

# ***Interactive comment on “Transposing an active fault database into a seismic hazard fault model for nuclear facilities – Part A: Building a database of potentially active faults (BDFa) for metropolitan France” by Hervé Jomard et al.***

**PhD GARCIA-MAYORDOMO (Referee)**

julian.garcia@igme.es

Received and published: 23 May 2017

The manuscript is adequately written and structured. However, even though I'm not an English native speaker, I think the English could be better and, particularly, the style: there is an excessive use of brackets across the paper that should be avoided in the revised version in favour of a greater clarity in the statements and ideas expressed.

I strongly recommend the authors to check the English and style of writing. There are also many typos, some of them highlighted in a commented pdf attached.

My major concern relates to sections 3.1 and 3.2:

C1

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



The manuscript would benefit enormously if Sections 3.1 and 3.2 are extended, and more detailed is given when explaining the BDFA database fields, including examples.

## REVIEW QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1.Does the paper address relevant scientific and/or technical questions within the scope of NHESS? Yes

2.Does the paper present new data and/or novel concepts, ideas, tools, methods or results? Yes, new results.

3.Are these up to international standards? Yes

4.Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and outlined clearly? Yes

5.Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and the conclusions? Yes

6.Does the author reach substantial conclusions? Yes.

7.Is the description of the data used, the methods used, the experiments and calculations made, and the results obtained sufficiently complete and accurate to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? Yes.

8.Does the title clearly and unambiguously reflect the contents of the paper? Yes

9.Does the abstract provide a concise, complete and unambiguous summary of the work done and the results obtained? Yes

10.Are the title and the abstract pertinent, and easy to understand to a wide and diversified audience? Yes

11.Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations and units correctly defined and used? If the formulae, symbols or abbreviations are numerous, are there tables or appendixes listing them?

Not sure. There is just one equation, page 7, (authors should check if they meet Journal standard requirements).

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



12. Is the size, quality and readability of each figure adequate to the type and quantity of data presented?

In general Yes. A larger font size in Figure 3 is recommended.

13. Does the author give proper credit to previous and/or related work, and does he/she indicate clearly his/her own contribution? Yes

14. Are the number and quality of the references appropriate? Yes

15. Are the references accessible by fellow scientists? Yes

16. Is the overall presentation well structured, clear and easy to understand by a wide and general audience? Yes

17. Is the length of the paper adequate, too long or too short? It is ok. A bit longer would be good, particularly if sections 3.1 and 3.2 are extended.

18. Is there any part of the paper (title, abstract, main text, formulae, symbols, figures and their captions, tables, list of references, appendixes) that needs to be clarified, reduced, added, combined, or eliminated? Yes, sections 3.1 and 3.2 should be extended and explained in more detail, as they are the core of the database.

19. Is the technical language precise and understandable by fellow scientists? Yes

20. Is the English language of good quality, fluent, simple and easy to read and understand by a wide and diversified audience?

It is just all right. There is an excessive use of brackets.

21. Is the amount and quality of supplementary material (if any) appropriate? It is very good.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/nhess-2017-96/nhess-2017-96->

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2017-96, 2017.

Interactive  
comment

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

