

Interactive comment on “Quantifying uncertainty of remotely sensed topographic surveys for ephemeral gully channel monitoring” by Robert R. Wells et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 20 February 2017

The paper is interesting but in its present form, and based on the comments highlighted below, should be modified to improve the readability. The ideas could be interesting for the scientific communities, the methods and the assumptions resulted valid, but I suggest to improve some aspects of the analysis, the description of experiments and calculation. The reproduction of the experiment should be very difficult with the paper in this form. The conclusions resulted too general and no information repeatable and useful were provided. The authors should give proper credit to related work and the discussion (and conclusion) should clearly indicate their own new/original contribution. Therefore I suggest to improve the structure of the paper for a better reading, the discussion to compare the results obtained in the paper

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



to others recent paper, the conclusions have to be enlarged because in present form resulted very insignificant. I have highlighted many of these instances below in the specific comments. For the language, I suggest to verify the comma in the text. All the formulae, figures and tables have to be verified. I highlighted some corrections, but probably my suggestions are not complete. I suggest to improve the references considering some recent paper that compared different survey technology for erosion studies.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.earth-surf-dynam-discuss.net/esurf-2017-3/esurf-2017-3-RC1-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Earth Surf. Dynam. Discuss., doi:10.5194/esurf-2017-3, 2017.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

