

Interactive comment on “Assessing the impact of Syrian refugees on earthquake casualty estimations in southeast Turkey” by Bradley Wilson and Thomas Paradise

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 18 March 2017

The paper introduces a model that is based on a number of assumptions that appear to be untested and are perhaps suspect. The first is that the migration data are accurate and representative of the situation on the ground. I doubt it, but what effort has been made to find out? The second is that there is no differentiation between the homes of the refugee populations and those of their local hosts. What if the refugees are concentrated into the most seismically precarious buildings? That is quite probable and it would inflate the death toll. Has this important point been investigated? The model produces a series of numbers which at the least represent spurious accuracy and may well simply mislead if the assumptions are inaccurate. Hence, something needs to be done to test them before the paper can be considered to offer a good

C1

representation of the risks of seismic mortality.

The paper conflates 'casualty' and deaths. This is wrong: casualty refers to mortality and morbidity. It appears that the latter is not taken into account.

Pg 1, lines 24-25: "...high rates of urbanization have been attributed to the Turkish government's failure to enforce seismic building codes" - It seems odd to attribute urbanisation to failure to enforce codes. Vulnerability, yes, but urbanisation, I doubt.

Pg 2, line 3: "...to the disparaging earthquake mortality rates" - wrong choice of word

Pg 2, lines 24-25: "Because loss estimation systems can be used to direct rapid post-event humanitarian decisions..., their accuracy is crucial." - Not really. They are mainly used for actuarial purposes and some degree of approximate first estimation of effects, not for humanitarian decision-making.

This paper is quite sloppily written, with numerous errors of English.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2017-69, 2017.

C2