

Interactive comment on “Testing a failure surface prediction and deposit reconstruction method for a landslide cluster that occurred during Typhoon Talas (Japan)” by Michel Jaboyedoff et al.

A. Strom (Referee)

strom.alexandr@yandex.ru

Received and published: 15 September 2018

Dear Authors,

Thank you for interesting paper. I recommended to accept it after minor revisions due to following reasons. Some statements need additional clarification. 1) What do you mean as 2.5D surface (in the Abstract and in Conclusions). Short explanation how it differs from 3D will be useful for the reader. 2) in section 1.2 it will be good if you will add basic linear dimensions of the described landslides (length, width, slope height). 3) It is important to notice that L is the horizontal projection of the source zone length, not total runout that is described in most of paper as the horizontal projection

C1

of the distance between the headscarp crown and the deposits tip. While L can be defined in a univocal manner, W (width) definition needs clarification - is it a maximal or mean value. 4) Step's order (Figure 3, and in the text). For me it remains unclear why do you start from the pre-DEM. It looks more logical (at least for landslides that have occurred already) to start from the post-DEM where we know exactly what are the landslide dimensions, at least in the upper part of the headscarp. May be some additional explanation is necessary. 5) Figure 7. Add, please, what are A, B, and C. 6) Figure 8, 16, 17. Legend will be useful (as on Fig. 18). 7) Page 27, lines 29-30. Statement that the amount of expansion caused in situ by the slope deformation is in the range of 8% to 23% require some comments. It seems to be too large (before real release of landslide).

Interactive comment on Earth Surf. Dynam. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-2018-61>, 2018.

C2