

## ***Interactive comment on “An integrated user-friendly ArcMAP tool for bivariate statistical modeling in geoscience applications” by M. N. Jebur et al.***

**M. N. Jebur et al.**

biswajeet24@gmail.com

Received and published: 3 January 2015

Dear Editor, We would like to thank you and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments which helped us to improve the quality of the manuscript. We have revised the manuscript GMD-2014-168 - entitled “An integrated user-friendly ArcMAP tool for bivariate statistical modeling in geoscience applications” to incorporate minor revision, strictly based on the reviewer’s report.

We have revised the paper based on the feedback and comments given by the anonymous reviewers. As a result, you can see that there are changes in the new submission. All the comments and feedback have been taken very seriously and hence addressed

C2835

them carefully in the revised manuscript. Please find the next page onwards of this document wherein we have answered to the issues raised by the referees in a point format. Additionally, I am uploading the manuscript with “track changes” (please see supplement) in order to view those changes made during the new submission.

We sincerely expect that this revised manuscript can be published in “GMD”. With best regards,

Prof. Dr. Biswajeet Pradhan (Corresponding author)

Comments from First Reviewer 1. Same area has been studied previously by three authors of this study (MN Jebur, B Pradhan, MS Tehrany, 2014. Optimization of landslide conditioning factors using very high-resolution airborne laser scanning (LiDAR) data at catchment scale. Remote Sensing of Environment, 152, 150 – 165pp). Author’s response: Thank you for the comment. Actually, the main aim of this research is not related to the specific study area. The study area was selected in order to examine the proposed tool. Therefore, there was no need to test it in the new area because the main focus and contribution of this paper is the tool itself.

2. We can observe the behavior of this study area against the employed methods more or less from this previous one. The novelty of this study should be the developing of BSA as ArcMap tool, but there are very limited details about this point. Author’s response: Thanks for the comment. We have provided some additional text which describes the novelty of this study which is the development of the proposed Arcmap tool. Additional section was added to the manuscript calls “2.2. Code description” to describe the code thoroughly. Moreover, the literature review has been modified and some information regarding GIS tools was added.

3. Pseudo codes of EBF, FR and WOE have not been presented. Author’s response: The code has been added as an appendix in the end of the manuscript. Moreover, the tool has been submitted with the modified edition.

C2836

4. Most of paper consists of the methodological details of BSA, experimental results and study area. To make complex methods more practically applicable on the natural hazards is an important point and deserves to work. This point of view makes this study interesting. However, authors preferred to present the tool as a detail and the method (BSA) as the major point. Author's response: Thank you very much for your constructive comment. As it has been mentioned in comment 2, additional section was added to the manuscript calls "2.2. Code description" to describe the code thoroughly. Moreover, the literature review has been modified and some information regarding GIS tools was added.

5. The last point is that, there are too much self-citations in the references (almost 21 of total 43). Author's response: Thank you for this observation. The references have been reformatted and the self-citation has been significantly reduced.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.geosci-model-dev-discuss.net/7/C2835/2015/gmdd-7-C2835-2015-supplement.pdf>

---

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 7, 7239, 2014.