

Interactive comment on “Landscape analysis for multi-hazard prevention in Orco and Soana valleys, North-Western Italy” by L. Turconi et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 24 April 2015

This paper presents a multi-hazard research for the Orco and Soana valleys which seems to have informed the civil protection plan for the area.

While it seems to me that this work is very interesting I am currently unable to provide feedback on the methodology and the results used since too little information is provided and the given information is not following a clear structure. In order to move the reviewing process one step further I would suggest an in-depth revision with focus on the following points:

- Objective: Please provide relatively in the beginning of the paper a clear statement of the full objective of the study you are presenting and focus the rest of the paper on explaining what you did to reach the target and what the results were. Currently

C502

I am not sure if you primarily want to present in this article what analysis you carried out/results you obtained or if you also aim at integrating how the results informed the civil protection plan. Please decide and adjust the content accordingly

- Abstract: The abstract should provide a summary of every section of your paper – it should include 1-2 sentences of intro including the objective: introduce the study area in a sentence; very briefly describe your methodology; summarize your results and discussion in 1-2 sentences and close with 1-2 sentences of conclusion

- Organization: Each type of information has its place and in order to not confuse the reader it is crucial to not mix. E.g. the description of the study area, introduction to the hazards and past events should be in the introduction and the description of the study area. However, there is also information on the study area in the methodology on page 2228 – lines 24 and following on forest management, and in the results section on page 2233 you refer to pictures of torrential hazards (Fig. 9), and in the conclusion section you provide general background on the number of lives lost due to each hazard. Another example is the methodology: In the methodology section far too little information is provided what analyses you actually carried out and in the results section which is split hazard by hazard (this would also be a good approach for the methodology section – this way you could present the methods used for each hazard analysis) you provide more information on your analysis approaches than in the methodology section.

- Detail provided: Please provide much more detail on the methodology and results

- Please have the paper corrected by a native-speaker

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/3/C502/2015/nhessd-3-C502-2015-supplement.pdf>