

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

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 30 October 2020

The manuscript touches on an interesting topic, by analysing the users' comments on earthquakes on a public, general purpose website in Turkey. Based on the comments, the authors predict the intensities using the ground motion prediction equations developed for Italy. They analyse four earthquakes, and they even attempt to crowd-source the magnitude estimations for the earthquakes. Unsurprisingly, these show the largest scatter.

The manuscripts uses a lot of unnecessary abbreviations. The description of the methodology is rather thin, the reader should expect a more detailed explanation what is exactly done. This section needs to be extended.

In the discussion the authors correctly point out that because of users' the location is known only at the district level, and taking the centroid location of the district introduces

errors due to the variability of soil conditions within the district. Moreover, changes in population density are only rudimentarily taken into account.

The manuscript makes an interesting observation: people who felt larger number of earthquakes, make better a guess about the magnitude of the earthquake than those who live in an aseismic region, although I'm not sure how does this helps in the determination of magnitude.

The authors observe that the residuals between observed and predicted MCS values increase with distance, but do not give any explanation why.

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.

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.

I would recommend the acceptance of the manuscript with major revisions.

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

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)