Natural Hazards
and Earth System
Sciences

Open Access

EGU

Discussions

Interactive comment on "Simple rules to minimize exposure to coseismic landslide hazard" *by* David G. Milledge et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 3 December 2018

General comments

Thank you for this interesting paper. Using six inventories of coseismic landslides, the authors test the significance of multiple topographical parameters to constrain a set of simple rules in order to minimise exposure to landslide hazard. The paper forms a significant added value to the landslide hazard scientific community as a first attempt in identifying simple rules which is essential for communication about complex hazards to a broad (lay) audience in creating awareness and minimizing landslide exposure.

I appreciate the authors' balanced conclusion on the most effective parameters for hazard reduction ["We conclude that decisions on how to reduce landslide hazard most effectively need to be made on a case by case basis, and are best made using hazard area, skyline angle, and the local slope in conjunction with each other."], unfortunately

this is not taken in the abstract and conclusion where the authors present without further nuances three simple rules. The discussion is focused on the authors' results with limited reflections with respect to related research (cf. introduction). I believe such a reflection would make the results more convincing.

Specific comments

- The first time I read through the paper I found the abstract and introduction confusing while the terms hazard, exposure, risk, hazard response, "anticipating"... are used without first clearly constraining them. Even though the audience from NHESS should be familiar with these terms I believe that these terms are still easily confused. I would therefore recommend to distinguish these terms in the introduction, or make reference to literature in which this is done.

- The paper is well structured and the figures of high quality presenting very clearly the results, yet I would suggest to shorten the paper to bring forward the main messages even more clearly. Sections that I would suggest to reduce are section 4 ("Earthquake inventories") by providing a summary of the used inventories with the most important parameters necessary for the analysis; and section 5 ("Methods") could also be reduced, moreover this would allow the reader to more easily follow the workflow.

- I wonder how easily the presented rules can be adopted without prior knowledge or skills, which seems to be the main purpose of the study yet lacking from the discussion. This is not easily answered and out of scope of the study to check the applicability of their rules by householders, local government, and NGOs, but I would recommend to be more cautious when claiming to present 'simple rules'.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:
https://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/nhess-2018-271/nhess-2018-271-RC2-supplement.pdf

2018-271, 2018.