

Interactive comment on “Controls on the magnitude-frequency scaling of an inventory of secular landslides” by M. D. Hurst et al.

M. D. Hurst et al.

mhurst@bgs.ac.uk

Received and published: 4 October 2013

Dear Dr Lague,

thank you for your comments and for those of the reviewers'. The latter have all been responded to, and new figures and captions have been appended to the first reviewer's reply and should be visible to all. (I forgot to add the new table, and so I add it here.)

The reviewers' comments were very helpful and with extremely few exceptions, we have modified and I hope improved the manuscript.

Of particular importance to both your and the reviewers' comments, we have made the statistical analysis far more rigorous, including treatment of the uncertainties involved in estimating model parameters. Neither the results nor the interpretations change,

C201

although we do present a more balanced view of the interpretations, specifically by acknowledging that the apparent large-landslide deficit may be related to the lack of relatively large, steep slopes. A new figure 6 helps to illustrate this discussion.

We are unable to provide a more refined temporal analysis as there are no age data available. All we can say at this stage is that the landslides are in all probability post-LGM.

We fully realise and I think make it very clear that the interpretations hang on the limitations of the dataset, but we hope that these provide some thought-provoking ideas for other investigators, and that eventually our ideas may be tested by others and better data sets.

Many thanks

Martin Hurst, Mike Ellis, and all authors

Interactive comment on Earth Surf. Dynam. Discuss., 1, 113, 2013.

Deposit	No. Landfills	μ
M.I.	2453	1.71 ± 0.01
Superficial	2497	1.82 ± 0.03
Mudstone	2339	1.63 ± 0.02
interbedded	1986	1.71 ± 0.02
Clay	1388	1.61 ± 0.01
Carbonate	269	1.58 ± 0.04
Metamorphic	11	1.54 ± 0.05
Igneous	64	1.82 ± 0.12

Fig. 1. This is table 1.

C203