

Interactive comment on “Assessment of avalanche hazard situation in Turkey during years 2010s” by Tayfun Kurt

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 2 October 2018

Dear Author, I have read your response to my comments. Normally it is expecting from an author to address point by point to the comments raised by the reviewer(s). Unfortunately, in your case you prefer to insult reviewer instead of trying to improve the quality of your manuscript. As you know very well that the peer review process for a journal publication is essential, and works as a quality control mechanism. At the same time it is a process by which experts evaluate scholarly works based on their expertise and its aim is to ensure a high quality of published science. Please keep in mind that, as reviewers we don't decide to accept or reject papers but we recommend a decision. Final decision only belongs to the journal editors. After this short informative introduction I would like to emphasize that peer review process is a perfect chance for an author to improve the quality of his/her paper. As an author many times my papers rejected. After

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Interactive
comment

revising based on reviewers' comments and editor's decision I submitted to another journal and find opportunity to publish it. In your case, in my opinion your paper not mature enough to go to publication. You avoid to response my comments point by point. There are many wrong information in your paper which I already addressed some of them in my previous report. I listed two more examples below: 1. Abstract (page 1, line 11): "....., an avalanche occurred in Torul, Köstere, in the province of Giresun,". Torul is a town and district of Gümüşhane province not Giresun province. The distance between Gümüşhane and Giresun is about 170 km. Interestingly you gave this information only at abstract section. We couldn't see details at the main manuscript body. 2. Page 5 Table 1: Translation of the names of the two departments completely wrong. One of them is "Departments of Art Structures" and the other is "Art of Project Management Structures Branch". I guess the reason of mistranslation is the word of "Sanat" in Turkish means in English "Art" and "YapÄşlarÄs" is mean "structures". This is true but for it is first meaning. If you use "Sanat YapÄşlarÄs" terms in context of engineering (and particular for civil engineering) the meaning is "Hydraulic structures" not "Art structures". Actually "Art structures" meaningless in English when you try to mean culverts, bridges and other hydraulic structures.

Finally, ones more, i) THERE IS contradiction between title and content, ii) Unfortunately, manuscript DOES not elaborated well and iii) I have TO suggest to reject it.

Sincerely yours.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2018-205>, 2018.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

