

Interactive comment on “On the importance of snowpack stability, its frequency distribution, and avalanche size in assessing the avalanche danger level: a data-driven approach” by Frank Teichel et al.

Karl W. Birkeland (Referee)

kbirkeland@fs.fed.us

Received and published: 24 April 2020

This paper utilizes a data driven approach to look at the relative contributions of snowpack stability, the frequency distribution of snowpack stability, and avalanche size in assessing avalanche danger. The paper provides a novel analysis of a unique dataset to generate interesting results, and it will be a nice contribution to the literature. I believe the paper should be published after addressing several points.

First, the title could be worded more succinctly and less ambiguously. I might suggest

C1

gest something along the lines of “The importance of snowpack stability, the frequency distribution of snowpack stability, and avalanche size in assessing avalanche danger”. However, the authors might have some other title they prefer. In particular I think they could omit “a data-driven approach” since that can be emphasized in the abstract and the text. Also, in the title and in several places in the paper they write “...snowpack stability, its frequency distribution, and avalanche size...”. I personally find this to be a bit awkward and ambiguous with the use of the term “its”. Even though it is slightly longer and involves more words, I think saying “...snowpack stability, the frequency distribution of snowpack stability, and avalanche size...” states what the authors are trying to say more clearly.

Second, my main criticism of the paper relates to the conclusion by the authors that “avalanche size only has a rather minor influence on the danger level” (bottom of p. 23). Perhaps this is just from the author’s choice of words, but in my opinion the data and Figures in the paper do not show a “rather minor influence”. Instead, they show an influence that may be less than that of snow stability or frequency, but one that is still clearly evident. An example is in Figure 6 where no matter which letter you get from the combination of stability and frequency on the left side of the Figure, when you go to the right side of the Figure you can see that with all the letters you see an increase in the avalanche danger as the largest avalanche size increases. This is also clearly shown in Figure 8, where going from left to right in the Figure we can see that the proportion of higher danger levels increases as the avalanche size increases.

Another example of the influence of avalanche size can be seen in Figure 5. It is true, as the authors state in the Conclusions on p. 24, that “the largest avalanche size – used by itself – had comparably little discriminating power at 1-Low to 3-Considerable”. However, while that might be strictly true for “the largest avalanche size”, Figure 5 shows that the distribution of avalanche size – particularly of the largest avalanche (Figure 5b) – clearly does play into avalanche danger. The frequency distributions visibly tend toward larger avalanches at higher danger levels, with the proportion of size

C2

3 and 4 avalanches increasing while the proportion of size 1 avalanches decreases.

I would tend to disagree with the statement on p. 14, line 10-11, that Figure 5b shows "rather similar size distributions at 1-Low and 2-Moderate". Comparing the two, we can see a sizable decrease in size 1 avalanches and an almost doubling in the number of size 3 avalanches between Low and Moderate.

Given the data presented in the paper, I would argue that the authors should better acknowledge that avalanche size does indeed have an influence on avalanche danger, and is not a "rather minor influence" (as stated on p. 23). I think they could still make an argument that snow stability, and the frequency of snow stability might well have a larger influence on avalanche danger, but avalanche size is also an important part of the avalanche danger assessment process. I would therefore encourage them to revisit various parts of the manuscript where avalanche size is discussed and better acknowledge the influence of size on avalanche danger.

Below are some other suggestions and typographical errors that I believe the authors should address:

- p. 1, line 2, delete "the"
- p. 1, line 4, remove the two commas
- p. 2, line 16, replace "weakest" with "the most unstable" because weakest could simply be a weak snowpack that has no slab and is therefore not unstable.
- p. 2, line 23, what does the "(?)" refer to? Were the authors going to put a reference in there or ??
- p. 3, line 2, spell out EAWS completely the first time it is introduced in the text and then refer to it as EAWS afterwards.
- p. 3, line 7, remove the two commas and replace "work" with "works"
- p. 3, line 11, replace "but" with "and"

C3

- p. 3, line 12, replace "And" with "and"
- p. 3, line 13, delete "does" and change "describe" to "describes"
- p. 3, line 24, delete the comma and remove the apostrophe from "biases"
- p. 3, line 25, delete "The target variable" and "we want to describe the three factors with"
- p. 4, line 17, would the authors like to include Foehn, 1987 in addition to Schweizer, 2002 to the RB reference?
- p. 5, line 1, replace "comparably" with "relatively"
- p. 6, line 1-3. It would be nice if the authors would explain why they removed the upper and lower 2.5% of the avalanche data. I am guessing they did this to filter out possible errors with the extremes or something along those lines? In any event, a single sentence explaining why this was done would be helpful.
- p. 7, line 5. The authors state that they are assuming that "different days with the same danger level exhibit similar stability distributions". I think they probably have to assume this to continue with their analyses. However, although I don't have any concrete data to support this, I feel like stability distributions can certainly vary between days that have the same danger level. This is somewhat built into the Conceptual Model of Avalanche Hazard by the inclusion of "uncertainty" and relates to how large an oval a person might put on the probability/size graph of the CMAH when selecting a danger level. It seems to me that the largest variations in stability distributions fall under "3 - Moderate" and "4 - Considerable" danger levels. For example, sometimes under 4 - Considerable you might have a distribution that is more spread out with the possibility of triggering a larger avalanche, while another time you might have a narrower spread of values, but the size of avalanche expected might be smaller. Both of these could have the same avalanche danger level, but the distribution of stability would vary. I don't think the authors have to make big changes to this paper, but I do think they

C4

should acknowledge that this assumption they are making might not always be valid.

- p. 7, line 18, sentence is a bit awkward and confusing. I would change it to read: "Since nature is not as discrete as the danger levels suggest, we wanted both some overlap between our sampled stability distributions and a reasonably high resolution of our statistic."

- p. 9, line 12, replace "maximising" with "maximizing"

- p. 11, Figure 3. This is an interesting and important Figure. One limitation that is noted in the text and also in the figure is the very small N for "4-High" (approximately two orders of magnitude smaller than for 2-Moderate or 3-Considerable). To further emphasize this, the authors could consider stating something related to this in the Figure caption, possibly something like "Note the small N for 4-High for both tests", or, even better, you could write "Note the N for 4-High is small and is approximately two orders of magnitude less than the N for 2-Moderate or 3-Considerable".

- p. 12, line 11, delete the first "of" in the line.

- p. 14, line 19, delete "It is of"

- p. 19, line 4. I have seen this under representation of smaller avalanches in most datasets related to ski area snow safety staff in the United States. This isn't written down in too many places, but we do discuss this somewhat in Birkeland and Landry, 2002 (Power-laws and snow avalanches. Geophysical Research Letters 29(11), 49-1 to 49-3).

- p. 19, line 6. Replace "As" with "Since" and insert "instead" between "focused" and "on".

- p. 19, line 8, delete comma

- p. 19, line 9, replace "weak" with "unstable". I believe the authors are talking about an "unstable" snowpack here and not necessarily one that is just structurally weak,

C5

correct?

- p. 20, line 23 and 25 (and probably elsewhere in the manuscript), replace "in prep." with "under review".

- p. 21, line 23, delete "It is of" and replace "was" with "were"

- p. 21, line 26, replace "," with "." prior to "For instance,"

- p. 21, line 28, replace "Schweizer et al. (2003) s" with "Schweizer et al.'s (2003)"

- p. 22, line 25 and 27. The authors refer to the correlations being "strong" or "moderate". What do you mean by this? Are they statistically significant or not? You might want to state whether they are significant and list a p-value. When I refer back to Section 4.1.2 as is suggested on line 27, I believe the authors are referring to p. 12, line 5-8. Is this correct? Here it states that – even with an N = 10 - the correlation is highly significant (p < 0.001).

- p. 23, line 5. What does the "(?)" refer to? Are the authors planning on adding a reference here?

- p. 30, delete "and tables" from the title of Appendix 2 since this appendix has only figures.

- p. 31, in the caption for Figure B1, replace "Fig.s" with "Figs."

- p. 34, Figure E1, for the top right part of the Figure (all avalanches for Switzerland), add "(SWI)" after "all avalanches" to be consistent with the other headers. Also, add the percent number above the bar for size 1 avalanches under Low to match the other graphs in this Figure.

Again, I believe that this is a good paper and, with some relatively minor changes, will be ready for publication. If the authors have any questions about these comments, they should feel free to email me at karl.birkeland@usda.gov.

C6

