

Interactive comment on “Revised earthquake sources along Manila Trench for tsunami hazard assessment in the South China Sea” by Qiang Qiu et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 18 June 2019

The authors mentioned “Large variability in the results produced by these models underscores the fact that the seismogenic behaviors of the MSZ are still poorly understood”. Based on coupling models A and B of Hsu et al. (2016) in which the spatial distribution of slip rate and coupling rate are available, the authors used a return period 1000 years to calculate the slip deficit of great earthquakes. For zones 1 and zone 2 where the coupling ratios and slip rate are relatively better constrained than zone 3. Because the MSZ is poorly understood, the authors think the current status of the Manila subduction zone could be an analog of the Sumatran subduction zone before the 2004 Mw 9.2 Sumatra-Andaman event between Myanmar and Aceh where a paucity of earthquake > Mw 8 precede the 2004 event (Chlieh et al., 2008; Hsu et al.,

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



2012). Based on those assumptions, the scenarios were created. Due to paucity of observations in zone 3, no coupling ratios were resolved. Geologically this zone is much more complicated than zones 1 and 2 (Lin et al., 2009). It is, therefore, crucial but difficult to precisely quantify individual role of the OOSTs and megathrust in tsunami generation. We propose two end-member scenarios, considering different rupture modes in zone 3 with two steps. We first calculate the slip deficit from the slip deficient rate of models A and B between 19N to 20N. We then consider two end-member scenarios in the region from 20N to 21.7N. The first-member is the seismogenic events with rupture depths determined from a collection of GCMT solutions of the world megathrust earthquakes

This paper made a great contribution on the literature review of the MSZ system. The authors did provide more geological evident for understanding MSZ, but combined the references regarded geological characteristics of the subduction plate, the geometry, and coupling, and state of the subduction interface to propose a series of fault rupture scenarios. Each scenario reaches the earthquake magnitude from Mw 8.5+ to Mw 9+. Most of the cases not only reached but also beyond the upper limits of previous related studies.

Because no new geological evident for understanding the MSZ system, the authors shall carefully state background of creating the scenarios, and also emphasis those probably the upper limit case for the regional tsunami.

For a scenario with earthquake magnitude greater than 9 and with a return period at 1000 years, geological evident such as tsunami deposit and tsunami boulder shall not-so-hard to be found along the coasts of the flooding areas. The authors shall explain this issue.

In terms of the numerical model, they look OK to me. Great job.

Some minor mistakes: Line 822 Figure 1. The “1781/Tainan” shall be “1782/Tainan”, or “1781/ Kaohsiung-Pingtung”

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

Line 134: COMCOT solves shallow water equation which is a hydrostatic model.

Table S1 is missing. No detail can be found the scenario parameters.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2019-116>, 2019.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

