Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, C782–C783, 2015 www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/3/C782/2015/
© Author(s) 2015. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribute 3.0 License.



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

Editor: You 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.

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

-

C782

Editor: 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.

Answer: all figures will be subject to modifications. We will also revise some of the captions, in order to provide additional explanations.

-

Editor: 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.

Answer: we also agree that the manuscript is unbalanced towards introduction. In the revised version, we will improve sections 3, 4, 5 and 6, according to the inputs provided by the Editor and the Referees. In particular, we will provide a better description of the datasets and a more in-depth analysis of the results. In addition, we will improve the discussion and 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.

-

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

Answer: We will incorporate in the revision version of the manuscript all modifications suggested. We plan to make also other improvements, since we noticed some other weaknesses and a few errors that could be corrected with moderate efforts from our part.

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