

Interactive comment on “Evaluating Simplified Methods for Liquefaction Assessment for Loss Estimation” by Indranil Kongar et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 30 October 2016

This is a review of "Evaluating Simplified Methods for Liquefaction Assessment for Loss Estimation"

This paper is overall well written, interesting, and needing only minor revisions.

My comments, in no order of importance are as follows:

(a) Abstract. Please put more quantitative description of data/results into the abstract, not just qualitative.

(b) Section 1. Although there is a good 'motivation' and letting the reader know how the paper is organized in the last paragraph, can you refer to what the paper is about early on? Perhaps in or at the end of the paragraph a sentence that says "Here we investigate".

C1

(c) Prediction. Please evaluate throughout the use of the word prediction (time, place, magnitude) if that is meant, or probabilistic forecasting. If prediction really is meant, then make this clear why, and to what degree.

(d) Testing. I am not a fan of the use of the word 'testing' in the natural hazard community. See the following paper for why: http://www.nssl.noaa.gov/users/brooks/public_html/feda/papers/Oreskes1.pdf

(e) Where possible, avoid acronyms in Figure captions/Table headers (or spell them out the first time) to make the paper a tad less 'jargon' rich. Figures and tables should be as stand-alone as possible so if someone uses them (without the paper) one can tell from the figure caption/table header what it is about. Particularly important for this is your figure comparing all the methods—you need to then state what all the acronyms mean.

(f) Would it be possible to provide an overview table of all the acronyms, and what data is being put into each one? This would be a nice 'tutorial' table that is more likely to be cited by people.

(g) Sensitivity of models to data input. It would be very nice to see more on how much the outputs (what you call prediction) are sensitive to slight changes in the inputs. Again, a comparison between different types of liquefaction models would be very useful.

Overall, enjoyed the paper, but think about how to make it accessible and more comparative/tutorial in nature where possible.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2016-281, 2016.

C2