

Interactive comment on “A new web-based system to improve the monitoring of snow avalanche hazard in France” by E. Bourova et al.

B. Zweifel (Referee)

zweifel@slf.ch

Received and published: 20 February 2016

General comment

Dear authors, first of all I would like to congratulate you for this very concise article on a web-based system to improve avalanche monitoring in France. In my eyes, the article is very well written and clearly understandable for a large community in avalanche safety research. However, I have significant concerns if this article really belongs to a research journal since its topic is clearly in applied research. Nevertheless, I would encourage the editor of the journal to publish this highly relevant article for the avalanche community. Several other research institutions might face some similar problematics and a share of knowledge in this field might be very valuable.

Specific comments and technical corrections

C1

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



As I mentioned above, I find the article very well written and consequently I have only some minor comments: - Line 30: please use the correct term for the SLF institute which is: WSL Institute for Snow and Avalanche Research SLF - Line 32 to 34: I would recommend to use a more up-to-date publication of the DADB (I would suggest this publication: Techel, F., & Zweifel, B. (2013). Recreational avalanche accidents in Switzerland: Trends and patterns with an emphasis on burial, rescue methods and avalanche danger. In F. Naaim-Bouvet, Y. Durand & R. Lambert (Eds.), International Snow Science Workshop 2013, Proceedings (pp. 1106-1112). Grenoble, France: ANENA, IRSTEA, Météo-France.) By the way: DADB is there mentioned as ADB. However, I think, both is fine since there is no official English term for this database. - Line 76: Is there any specific reason to write Access with a capital letter? - Line 104, 129: I think, peer-reviewed is not the appropriate term for the procedure you mention. It is more of a cross check through another person. The process of peer-review is closely correlated to scientific writing though. - Line 125: I'm just wondering: 48 h is quite a lot since conditions can change very quickly especially in these storm periods when the significant avalanche happen. Is there any reason for taking that long time or would there be the chance to be quicker? - Line 136: the term i.e. seems to be in a different format? - Section 4: I have to honest that this is not at all my knowledge area. So, I would recommend the editor to have at least one reviewer for this article with a software developer background.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2015-343, 2016.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

