

Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., referee comment RC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2022-88-RC2>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on nhess-2022-88

Anonymous Referee #2

Referee comment on "Multi-event assessment of typhoon-triggered landslide susceptibility in the Philippines" by Joshua N. Jones et al., Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2022-88-RC2>, 2022

The authors present an interesting and well-written manuscript presenting an analysis of typhoon-triggered landslides as input to susceptibility maps for two regions in the Philippines. The paper focuses on three separate typhoon events, two in one region and one in another, and discusses spatial and temporal effects on landslide susceptibility. Overall the reviewer thinks the manuscript is well written and explains the problem, method and conclusions in a clear and understandable manner.

Two general comments:

1. The discussion about the accuracy of the Abuan model includes discussion on whether "something is better than nothing" with regard to susceptibility mapping. The reviewer thinks this is a very relevant comment, and should be highlighted in the conclusions of the manuscript. If the authors believe the input data into the model is not sufficient enough to produce a reliable susceptibility map, it should not be concluded that a new susceptibility map is produced, particularly when the region did not already have a map available.
2. The aim of the paper was to use data from multiple typhoon events to assess typhoon-triggered landslide susceptibility in the Philippines. The reviewer thinks the topic of time-dependance is discussed sufficiently within the Itogon region, with analysis completed on two individual typhoon events and then a combination of the two events. These three models are then tested on the 2019 data from the Abuan region, with poor results (AUROC between 0,54 and 0,59 according to Figure 6 and 7). To the reviewer this seems that some discussion is warranted on the spatial dependancy, although it is mentioned in Line 574 that this is not the focus of the paper (but not mentioned or excluded from the paper in the introduction or abstract). If the focus of the paper is really only discussing time depenance, it may not be relevant to include the Abuan region, which is only analysed using one typhoon event.

Specific comments:

- Section 2 general comment - There is a mixing of unit systems here. Amount of rain is listed in millimeters, while wind speeds are noted in miles per hour.

- The accuracy of the model from the 2009 typhoon was classified as "good/excellent", and the combined 2009/2018 model as "good", are there any complications with building a susceptibility model from a typhoon event which was described in Section 2.1 as influenced by the Fijiwhara effect, where the typhoon was impacted/worsened by a nearby typhoon?

- Line 227 - the reviewer thinks the toolbox in ArcGIS may be called "Spatial analyst", not Spatial Analysis.

- Line 286-289 - In point 4 it would be nice to mention what the other predisposing factors are. Here it is listed that three factors are categorical, but one must look to Table 1 to find the other factors.

- Line 443-447 - The figure caption for Figure 7 was challenging to read, with similar years being discussed. Perhaps make it more clear on the figures that a and b are using a different model year than c and d.

- Line 449 - the word "models" is missing after 2009.

- Figure 8 - In the plot for e) Aspect, the reviewer does not understand why the distributions for the Itogon catchments have a peak at E/SE aspects, when the bar charts are approximately equal to the Abuan catchment data.

- Line 520-527 - The sentences discussing the three main zones (core zone, middle zone and peripheral zone) are not really sentences and are slightly challenging to read. Consider restructuring.