

Interactive comment on “Geosystemics and Earthquakes” by Angelo De Santis et al.

Angelo De Santis et al.

angelo.desantis@ingv.it

Received and published: 23 April 2018

Final Comment

We already responded to Dr. Freund and to Referee #1 on 6 March 2018 (see <https://www.solid-earth-discuss.net/se-2017-120/>). Now we also included a Reply to Referee #2 (see our AC3). For Editor's convenience, we summarise all points here.

Dr. Freund was extremely positive while Referee #1 was completely negative. We inserted the main comment by Dr. Freund in the text, so clarifying the point arose by him. We replied to Comments by Referee #1 that we find very skeptical, and probably against any earthquake prediction work. To what already replied in that occasion (see <https://www.solid-earth-discuss.net/se-2017-120/>) we also can now add what Molchan (2011) says about the systematic analysis to establish whether a method for earthquake prediction is valid or not: “The statistical analysis of any prediction method with

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



few target events and a short monitoring period is premature". Therefore, what we present in our paper in terms of entropy and R-AMR analyses, together with the climatological analysis before large earthquakes is valid and worth doing.

Referee #2, although partially negative, arose some important points that we admit were important.

Our final revision, with adding several parts, a Table and three new references, (here included with all changes evidenced in revision mode) attempts to respond to all these points, and we are confident to have improved the paper significantly, so as the paper is now worth publishing.

Best regards

Angelo De Santis On behalf of all authors

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.solid-earth-discuss.net/se-2017-120/se-2017-120-AC4-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2017-120>, 2018.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

