Natural Hazards
and Earth System
Sciences

Open Access

EGU

Discussions

Interactive comment on "Construct and evaluate the classification models of six types of geological hazards in Bijie city, Guizhou province, China" *by* JieQing Shi et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 5 July 2020

The paper entitled "Construct and evaluate the classification models of six types of geological hazards in Bijie city, Guizhou province,China" (please note the missing space after the comma) presents a study case of something that might be associated with a susceptibility assessment and somehow with a multi-hazard approach. Unfortunately, while such a study case might be interesting, there is nothing in the manuscript to represent a substantial contribution to the understanding of natural hazards and their consequences. More, the language is not scientific and the English language is very poor (for example in the first phrase there are missing articles; usually we speak about landslides and not landslide), even with too many misspelling errors and missing spaces, a situation that makes it very hard to read (spaces are missing, commas appear where

is not the case and the proper punctuation is not used). Often, even the conceptual basics of natural hazards and their modeling are missing: - from the first phrase hazard, vulnerability and risk are not well introduced; - the usual international natural hazard and risk terminology is also poor included, disasters being considered as hazards. The natural hazards are not well defined, for example: - the so-called collapse and ground collapse might seem different phenomenon, but are not referenced in the literature; - debris flows are not considered a category of landslides; - natural and human-induced processes are mixed. Also, the modeling approach speaks about classification, when actually such a study case needs a probabilistic approach. The chosen factors are not related to natural hazard processes. I have given a lot of thinking after reading multiple times the article, in order to try to give it some directions toward a natural hazards approach, but unfortunately, the shortcomings of the paper are too many. A full reconsideration of the problem is needed. The authors should choose a single natural hazard, and try to map it (there is no description of the inventory and on the methodology) and then probabilistically model it. The literature review is poor, many fundamental papers are missing. I do not see how could this paper reach a level for publishing without reconsidering every aspect. The English language needs a professional touch for sure also.