

Interactive comment on “Post-event Field Survey of 28 September 2018 Sulawesi Earthquake and Tsunami” by Wahyu Widiyanto et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 28 May 2019

Overall This is an interesting paper that describes the results of field work after the 2018 Sulawesi tsunami. The paper follows the general pattern of field work papers, and is important that such events are properly documents, so that modellers can then attempt to reproduce them. However, the paper suffers from lower than expected writing quality. The English is ok in some places, and poor in others. Also, the authors often repeat themselves. The more serious problem, however, comes from its unclear focus. Most of the paper deals with the tsunami damage, but at times the authors randomly include other information relating to aftershocks or landslides that are not related to the tsunami. Thus, several parts of the paper should be deleted, and the message should become more focused. Instead, the authors might want to describe the mechanisms of tsunami damage in more detail at each location (currently they only

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



superficially describe some locations).

Major comments

-By now a number of other field work papers have been published. Please find these, and cite them. Also, please explain what differences there are between your work and other papers P3, L24. In what way did the authors do this? How can they choose one point that can be representative for a tsunami that was as complicated as the one in this case? The English in the paper needs to be improved. In places the sentences are correct, and in others they are pretty poor. P4 L4-5 what kind of camera was used? Did the authors obtain a 360 degree view? Otherwise, in what way is this similar? Is this going to be opened to other researchers? (if not, what is the point of writing this?) P4 L19 and onwards. What is the point of talking so much about the rain, if the authors then dismiss the importance of it? P5 L2. Where all these measurements corrected for tide? Using which software? Are the datasets given in this paper those corrected for tide, or the original measurements? Also P5 L7-9, the location of these tidal stations needs to be shown in some figure. See also P5 L22, which indicates both corrected and uncorrected, making it unclear what the other numbers in the paper actually are. P6 L16. What is the point of this section? You are talking about earthquake damage, but this paper up to now is mostly about tsunami damage. Hence, it feels rather odd. I suggest just focusing on the damage by the tsunami, and delete this section. P6 L24 If the bridge was shifted, it was damaged. Not sure what the authors are trying to say here. . . Also, how can the authors say the area is only 3.4m², given the description earlier? This part feels rather confusing. P7 L2. From which sites? What is the point the authors are trying to make here? P7 L4-10. What is the point of this talk of aftershocks? I suggest all this is deleted, and the authors focus just on the tsunami damage. Same for P8 L10-19 P8 L20-30 What is the point the authors are making here? The authors don't seem to conclude anything, and merely state conjecture. This might be ok if it was in the discussion section of the paper, but this is not it. P9 L1-5 What is the point in a scientific paper of stating that surveys are being carried out?

The authors should provide details or analysis, or let others do so. Reporting that something is happening is journalistic. P9 L19-22. There are already papers that are describing the location of landslides. Also, it is strange that the authors conclude this when they did not talk about this at length in their own paper (they should focus on the conclusions that can be derived from their own work).

Minor comments P2 L26 “Most of the victims came from”. . . P2 L30 astonished should not be used in academic literature P2 L30, by now you said many times that the earthquake took place due to an active strike-slip fault in Indonesia. Please delete P2 L32, again, you repeated many times that the earthquake destroyed many buildings P3 L11 “for a numerical model” P3 L12 “rebuilding of the affected areas by the 2018. . .” P3 L30 what is the point of saying that the authors took videos. Are these provided in the present research or any additional information? Otherwise delete. . . P4 L1 you repeated already that this road runs parallel to the coastline. P4 L9-10, delete these lines. P4 L17 “until the date of the end of the survey. . .” P4 L28 “The authors obtained important information from the surveys”. . . P4 L31 “The first wave acted as a trigger for evacuation, with many people starting to escape from the coastline”. The technical word is “trigger”. Please read other papers about evacuation triggers for tsunamis P5 L5 “is recorded at the maximum horizontal inundation distance”. (Delete “the horizontal distance flooded by the wave) P5 L10 what do the authors mean by tsunami border? P5 L 12 Delete sentence starting by “The items scattered” P5 L17 what is “tsunami creeping”? run-up? P5 L23 “This area was flattened by the tsunami (Fig 6a), with no buildings surviving”? L5 L26 Rephrase “being quite nimble” P5L27 what exactly is this important observation? Be specific. P5 L32 tsunami risk managers know they can use this data for run-up modelling. Please delete this sentence, it is obvious. Same for P6 L31-32. P5 L18 check reference, not shown P8 L23 the words “impacted areas with a relatively narrow width” are unclear. Revise. P8 L28 “Ulrih et al. (2019) assume that a. . .”

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

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



2019-91, 2019.

NHESSD

[Interactive
comment](#)

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

