Natural Hazards
and Earth System
Sciences

Open Access

EGU

Discussions

Interactive comment on "Rapid landslide identification using synthetic aperture radar amplitude change detection on the Google Earth Engine" *by* Alexander L. Handwerger et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 1 November 2020

The paper is well written and the presentation is clear.

However, I still have to suggest to reject the paper. The reason is that it misses certain elements of a scientific paper and is rather a technical report.

The main reason is that the results are never put into any context or prepared to any other method. So, we do not know if they are good or bad. Are other approaches better? It is nowhere shown.

The authors argue that because GEE makes the use of SAR data easy, so basically no other method can compare to that. That basic assumption of the paper may be correct, but even that could be questioned. Nevertheless, it is essential that the approach is

compared to other state-of-the-art methods, so that we can validate the approach and see if there are other methods that can get a higher accuracy. Then the authors could argue, that this is still acceptable (or not), because their approach is easier to use, doesn't require expensive software, etc. However, the lack of any comparison with other methods, makes it impossible to validate the importance and correctness of the work.

Furthermore, just dismissing coherence based methods remains also questionable. In the case of Sentinel-1, at least in areas with 6-day repeat cycle, coherence maybe acceptable. Again, the authors should prove that and it seems to me that this is an excuse, as GEE does not support this. Again, this leads back to the main point. There is no comparison to other methods.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2020-315, 2020.