Earth **Surface**
Dynamics
Discussions

Open Access

ESurfD

Interactive
comment

Interactive comment on "New insights on the predisposing factors and geomorphic response to the largest landslide on emerged Earth surface: the Seymareh rock slide - debris avalanche (Zagros Mts., Iran)" *by* Michele Delchiaro et al.

David Petley (Referee)

d.n.petley@sheffield.ac.uk

Received and published: 1 April 2019

The Seymareh landslide is zone of the largest terrestrial rock slpe failures identified to date. Whilst there have been some interesting studies of the landslide, it remains somewhat under-investigated. Tom this extent the premise of this paper is good. The title of the paper is about predisposition and about geomorphic response, both of which are interesting topics in the context of this landslide.

However, the paper does not meet the standards required in its current form. I have

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

a number of fundamental issues: 1. The manuscript is very poorly organised. It is hard to understand what is new, what is a reinterpretation, and what is background information. I found the paper difficult to read and to follow, and at the end I am not sure i really managed to work out what was new. 2. There is a huge amount of background information. Much of this seems to be irrelevant or tangential. In some cases it misrepresents the literature (e.g to say "which is mainly focused on predictive models" in page 2 is not correct. The authors really need to work out what is needed and what is not. 3. Very little of the paper is really about predisposing factors. This seems to be focused on nickpoint migration, but it is it clear as to whether this is really a factor in such a large landslide. 4. The sections on the post-event landscape evolution is interesting, and probably represents the best part of the paper. But it needs to be organised in a more systematic manner that allows the reader to follow the argument. At the moment it feels somewhat chaotic and disorganised, and extremely difficult to follow. The substantive part of this section (5.2) is brief and hard to follow. There are results elsewhere though, which is confusing 5. I am not sure why so much detail is needed on the large-scale geomorphic evolution of the area. This would be better dealt with through references. 6. The discussion is also hard to follow, needing a restructure. 7. I am not sure that the review of previous studies of this landslide really present them in a correct manner.

I think the abstract needs rewriting - it does not present the contents of the paper well.

I also recommend that the authors think carefully about the figures. Fig 5 for example dows not seem to really present the information being presented, figre 16 is impossible to understand, Figure 11 needs annotation, Fig 7 is too complex to understand in its current form.

I do encourage the authors to think about resubmitting a radically revised manuscript as this is a good subject. But they would be well advised to map out a new structure for the paper, in particular with a completely new section of results and discussion, and with better organised background information.

ESurfD

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper