Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, C780–C781, 2015
www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/3/C780/2015/

Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences
Discussions

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

D. Lagomarsino et al.

samuele.segoni@unifi.it

Received and published: 24 May 2015

We thank Referee#2 for the insightful comments, which will surely improve the quality of the manuscript. Hereafter we answer point-by-point to his concerns.

Referee 2: The analysis of the comparison results is not good enough. In the conclusions, authors pointed out that the difference may arise from the landslide typology, however, the authors did not show any proof about this. They should show something which convince readers with certain logic.

Answer: Referee #1 and Editor had similar concerns and defined the manuscript "un-

balanced". We agree and, in the revised version, we will improve sections 3, 4, 5 and 6. Editor and referees provided several inputs that will be addressed to improve these sections. In particular, we will provide a better description of the datasets and a more in-depth analysis and discussion of the results. In addition, to improve the discussion, we will try to put in relation the quality of the results to the quantity and quality of data available in the two test sites.

-

R2: In some parts, I felt difficulty in understanding English expression. Re-checking by native speaker is recommended.

Answer: we will surely ask the help of a native speaker to improve the quality of English.

-

R2: As for presentation, a figure explaining the concepts of each parameter such as likelihood ratio and efficiency, is desirable.

Answer: we initially thought that providing references to previous works was enough. However, as suggested, to improve the readability of the manuscript we will improve the explanation in the text and we will provide a table explaining all parameters used in the validation.

-

R2: Generally, a bit longer caption is useful for readers.

Answer: we will revise all captions, providing more details.

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