



Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Brief Communication: Climate, topographical and meteorological investigation of the 16–17 June 2013 Kedarnath (India) disaster causes” by R. Singh et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 13 March 2015

This paper presents a study on the devastating natural disaster event of 17–18 June 2013 at Kedarnath (Uttarakhand, India). Other two articles on this event from India are by Dobhal et al. (2013) and Joseph et al., (2013). There is some additional information in this paper, but needs to be clearly separated from earlier two papers. Therefore, I am suggesting a major revision along the points:

• Introduction: The introduction is mainly about the site description and some part can go to the results. Most of the part of description to sites has already been given by Dobhal et al. (2013) and Joseph et al., (2013). Authors should give the brief introduction to the subject, then describe briefly what Dobhal et al. (2013) and

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Joseph et al., 2013) have done and what has not been done which is significant to investigate. This section is unnecessary very lengthy and should be written concisely.

â€¢ Data Source: The first para is actually the results should be moved to next section (Observations and Discussion). I suggest revising this heading to “Data Sources and Site Description” which will contain the second para of Data Source.

â€¢ Observations and Discussion: This is also an unnecessary lengthy section which mixes description of side, information from introduction and what is already given in given by Dobhal et al. (2013) and Joseph et al., 2013). In this section authors should mainly concentrate what aspects of this events were not explained/discussed by earlier work that your data is doing. There are many paras which should not be in this section-e.g. last three para: Kethannath town—River cutting”, should move to introduction/site description, next para (May and June—) is not necessary, next para (Continuous—), is not necessary or should go to introduction.

â€¢ Conclusion: Second para- what is new in this from Dobhal et al. (2013) and Joseph et al., 2013)? This may does not seem to be there.

â€¢ Figuer1. It just has very little new addition over Figure 5 of Dobhal et al. (2013) which does not add any significant new information. It should be removed.

â€¢ Figure 2. What is the aim of comparing the ground based and TRMM rainfall data. It is understood that there should be correlation between both with higher values by ground based observations. TRMM is already given in figure 2 in which ground based measurements could also be added. This figure is not needed.

â€¢ The grammar of the paper is very poor and need significant improvement.

â€¢ I suggest little change in the title of the paper” Climatic, Topographical and Meteorological Investigations of the 16–17 June 2013 Kedarnath (India) Natural Disaster Event.

â€¢ Summary. The paper needs significant reorganization and improvement before it could be considered for the publication.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/3/C205/2015/nhessd-3-C205-2015-supplement.pdf>

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 941, 2015.

NHESSD

3, C205–C207, 2015

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C207

