

Interactive comment on “Large submarine earthquakes occurred worldwide, 1 year period (June 2013 to June 2014), – contribution to the understanding of tsunamigenic potential” by R. Omira et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 28 March 2015

This paper is interesting. Of course 1-year interval is not good for representative statistics, meanwhile results are expectable and "reflect" the situation from more long time catalogue. Tsunami modelling plays here not major role. For instance, no link between tsunami height and earthquake magnitude was known early, shallow-focus earthquake generates tsunami was also known. But it is confirmed by new data., I support this MS for publication.

Minor indications: 1. p. 1870, Eq. 1: What does D mean? 2. p.1871, the last para-

C316

graph: Authors said that the portion of tsunamigenic events is 39%, but they present and discuss the results and comparisons of only single simulation for Mw 8.1 Chile event. Did you perform the simulations for other cases? To acquire reliability of numerical model, more comparisons are needed. Also, the results and comparisons of other simulations will improve the paper. 3. Figure 1: If possible, it is more understandable to affix the earthquake number shown in Table 1 to Figure 1. For example, 2014-05-24 Mw6.9 → 23. 2014-05-24 Mw6.9 4. Figure 2 – Figure 5: The texts in white, yellow and orange are not clear. 5. Figure 7: The texts are too small, and red and blue dots are not clear. Figure should be improved.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 1861, 2015.