

Interactive comment on “Italian Tsunami Effects Database (ITED): the first database of tsunami effects observed along the Italian coasts” by Alessandra Maramai et al.

Anonymous Referee #5

Received and published: 3 September 2019

The paper describes a new database of tsunami effects observed in Italy, which is accessible through a web application. The database will be useful for future tsunami hazard evaluations, and the paper is thus of interest to the wider tsunami and natural hazards communities, also outside Italy.

I recommend publishing the paper, but before publication I recommend the following revisions:

- I would have liked to see a more clear description of the possibilities this dataset opens for the scientific community. What can we do with this dataset that we could not do before?

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



- Except for a small comment on the tsunami history at Stromboli, there is no discussion of the level of completeness of the dataset. This is of huge importance when using the data for tsunami hazard assessment, and should be addressed.
- I recommend restructuring the paper with separate sections focusing on “methods” and “results”. This would make it easier for the reader to see what has been done to collect the data, and it would prevent a lot of repetition, which is in the current version.
- At the same time, I would have liked to see more detailed descriptions of the strategies for data collection and interpretation, and of the changes made to the EMTC. Ideally, changes made to EMTC could be included in an online supplement, which would make it easier for users of the previous version to correct their work.
- In my view, the description of the database and the web application could be shortened somewhat, and 1-2 of the example plots could be left out. I would expect any reader to go directly to the database to have a look at the functionalities, so figure examples do not need to be included for all functionalities.
- Figure 1: The meanings of the different reliability levels (or criteria for assessment) should be provided.
- Figure 2: The color scale is not logical, I recommend “shifting” the colors such that $l=6$ is red instead of green.
- It would be useful to include a short description of the intensity scales used.
- The manuscript contains many small grammatical errors and wrong wording, which should be fixed. For example, on page 1, line 14, I assume “interested” should rather be “affected”? Page 7, line 27: public awareness will not reduce tsunami hazard, but may contribute to reducing tsunami risk.
- At several places, the authors state that the database focuses on propagation effects rather than the tsunami source. In my understanding, “propagation” relates to the propagation of the tsunami in the deep sea, whereas the effect on the coast is better

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



covered by the term “inundation”.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2019-241>, 2019.

NHESSD

Interactive
comment

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

