Natural Hazards
and Earth System
Sciences

Open Access

Discussions

Interactive comment on "Smartphone applications for communicating avalanche risk information – a review of existing practices" *by* M. K. M. Charrière and T. A. Bogaard

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 19 January 2016

The objective is clear and very beneficial for the community; however, the paper does not accomplish this objective.

The methodology is clear and appropriate however it does not coincide with the objectives of the manuscript.

The paper is not very clearly written. Could/must use a native speaker check.

The abstract is very superficial and unfortunately not very clear. The statement in line 6918/1 is not correct. Avalanches do not occur in ALL mountains. Many mountain regions worldwide do not even have snow in the winter!

The title is not appropriate due to the fact that it does not fulfill the expectations. Reading the title, I would expect a clear evaluation/definition/embedment of how smartphones communicate avalanche risk information. Furthermore, a structured, illustrated feature listing such as the functionality or pros and cons that are described in the article would be beneficial.

I would like to see more structured tables and illustrations in the article. Figure 1 on page 6945 must have an extensive description. Besides the fact that the avalanche level icons are in the wrong order. Theses icons are designed to follow an ordinal structure. If reviewing 6 apps then I would like to at least get a quick glance of the look and feel. Table 2 is not really readable and badly structured.

The references mentioned are very profound. I would however like to see also a stronger linkage to the European (EAWS) perspective. A stronger focus also to the Austrian, German, Spanish, Italian, French and Slovakian avalanche community could be helpful to understand the overall problem.

The contribution addresses a very interesting topic however does not fulfill the expectations. While reviewing the article I got the impression that the authors seem to be very enthusiastic about the topic however, they seem to stay very superficial without clarifying or clearly explaining the facts. An example of this is on line 6919/10- 18. Why is it interesting to consider wireless technology ... What does "by extension communication" or on line 6920/1 "avalanche damages reduction" mean? I also miss a clear concept and methodology in the article as well as a short introductory overview at the beginning of each chapter. This would help the reader understand the following content easier instead of starting a chapter with a sub section such as in chapters 3, 3.3, 4, 4.3, 5, 6. The integration of tables and illustrations embedded in the text would help to understand the facts and structure the text. If statements are used to explain a certain issue then they must be cited correctly and not in a crude form. See line 6924/5-6,8, 10 or 6925/1. The answer to the statement/question postulated on line 6932/5-8 is exactly what I would have expected. What is on line 6932/9 the existing communication

framework? Technical issues such as coverage, on/offline mode, extreme weather conditions and usability should also be addressed in more detail, because they more often resemble the key factors whether a smartphone is utilized at all for communication purposes. On line 6935/12 if other sources are mentioned they must be cited. A focus on maps and spatial referencing for communication should also be acknowledged. Lines 6037/1-2 and 6938/5-9 describe exactly what I would have expected from the article!

———————————————————

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 6917, 2015.