Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.,
doi:10.5194/nhess-2017-71-RC2, 2017

Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences
Discussions
Open Access
EGU

Interactive comment on "Prediction of the area affected by earthquake-induced landsliding based on seismological parameters" *by* Odin Marc et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 13 March 2017

The authors did a good job of responding to most of the review comments, but one issue remains a challenge. The authors ascribe a very different definition of "critical acceleration" than has been used historically in the literature. Obviously, they are free to introduce and use any physically reasonable parameters they deem suitable for their analysis. But the term "critical acceleration" and its accompanying notation (a_c) has been in broad usage in the seismic-landslide literature for more than 30 years. This term has a rigorous technical definition that is quite different than the one used by the authors. Adopting a term with a long historical usage and definition and then using it in a completely different context and with a different technical definition is bound to cause a great deal of confusion to knowledgeable readers familiar with the historical usage of the term. And these readers might well draw incorrect conclusions from the paper if they are not familiar with the different definition being used by the authors.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

I recommend using a different term for what they are describing in order to minimize the potential for misunderstanding. If that is not possible, at a minimum the authors must clearly define “critical acceleration” on first usage and describe how it differs from the historical usage of the term.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2017-71, 2017.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper