

Interactive comment on “Path and site effects deduced from transfrontier internet macroseismic data of two recent M4 earthquakes in NW Europe”

by Koen Van Noten et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 13 January 2017

I won't repeat the points that Remy Bossu and Valerio de Rubeis stressed very nicely in their reviews, but will stress out just a few things that I consider crucially important:

DYFI is the USGS online questionnaire; it is very famous and very popular. But, it's not the basis of the majority of European national online questionnaires. The tradition of collecting macroseismic data in organised way is old and rich in European countries. Almost each of them has developed its own national questionnaire, based on the scale that was used locally, as well as including details that were of importance.

It is definitely not written in EMS guidebook that one should decrease the intensities from the observers in third and fourth floors by one intensity value.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



To exclude EMSC questionnaires because the intensities were not in accordance to the average values of other institutes is definitely not scientifically correct.

SED

But my main problem is the following: evaluating the intensity for some locality means to collect all the data about earthquake effects in that town or village and evaluate them together in order to obtain the intensity value for the said locality. It is not correct to assign individual intensity values to each observation and then recalculate the intensity following some rule. This is the only way to be sure that the intensity value is correct, and to obtain reliable seismic history of the settlement. Here, however, no one seems to care much about the earthquake effects described in questionnaires; lot of effort is put into fiddling with the already calculated intensities instead.

Interactive comment

What is the use of this? I can give it a benefit of being handy for showing the rough outline of the intensity field soon after the earthquake. But this can not be a tool to really study a transfrontier earthquake. There is much more behind each coloured circle on the map than just playing with the grid size.

I feel bad for writing all this, as it is obvious that there is a great effort behind this work; I would sincerely recommend the authors to reconsider what they did and to adjust the already prepared framework to deal with the intensity data again, this time using the proper methodology.

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., doi:10.5194/se-2016-150, 2016.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

