

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Predicting storm triggered debris flow events: application to the 2009 Ionian-Peloritan disaster (Sicily, Italy)” by M. Cama et al.

F. Guzzetti (Editor)

f.guzzetti@irpi.cnr.it

Received and published: 14 June 2015

Dear Mariaelena Cama and Edoardo Rotigliano,

two independent referees have now examined your work, and posted their open comments on line. Both referees have outlined issues and suggested improvements but, overall, their comments are positive.

This is in favor of the acceptance of your work.

However, one of the referee has noticed a close similarity of your paper to the paper by Von Ruette et al. published in Geomorphology, v. 133, p. 11-22, in 2011. Your

C974

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



paper uses the same methodology and a very similar approach to validate the landslide susceptibility model. Presentation of the results and the conclusions are also very similar in the two papers.

Although in principle I do not have problems with a paper that applies a methodology already presented in a different area, I agree with the referee that you should clarify what are the differences, if any, and what you have learned that was not known already from the work of Von Ruette et al. (2011).

In case your intention was to repeat the experiment performed by Von Ruette et al. (2011) in a different area and using different data, you should be explicit about this from the very beginning, and you should explain why you intended to do this, and what are the lessons learnt. It is also important that you outline the novelties in your work.

Your paper is for a special issue of NHESS that deals with landslide prediction and forecasting. A number of papers have been published (http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci.net/special_issue206.html) or are under discussion (http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/special_issue32.html) in this special issue. A few of them deal with susceptibility modeling, the main topic of your work. I encourage you to examine these papers, and consider differences and similarities with your work.

Overall, I conclude that your work has potential, and I have decided that it will reconsider it after a major revision.

In preparing the revised version of your work, please consider all the comments and suggestions made by the two referees, but particularly the ones concerning the similarity of your work with the previous work of Von Ruette et al. (2011), and the new lessons learnt.

When submitting the revised manuscript, be sure to submit a list of all the changes made and detailed responses to the comments of the referees.

I look forward to receiving the revised version of your work, which will be sent out for

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



review to the the same two referees.

Sincerely,

Fausto Guzzetti NHESS Executive Editor

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 1731, 2015.

NHESSD

3, C974–C976, 2015

Interactive
Comment

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)

