Interactive comment on "Probabilistic landslide susceptibility analysis in tropical mountainous terrain using the physically based r.slope.stability model" *by* Johnnatan Palacio Cordoba et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 18 October 2019

1. Does the paper address relevant scientific and/or technical questions within the scope of NHESS?

Yes

2. Does the paper present new data and/or novel concepts, ideas, tools, methods or results?

No, but the paper try to compare different landslide susceptibility models to improve landslide susceptibility maps computed for future need

3. Are these up to international standards?

Yes

4. Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and outlined clearly?

More or less. The scientific approach is well explain. Nevertheless, the authors have to improve the paper following the remarks and comments. Moreover, the validation/evaluation suffers from expert overview of the area. They must add a discussion about the validity of the new maps not only by statistics but with an expert vision. They have to put one paragraph about the way to use this map to help regulatory maps and report, as it is explain in the introduction.

5. Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and the conclusions?

Results are well explained but see the dot 5 to improve the paper

6. Does the author reach substantial conclusions?

They have to improve it and give some indications for the use of the new maps for future regulatory maps.

7. Is the description of the data used, the methods used, the experiments and calculations made, and the results obtained sufficiently complete and accurate to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? Yes

8. Does the title clearly and unambiguously reflect the contents of the paper?

yes

9. Does the abstract provide a concise, complete and unambiguous summary of the work done and the results obtained? 10. The abstract has to be corrected following the future corrections

11. Are the title and the abstract pertinent, and easy to understand to a wide and diversified audience?

They are pertinent for the landslide community

C2

12. Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations and units correctly defined and used? If the formulae, symbols or abbreviations are numerous, are there tables or appendixes listing them?

It is ok

13. Is the size, quality and readability of each figure adequate to the type and quantity of data presented?

It is well presented

14. Does the author give proper credit to previous and/or related work, and does he/she indicate clearly his/her own contribution?

Yes

15. Are the number and quality of the references appropriate?

Some references (key references and examples of the same type of study → landslide model for regulatory maps) has to be put in the text. They are given in the different comments

16. Are the references accessible by fellow scientists?

Yes

17. Is the overall presentation well structured, clear and easy to understand by a wide and general audience?

Yes

18. Is the length of the paper adequate, too long or too short?

The length is ok

19. Is there any part of the paper (title, abstract, main text, formulae, symbols, figures and their captions, tables, list of references, appendixes) that needs to be clarified,

reduced, added, combined, or eliminated?

No, for me it is ok

20. Is the technical language precise and understandable by fellow scientists?

Yes

21. Is the English language of good quality, fluent, simple and easy to read and understand by a wide and diversified audience?

Yes

22. Is the amount and quality of supplementary material (if any) appropriate?

No comments

Please also note the supplement to this comment:
https://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/nhess-2019-223/nhess-2019-223-RC2-supplement.pdf

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2019-223, 2019.