

Interactive comment on “The influence of expertise on rockfall failure probability assessment – an original experimentation” by A. Delonca et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 6 May 2016

This paper deals with the influence of the chosen method and of the level of expertise on the probability of rockfall failure. Although this is an interesting topic, I think that the approach followed at this paper is not very rigorous as concepts are not clear, there exist methodological gaps, and methods as well as results are not always coherent and not presented in a clear and concise way. A major point of review as far as it concerns the methodological concepts used in this work has to do with the definition of the probability of a rockfall. It is not clearly described in the paper whether this term refers to a spatial or temporal probability of occurrence. The interpretation of the probability as a term depends on the uncertainties that are taken into account for its definition. As a result, probabilities referring to different types of uncertainties cannot

C1

be compared, because they represent different values. This point is not clear in this paper and probability concepts are mixed. The quantification of these probabilities also misses explanation. An extensive state of the art on the topic of the calculation of rockfall probability is missing. I believe that before proceeding with some specific points, a general review of the methodological concepts should be made respectively. The methodologies and the results should be better explained and some of the conclusions at the discussion should be checked to make sure that they are coherent with the results. The English language would need a thorough review as well. Further comments (major and specific) can be found at the attached .pdf document.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/nhess-2015-318/nhess-2015-318-RC1-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2015-318, 2016.

C2