



Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Revision of the geological context of the Port-au-Prince, Haiti, metropolitan area: implications for seismic microzonation” by M. Terrier et al.

CHF Flores (Referee)

cflores@usgs.gov

Received and published: 23 May 2014

General Comments: Overall, I think this is an important study for an area that has been scientifically neglected before the 2010 Haiti earthquake. The author is correct to note that further study is needed but we all have to start somewhere and keep the scientific discussion.

Specific Comments: I really don't have any arguments against the methods used and the tools brought together to formulate the final conclusions in this paper. I do find that maybe some of the figures could use more color, especially the maps to make the

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



visual conclusions come out better. I am not aware if there are added costs to adding color to figures in this particular publication. If there are none, then take advantage of color to contrast the different rock/soil types, symbols, etc.

Technical Corrections: The other reviewer has already noted on grammatical errors so I will not point those out again here. I do take issue with the use of "Porto-Rico" (section 2 paragraph 1). This island is a U.S. Territory and it is called "Puerto Rico". Similarly, double check the local geography to make sure all the place names are spelled correctly. In section 1, paragraph one, use a citation for the reported death, injury, etc. estimates as a result of the Haiti 2010 earthquake. This number changes depending on when it was estimated and this is just an important a citation as where you get your images, techniques and data. It's okay to cite a newspaper in a research journal for this, or use the UN estimates. Concerning the figures: On all the figures, include the source of the image or who took the photo in the figure caption. On Figures 2, 6, and 7, as I mentioned in the Specific Comments section, if you can add color and if it is not going to blow your budget, add color. As they are right now, the explanation with all the different patterns make it more work for the reader to really interpret the differences you are trying to show in the maps. If you wanted to keep Figure 3 in black and white (the Lithological units diagram) that's okay. On the photos, indicate clearly on at least one of the maps, where the photo was taken. In Figure 6, it's hard to see the inflection points because they are the same color as the rivers.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, 1613, 2014.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

