Natural Hazards
and Earth System
Sciences

Open Access

EGU

Discussions

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

Ahmet Cevdet Yalciner (Referee)

yalciner@metu.edu.tr

Page-1 Line 14: Indicating the name of the university mentioned would provide more clear information. Line 22-23: Do the authors have any reference for the earthquake parameters given? Line 23-24: Do the authors have any reference for the numbers reported?

Page-3 Line 2-5: "For tsunamis, post-incident surveys are often carried out. Major tsunamis such as…." Only stating some of the tsunami post-event surveys like "giving examples" may not be appropriate. Two suggestions: Either state the importance and relation of them with this study OR delete these sentences. Line 9: "Observation of damage was also conducted." Too general sentence. What kind of damage data is

collected? Any details on the data collection processes?

Page 9: Line 14: "There were three main tsunami waves that reached the beach." Which beach? Not clear. Line 14: "The first wave was relatively low." With respect to what? You should State it more clearly and in an understandable way. Line 18: "The wave that hit the beach was quite high." This sentence by itself does not provide any meaningful information.

General Comments: - A brief summary and citation of previously published papers on 2018 Palu Event field survey is necessary. - Section 5.1, Aftershock information is not related with the focus of this study and the work done. - The conclusion section should be rewritten by clear sentences and providing a comprehensive summary of the results obtained. For example, Giving ranges such as "2 to10 m and the inundation distances were 80 to 500 m." Or "The arrival time of waves varied from 3 to 10 minutes.." does not provide satisfying information. The authors, at least, may add the locations of these measurements.