

Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., author comment AC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2022-164-AC2>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Reply on RC2

Pablo Salazar et al.

Author comment on "Multi-station automatic classification of seismic signatures from the Lascar volcano database" by Pablo Salazar et al., Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2022-164-AC2>, 2022

Referee 2:

Dear Referee 2, thanks a lot for your comments, we are prepared a revised manuscript with all your observations.

"First, I would more extensively describe and discuss AlexNet discussing (a) its implementation, (b) target, and (c) recognized advantages and limitations. These should then be discussed in the light of the analysis of spectrograms, which is here proposed."

Answer: We added some paragraph in order to answer these comments: (a) implementation, (b) target and (c) recognized advantages and limitations. All these aspects are included in the lines 83-113. In the case of discussion, this aspect was included in the lines 304-311.

"Next, authors should better introduce the classification and elaborate on the different classes of signals. This classification is, I believe, inherited from previous manual catalog, where volcano-seismologists introduced the different classes on the base of visual observation of a large amount of data. How is the classification done in the original catalog? What are the typical features? Can one show a compact example of different waveform types and corresponding spectrograms?"

Answer: This information was added in the lines 131-152. Also the Figures 2 and 3 were added in order to explain the steps.

“Adding some more information on the typical spatial and temporal evolution of these type of events, and the different amount of signals in the original catalog, would also make the paper more interesting and easy to read.”

Answer: We included a new figure, Figure 5 to show the temporal evolution and the different amount of signals in the catalog. We do not included spatial distribution, mainly because is not the focus of the article and we also have some location for VT events.

“From the technical point of testing the performance of the approach, it would be good to make explicit e.g. the advantage to add merged data-synthetic datasets. Here, I think the first part of the result section could be extended, accompanying the description of each processing with the aim of such test(s).”

Answer: We included some paragraphs in order to give more detail about this in the lines 224-248, lines 181-194.

“Authors use only Z component seismograms, and mention 3-component data may be used

in future (in a future work). This is acceptable, but the authors should somehow justify this choice.”

Answer: We included the lines 123-124 to explain this point.

“I am still confused about how the classification performed at different stations is joined into a single catalog. What, e.g. if differently detected and/or classified at different stations?”

Answer: This aspect was included in the lines 143-145. Also a new Figure was added Figure 3 in order to explain this.

"Results and discussion sections are too compact and not well separated: some of the text in the result section seems to be more adequate for the discussion."

Answer: Both, Results and Discussion was re-write in order to give more information and cover in the discussion more aspects.

"A key issue for the proposed approach, and the interest it may have for a broader volcano-seismology audience, seems to be portability of this method, e.g. to other volcanoes, other time spans, or other monitoring setup. This can only be partially discussed here, as only one volcano monitoring is considered. However, one can still play with different observations. Can we train with one station and process another one?"

Answer: This aspect was discuss in the lines 312-315.

"Figure 1 could be more informative, plotting the regions where different type of seismicity was found in the original catalog and to inform the reader where does seismicity take place. Station symbols are too small, as well as labels. The figure size is too small"

Answer: The Figure 1 was modified, the sesimicity was not included because is not the focus of our article.

"I would also add a figure showing the time evolution of detections of different classes over time for the study period; such figure could help to summarize these results."

Answer: The Figure 5 was included.

"Figure 2 is important and useful, but somewhere hard to read. Labels should be larger, to appreciate the (common) duration of the signal."

Answer: The former Figure 2, now Figure 4, was modified in the labels associated to the signal.

"Figs. 3-5 can be possibly be merged into a single figure with different panels. Here, again, labels are too small."

Answer: The Figures were modified.

"Same for Figs. 6 and 7, join in a single figure"

Answer: The Figures were modified.

"And same for confusion matrices (Figs. 8-11), they can be subpanels of a single figure, with no loss of information."

Answer: The Figures were modified.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://nhess.copernicus.org/preprints/nhess-2022-164/nhess-2022-164-AC2-supplement.pdf>