

Interactive comment on “Landsliding near Enguri dam (Caucasus, Georgia) and possible seismotectonic effects” by Alessandro Tibaldi et al.

Alessandro Tibaldi et al.

alessandro.tibaldi@unimib.it

Received and published: 13 November 2018

Reply to reviewer 2

Thank you for all the very useful suggestions of reviewer 2 that have been accepted. Here below I give detailed reply point by point, with reference to the annotated pdf prepared by the reviewer:

Line 37 page 2 we deleted this phrase as suggested.

Line 50-52 page 2 as suggested, we rephrased the unclear sentence. Now it is: <Nearby the Enguri reservoir, there is also the main road leading to the famous town

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



of Mestia, hosting several ancient monuments and a sky resort.>

Line 59 page 2 the suggested paper by Sajinkumar K.S. et al has been inserted.

Line 59 page 2 Correction made.

Figures 1, 2 and 3. In the new version, we homogenise the maps following the same styles in displaying the scale, direction and coordinates.

Line 16 page 5 We totally agree, and thus we wrote now: <Cretaceous strata crop out around the Enguri dam where they strike around E-W and dip mostly at 60-70° towards S.

Line 60 page 8 corrected.

Line 61 page 8 Changed as: (Figs. 5B and 5C).

Line 61 page 8 We now mentioned (Fig. 5A) at Line 59, followed by mentioning Figs. 5B and 5C at Line 61, and then Fig. 5D at Line 67 and finally Fig- 5E at Line 72, resulting in the correct order.

Line 63 page 8 We now deleted the word “fastest”.

Figure 5. We now labelled the various parts of Figure 5 in clockwise order. We also added a line in previous Figure 5D to highlight the fissure.

Figure 7 As suggested we deleted now the spots in the two logs.

Line 17 page 11 Sorry, it was a mistake: now we correct the previous citation “Figs. 8A and 9” as “Figs. 8 and 9”.

Figure 8F We really do not understand why the reviewer says that this photo is not convincing: it clearly shows a left-lateral offset of the water channel, so we retain this photo as suggested by the reviewer himself.

Figure 9 We now corrected this figure by adding two lines that connect the photo above with the sketch below, as suggested.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Table 2 We corrected now the form of the decimal (e.g. from 566,6 to 566.6 etc).

Figure 14 corrected as “Jurassic”

Line 45 page 24 Thanks for this useful observation. We changed the original phrase from this: <Moreover, at the foot of the present onshore slope, there are gypsum deposits extremely deformed, which should result from a long history of movements.> into the following new phrase: < Moreover, at the foot of the present onshore slope, there are gypsum deposits extremely deformed; this might result from a long history of tectonic movements, from localized landslide movements, or from a combination of both. Whatever the origin, the presence of gypsum deposits favours slope instability.>

Line 34 page 26 We agree to emphasize the role of uplift in river incision, and thus we changed the phrase as follows: <The above mentioned valleys have been deeply incised by river activity, consistently with the recent mountain uplift of the region. Thus, the formation of the two river valleys and the consequent development of the mountain ridge that gave rise to the two landslides, may also be linked with tectonic uplift.>

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2018-186>, 2018.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)