

Interactive comment on “Speeding up and boosting tsunami warning in Chile” by Mauricio Fuentes et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 6 March 2019

General comments: The paper discusses a rapid estimation of potential tsunami energy distribution along the coast (or at certain isobath) from any given earthquake parameters. As a typical forecasting algorithm, the main issue here is the tradeoff between the speed and accuracy. To obtain a timely warning, the proposed algorithm uses a rough source estimate from the W-phase inversion as well as a linear tsunami model. Despite the simplifications, the model produces a sufficient level of accuracy to facilitate the early warning system. Additionally, the proposed method is rigorously tested against historical tsunami events, which is another important factor of this paper that make it worthy of publication. In general, the paper is well-written (except for the discussion and conclusions section) and the main message to convey is easy to follow. However, I would recommend further clarifications in some parts, which can be found

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



in the following specific comments, before the paper can be accepted for publication.

Specific comments:

1. Page 1 Line 8. “Our results show that ... non-linear tsunami code.” The sentence can be misleading. I would suggest to revise it into “Our results show that, at a certain water depth, this linear method ...”.

2. Page 2 Line 1. “. . . are based on precomputed scenarios”. Adding a sentence here with reference to the previous related works would better justify the statement. Here are some papers that can be considered:

Reymond, D., Okal, E. A., Hébert, H., & Bourdet, M. (2012). Rapid forecast of tsunami wave heights from a database of pre-computed simulations, and application during the 2011 Tohoku tsunami in French Polynesia. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 39(11).

Gusman, A.R., Tanioka, Y., MacInnes, B.T. & Tsushima, H., 2014. A methodology for near-field tsunami inundation forecasting: Application to the 2011 Tohoku tsunami, *J. geophys. Res.: Solid Earth*, 119(11), 8186–8206.

Mulia, I. E., Gusman, A. R., & Satake, K., 2018. Alternative to non-linear model for simulating tsunami inundation in real-time. *Geophysical Journal International*, 214(3), 2002-2013.

3. Page 3 Equation 1. The first line of the equations is a linearized SWE, and the second line refers to the initial condition. What about the third line? Derivative of elevations with respect to time at $t = 0$?

4. Page 3 Line 19. The tsunami propagation is limited at 100 m isobath, while in the supporting information the simulated runups are compared with the actual runup observations. I am aware that the paper aims to estimate the possible runup distribution in general by disregarding the physic of nearshore processes due to the nature of the algorithm. However, such an inconsistent comparison needs to be clearly defined. For example, by including the 100 m water depth contour on the plots and additional sen-

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



tences in the figures caption explaining about the difference of runup locations between observation and model. Or, better yet, why don't use Green's Law as in the Raymond et al. (2012)?

5. Page 5 Table 1. The use of “lon” and “lat” is rather confusing without seeing the corresponding figures. I suggest to add a reference to the supporting information in the Table caption, though it has been mentioned somewhere in the text. Furthermore, mathematical formulation of the correlation coefficient can also be a good addition for the supporting information.

6. Page 6 Table 2. Please explain why the computational time of the elliptic slip distribution is longer than the FFM? From the figures in the supporting information I can see that the elliptic slip models have a smaller subfault size. If that is the case, information on the subfault size should be added in section 2.1 including the reasons for using finer resolution in the elliptic slip model. Also, tT in the caption is written tR on the table.

7. Page 6 Line 15. It is difficult to grasp the meaning of the last sentence. Please rewrite it.

8. Page 7. The flow of descriptions in the discussion and conclusions section is not very smooth. Improvements can be done by either rewriting the whole paragraphs or using bullet-points or numbers to indicate different topic of discussion.

9. For the Java case (Figure S7), it seems like the fault of the elliptic source is located seaward of the trench (in the outer rise region). If this is true, then the model needs to be revised, because the 2006 West Java event was a shallow interplate earthquake (a typical tsunami earthquake), which is better depicted in the FFM solution (Figure S8). Other than that, the Java Island map in the left panel is inaccurate. I believe this may be caused by a wrong color map scale used for plotting. Please also check the other locations.

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

2019-9, 2019.

NHESSD

[Interactive
comment](#)

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

