

Interactive comment on “Real-scale investigation of the kinematic response of a rockfall protection embankment” by S. Lambert et al.

T. Badger (Referee)

badgert@wsdot.wa.gov

Received and published: 19 February 2014

I have not performed such detailed field tests as the authors; my perspective is primarily of one who would recommend, design, and construct such a protection structure.

The paper thoroughly describes the investigative materials/components/methods and results of a well instrumented set of full-scale field tests. The paper is well organized and generally well written, though I've made a number of minor grammatical suggestions on the attachment that might improve readability. I found the study quite interesting and useful, and I felt that the authors made a very good effort summarizing and making relevant the contributions of previous studies by themselves and others. The results presented and discussed seemed clearly substantiated, leaving few questions

C72

or uncertainty about the study's methods and conclusions.

Regarding the English usage of "sandwich", I personally don't favor this terminology for the wall system. Perhaps "composite" wall or "cellular" wall might be better?

The one question I did have is in Section 3.3 comparing the results from their structure with tests of similar protection embankments, in particular the second paragraph. I think it is important and useful that the authors attempted make these comparisons, but I think the amount of discussion provided is insufficient to substantiate what is provided. Perhaps some additional graphics and more text would better convince the reader of these similarities.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/2/C72/2014/nhessd-2-C72-2014-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, 491, 2014.

C73