

Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., referee comment RC1  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-112-RC1>, 2021  
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



## Comment on nhess-2021-112

Anonymous Referee #1

---

Referee comment on "CHILDA – Czech Historical Landslide Database" by Michal Bíl et al.,  
Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-112-RC1>,  
2021

---

Revision of the manuscript

### **"CHILDA – Czech Historical Landslide Database"**

by Michal Bíl, Pavel Raška, Lukáš Dolák, Jan Kubeček.

General comments

The paper presents a new and unique complete database of historical landslide in Czech Republic. Despite in the past other authors compiled catalogues on historical landslides this work represents the first effort in organize and systemize the existing information widespread in different catalogues and/or collected for small portions of the nation. Authors also collect new and original information not included in the previously prepared catalogues.

The abstract provides a concise, complete summary of the work done and the results obtained, even if I would remove the last sentence. I appreciate the short title that provides immediately the idea on the content of the manuscript. The size, quality and readability of figures are adequate even if I would appreciate a figure showing the amount of landslides collected using the works/catalogue (mainly Špárek 1972 and Bill 2020) and the new/original data on landslides (not obtained in previous catalogues). The authors give proper credit to previous and/or related work in the introduction and in the discussion section.

The overall structure of the paper is adequate, even if I suggest the to shorten the paragraph 2.1, because the information on geography are useful to understand the location of the OWC or CS or DV but the information on geological formations are not functional to the reader. Also paragraph 2.2.1 should be deleted or summarised in the introduction section.

The section Database structure could be improved also improving some definitions. The table shows the table structure, and not the structure of the records and the first row should be "Field Name", "Description", and "Field Type". The List is called Dictionary. Other issues are in the specific comments in the pdf file.

The web map interface is well described and easy to navigate (I have tried it). I suggest to improve the English version (adding calendar to select the date in English language). I can suggest for the future to add base maps describing landslide susceptibility or population density.

In the result section I appreciate if you could prepare a map (similar to the one of density) showing also landslide frequency since the database is more complete (1891).

I appreciate a lot the limitation described in the discussion section, that are well written and argued, that provide the measure of the reliability of the dataset. Other comments are as comment in the pdf of the preprint. In my opinion the overall quality of the manuscript is good.

I'm not a native English and so I don't feel qualify to evaluate English style and language.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://nhess.copernicus.org/preprints/nhess-2021-112/nhess-2021-112-RC1-supplement.pdf>