

## ***Interactive comment on “Quantitative comparison between two different methodologies to define rainfall thresholds for landslide forecasting” by D. Lagomarsino et al.***

**F. Guzzetti (Editor)**

f.guzzetti@irpi.cnr.it

Received and published: 19 April 2015

Dear Dr. Lagomarsino,

the discussion phase on your work entitled "Quantitative comparison between two different methodologies to define rainfall thresholds for landslide forecasting" is now closed.

Two independent referees have examined your work, and posted their comments on line. The referees agree in saying that your manuscript has problems that need to be addressed prior to its possible acceptance in NHESS.

C457

I have read the paper myself, and I share the comments of the two referees.

Your submission has problems with the English language, which in places is poor and difficult to read. This has not helped the work of the referees.

Quality of the submitted figures, and particularly the maps and the graphs is not sufficient. The maps need a proper geographical grid; the index (location) maps (figures 2 and 4) are too large compared to the maps containing the relevant information; the graphs and their legends need to be substantially improved.

I also agree with one of the referees that too much space in the paper is devoted to the Introduction, and that the paper lacks a proper discussion of the results obtained.

I encourage you to consider all these aspects, and the others raised by the two referees, in your responses.

Sincerely,

Fausto Guzzetti NHESS Executive Editor

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 891, 2015.