Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences Discussions

Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., referee comment RC1
https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-403-RC1, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

# Comment on nhess-2021-403

Paolo Gasperini (Referee)

---

Referee comment on "Pseudo-prospective testing of 5-year earthquake forecasts for California using inlabru" by Kirsty Bayliss et al., Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-403-RC1, 2022

---

The paper is generally well written and sound hence it is suitable for publication with minimal changes.

At a first read is very hard to follow because it continuously refers to the companion paper by Bayliss et al. (2020). The authors should describe some more details of the forecasting models (e.g. SRMS, SRMSDC etc.) and of testing methods (e.g. DIC) defined in Bayliss et al. (2020) so that the reader is not obliged (as I had to do) to read the latter paper to understand the present one.

I do not think that Fig. 1 and 4 are particularly useful, and then can be omitted without loss of information.

Panels in Fig. 3 can hardly be distinguished one to the other. Try changing somehow the color palette.

Line 211. Figure 5 instead of Figure 4

The conclusions are weak, please try to better explain what you have learned from this work.