Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2017-421-RC2, 2018 © Author(s) 2018. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



NHESSD

Interactive comment

Interactive comment on "New Approaches to Seismic Microzonation Modelling of Ground Shaking Using Direct Characteristics of Influencing Criteria: Case Study of Bam City, Iran" by Reza Hassanzadeh et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 9 October 2018

Dear Editor, I just reviewed the paper entitled "New Approaches to Seismic Microzonation Modelling of Ground Shaking Using Direct Characteristics of Influencing Criteria: Case Study of Bam City, Iran". This paper deals with a new approach for seismic microzonation in urban areas. I think the paper could be accepted for publication only after a major revision. There are several points that need to be fixed. First of all, the paper need a strong revision of the English by an English mother tongue. Second critical point, authors shoud avoid to repeat the same concepts too many times just by using sligthly different sentences. Third, very important point. Authors

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



talk about seismic microzonation of ground shaking amplification. This concept is not clear to me. Do they mean "seismic site response"? This is a crucial point that needs to be clarified. In addition, in the discussion section, authors suddenly introduce the concept of "susceptibility amplification" (line 469). Susceptibility is different from seismic site response! Authors need to clear state these concepts in the entire paper. Fourth critical point, the method section is 12 pages long whereas the discussion and conclusion section is just 3 pages! This discrepancy is incredible! Methods section include too many repeats of the same concepts (e.g., authors said several time that they interviewed 10 experts!). In additiond, discussion and conclusion section needs to be more detailed. Fifth point, most of the figures are very hard to read. Quality of figures should be increased. Several other comments are listed in the attached file. Best.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

https://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/nhess-2017-421/nhess-2017-421-RC2-supplement.pdf

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2017-421, 2018.

NHESSD

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

