

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Assessing the performance of regional landslide early warning models: the EDuMaP method” by M. Calvello and L. Piciullo

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 18 November 2015

Review of “Assessing the performance of regional landslide early warning models: the EDuMaP method The manuscript presents an interesting and unique perspective to outline a methodology for addressing landslide early warning models. The authors make cogent arguments as to why an evaluation method such as the one proposed is needed and could improve the characterization of early warning model effectiveness; however, I suggest some changes to the text and structure before this paper should be published. I have outlined them below. There are also a large number of

Overall, there are many places in the text where the wording is awkward and therefore it makes the arguments difficult to follow. I suggest having an expert and native English

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



speaker review for content and grammar to help with the flow of the paper. Right now, it seems a bit disjointed and difficult to follow, though the ideas are interesting and represent a contribution to the field.

General Comments: The authors' use of acronyms is a bit confusing or non-intuitive at times. They introduce a large number of acronyms that can be difficult to follow. Suggest creating acronyms only for the most important systems. Also, the four elements of the contingency table they cite is Correct Alerts (CA), Missed Alerts (MA). . . This is not consistent with the True Positive, False Positive, True Negative, and False Negative terminology that is typically used within the above cited studies. The use of the CA, MA, TN, etc. isn't incorrect, it would just make more sense if the authors were more consistent with previous work or provided a justification for why this naming makes more sense.

Specific Comments: Lines 2-5 on page 6023: This statement isn't true, LEWSs provide information for others to make actionable decisions about how to respond and evacuate/remove people. The LEWSs themselves do not do this. Please correct Lines 22-30 on 6023: These sentences are awkward, especially the listing of all the questions. Suggest revising. The authors should be consistent with the citations, URLs are given in some cases and some acronyms (defined elsewhere (i.e. ICG (2012) should be spelled out. Figure 8: Add legend for susceptibility map Figures 9-11: if someone is looking at the figure without reading directly from the text, the captions for the figures would be confusing. Consider explaining what ZS-T1 and G-T1 are for example, at least to give context for what the reader is seeing.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 6021, 2015.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper