and comments are listed hereafter in order of appearance in the manuscript.

Pg. 3 line 42. "Ercanoglu and Gokceoglu, 2004" is not present in references. Pg. 3 line 61. "Brardinoni et al., 2002" in references is "Brardinoni et al., 2003" Pg. 4 line 84. "Raggi, 1985" is not present in references. Pg. 4 line 91. "ISPRA, 2013," is not present in references. Pg. 5 line107/108. "Analysis of weather radar. . . . .in the catchment": this sentence should be supported by some references or, at least, a citation of a project /Institution that have carried out the analysis (maybe the author themselves). Pg6 line 139/141. The ancillary data/thematic maps listed (i.e. geologic map, land cover map, DEM and so on) should be characterized by the author and/or project and/or origin. Pg. 7 line 171/172. Some few words to detail the field surveys would be appreciated (how many, which dates, types of investigated landslides,. . .). Pg. 8 from line 210. The description of the image classification is limited. How many and what classes did you classified? I assume: water, forest, urban areas and landslides. It is not clear. A supervised classification map would help a lot, maybe together with the NDVI map. Pg. 17 line 505. "Roth. . . . . .." is not cited in the text. Pg. 17 line 511. "Wald. . . . . .." is not cited in the text.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, 1093, 2014.