

Interactive comment on “Web-based macroseismic intensity study in Turkey: entries in Ekşi Sözlük” by Deniz Ertuncay et al.

Deniz Ertuncay et al.

dertuncay@units.it

Received and published: 10 November 2020

We are thankful for the improving comments of the Anonymous Referee #2. We have agreements and disagreements with some of those comments. We prove our updates and opinions about the referee's comments.

1. The manuscripts uses a lot of unnecessary abbreviations - There is only one abbreviation that is used once (DBMI15 in line 55). We delete that abbreviation.
2. The description of the methodology is rather thin, the reader should expect a more detailed explanation what is exactly done - We expand the Method section.
3. The manuscript makes an interesting observation: people who felt larger number of earthquakes, make better a guess about the magnitude of the earthquake than

C1

those who live in an aseismic region, although I'm not sure how does this helps in the determination of magnitude - We compare the magnitude estimations of users that are living in regions where earthquakes with various magnitudes are more common with users that are living in regions where earthquakes are relatively rare. Our proposal on the user estimation relies on the fact that users who have experienced seismic activities more often have a baseline to compare their latest feeling with their previous experiences. On the other hand, users who live in less seismically active regions have a lack of such baseline. Hence they may think that they have felt the earthquake due to its larger magnitude. We explain it in the conclusion.

4. The authors observe that the residuals between observed and predicted MCS values increase with distance, but do not give any explanation why - We believe that it is due to the lack of explanation of users' experience. We express our thoughts in the updated version as below: "This is due to the fact that it is hard to distinguish between MCS 1 to MCS 2 by analyzing the entries. Lack of resolution in terms of 'expression of the experience' limits our distinction levels for intensity."

5. The future work section is a wish list for possible tasks for the public website, and therefore it is quite irrelevant for the paper itself. I recommend deleting it - We believe that in the case of an official collaboration with the website, it would be a nice data provider. Hence, we would like to point out the significance of a possible collaboration.

6. The only difference between the intensity maps and felt reports is that the locations of the felt reports are plotted on top of the intensity maps; there is no need for two separate figures - We agree with the referee and keep the figures with EMSC information and delete the other type of presentation.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2020-31, 2020.