

2/24/24

Re: Review of Revisions of “DEEP-SEATED LANDSLIDE MAPPING AND CLASSIFICATION PROJECT” Study Plan

To whom it may concern,

I have read through the author responses and the revised study plan for “DEEP-SEATED LANDSLIDE MAPPING AND CLASSIFICATION PROJECT.” I commend the authors on clearly and effectively revising this document to not only provide more detail and focus for specific actions in such a study, but better owning the uncertainties and challenges with an effort of this magnitude.

I felt comfortable reviewing the author responses to all comments and determining whether they were satisfactory. Overall, the authors largely addressed these comments adequately, although there are a few thoughts (mainly rhetorical) that I have left in responses for the authors that I hope are helpful for future endeavors. Some of the sections that lacked specificity are certainly more clear – some of the narrative is still a bit ambiguous as it relates to details or questions that only be resolved after full exploration of the data. I believe this is reasonable and describe why below.

Many of the technical review comments are addressed in these revisions through more explicit description of proposed methods that will be used for DSL change detection and classification, as well as direct acknowledgment of risks and unknowns. Some of the review comments and responses are more philosophical, focusing on the risk and reward structure of this proposed study plan. That is, there are surely uncertainties in such an effort and some of the details of this plan can only be fleshed out in full after a true deep dive into the data, its capabilities, and limitations (i.e. “known unknowns”). However, I believe that this limitation is understandable (perhaps expected!) for such an effort and should not be an obstacle to it moving forward. The authors also acknowledge this in several sections describing limitations. This type of work inherently has uncertainties and risks; however, I feel from reading this revised plan that the authors have a vision for this study and moreover, their specific revisions and thorough comprehension of the technical feedback provides more confidence for potential success of this work, in whatever form that may be. This team is certainly qualified for such an effort.

Based on this revised study plan and the diligent responses of the authors, I feel that this ambitious study plan instills more confidence than before, and while some details will be worked out at the potential project onset, this study plan is ready to move forward. I would encourage the authors to thoughtfully consider some of these comments, however, if this project does proceed. In particular, I think it would be valuable to revisit objectives and proposed approaches throughout the study, perhaps with some external feedback about feasibility, from CMER/DNR/etc. to keep the project manageable and somewhat flexible as it evolves. This may be part of the typical project delivery process (I am not sure), but it'd be a valuable mechanism to maximize success of this work while maintaining reasonable expectations and enabling meaningful, practical findings and data creation.

Sincerely,

