

## ***Interactive comment on “Quantitative Risk Assessment of Vehicles Hit by Landslides: A Case Study” by Meng Lu et al.***

**Xiu He**

474302241@qq.com

Received and published: 12 March 2020

After reading your manuscript, I feel that there is a lack of innovation, so I'm not going to accept your manuscript. The manuscript has not reached a different or deeper conclusion from the previous work. In addition, the structure and writing of the manuscript is quite unsatisfied. The authors are suggested to read more high-quality papers for reference. To improve the quality of this manuscript, I strongly suggest the authors make the following revisions: 1. (1) the type of this manuscript should be first and clearly classified. Frankly, the manuscript is like a project report, not an academic paper. This is because: typically, the paper can be either (1) Technical Article in which the authors proposed or developed novel or interesting algorithms or methods to solve an engineering problem, or (2) A case report / case study in which the authors described how

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



to solve an engineering problem in details. However, the paper in current form is not a Technical Article or a Case Report. It is between those two types. Readers will not understand the main ideas or contributions in the paper. So, overall, the paper is not suitable for publication in current form. 2.in the abstract, the authors introduced the process of conducting their work in many details, but not clearly stated the novelty of the work. Only descriptions of your work is not sufficient. 3. similar to that in the abstract, in the section of introduction, the authors did not clearly pointed out the novelty of the work.In addition, too much emphasis on landslide events is not practical significance. 4.in the section of Method, the authors did not clearly presented the process of the method. It usually needs an overview of the method, and also a flowchart of the entire process. 5.There are a lot of formulas in the article, but there is no real innovation.

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2020-11>, 2020.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

