

Authors Final Response:

Response to Reviewer 1 comments

AC: We are grateful for the detailed and constructive critique provided by Professor Stephenson and we appreciate the time taken to review this manuscript. We have taken on board all of the comments and suggestions provided and have edited the manuscript accordingly. Responses to comments and suggested edits are provided below.

RC: This paper offers an interesting and useful comparison between SfM and the TMEM methods. It helps to demonstrate how erosion measurements on shore platforms can be made across a range of scales from sub-millimetre to centimetres. While this is welcome I think the absence of a genuine field trial and data from a shore platform is a significant weakness. I suspect that such data are available and hope that some could be presented in a revised version of the manuscript to show that it actually worked in the field.

AC:Response: We agree that a field trial is necessary and indeed have a project pending to undertake such a study. However we strongly disagree that this represents a significant weakness of the paper. The paper concerns the development of the experimental protocol and testing of the approach under controlled conditions. A field study is beyond the scope of this manuscript, principally because of the time required for many of the hard-rock coastal platforms in Ireland to erode. This might help address my second main concern related to rock swelling.

RC: Throughout the paper there are many places where further reference to rock swelling is needed. Certainly in the consideration of SfM versus TMEM the value of the TMEM for the study of rock swelling has not been given enough attention.

AC:Response: We agree with and have included additional references to platform swelling in the manuscript as recommended. Specifics are provided in response to further comments regarding the same below.

RC: In addition to swelling the TMEM has enabled much shorter timescales to be considered. At line 53 – there needs to be a correction, since short times scales are actually hours not years based on a number of studies that have investigated rock swelling over hours and days.

AC:Response: We agree and have corrected the text to clarify reference to hourly measurements of platform swelling.

RC: Can your SfM method detect short term variability in rock surfaces? Reference to this point is needed at line 115 needed.

AC:Response: This is unlikely given the spatial scales involved. We have included additional text to highlight the resolution limitations of SfM-MVS for measuring processes such as platform swelling (Lines 126 – 129 of revised manuscript)

RC: Where multiple references are provided these must be in chronological order, not alphabetical (I suspect that is an artefact of using reference management software).

AC:Response: This was an error in formatting and intext citations with multiple citations have been changed throughout the text to order of publication by year (earliest to most recent).

RC: It is important that chronological order is used so to recognised correct attribution and who made the contribution first. E.G. it is important that Spate et al is recognised before Moses et al 2014, since Spate clearly identified sources of error long before Moses.

AC:Response: We agree and have edited the text clarify that Moses et al. (2014) refers to limitations identified by previous research and the relevant citations have been added. (lines 63- 67) in revised manuscript)

RC: Scale terms need far more careful definition, micro – meso and macro scales need to be defined with a range of values. E.g. at line 165, what is micro to meso?

AC:Response: We agree and have clarified this by where micro refers to sub mm and meso refers to > 1mm to cms (line 189 in revised manuscript).

RC: I wondered if it is possible to expand the applicability of the paper by reference to rock erosion more broadly than just shore platforms. This should probably include reference to: Turowski, J.M. and Cook, K.L., 2017. Field techniques for measuring bedrock erosion and denudation. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 42(1), pp.109-127. After all the method is not limited to shore platforms and clearly has potential in any environment where bedrock erosion is of interest.

AC:Response: We agree and have inserted ne text that highlights the broader application of the method, including reference to Turowski and Cook (2017). (Lines 499 – 503)

RC: I find the use of the term “rock shore platform” unnecessary, it is almost a tautology – just shore platform.

AC:Response: We agree and used ‘shore platforms’ throughout the text.

RC: Line 65 The limitation to smooth surfaces is pretty well known, I don’t think you can claim to have identified this limitation.

AC:Response: The text has been edited to clarify this point (Line 74)

RC: Line 142, what does “specially” mean? Needs explanations.

AC:Response: We have clarified the text to indicate that ‘specifically designed’ refers to the design of the robust new coordinate system which is based on the coordinate system described in Verma and Bourke (2018) (Lines 161-162).

RC: +/- how many millimetres?

AC:Response: We have inserted the following text in Line 165-166 to improve clarity ‘Distance/angle between targets can also be measured after application to ensure accuracy of placement and application can be repeated if necessary’.

RC: Line 148 how was the bolt levelled? Move explanation from lower down up.

AC:Response: We have clarified how we levelled the bolts in lines 187-188.

RC: Line 150 you need to tell the reader what is the “high degree of relocation precision”. Is this same as the Kelvin clamp used by the TMEM? Or is it +/- some number and unit?

AC:Response: The relocation precision is validated in the results section and we have clarified refer the reader to this in line 174-175 in revised document).

RC: Since this is a technical methods paper I think you need to provide a technical drawing of your bolt and plate so others can manufacture both themselves.

AC:Response: We agree. The bolt is a standard square head bolt available from Stig Fasteners UK (SQHM8x75) . We have requested a technical drawing of the CRS from the manufacturers and this will be available from the authors upon request as soon as it is available. We will also attach it as SOM to the field validation paper when published. Bolt manufacturer and specifications have been added to text (lines 204-205 in revised manuscript)

RC: Fragments and granular need definition, what size are these?

AC:Response: The size has been specified in the text (Lines 176-177)

RC: Caption to Fig. 1 can you add some dimensions of the triangle angles so we get a better sense of scale?

AC:Response: Scale bars have been added to figure 1

RC: Was the camera held by hand or placed on a tripod? Does it matter?

AC:Response: We have confirmed the use of a tripod to reduce effects of hand shake on image quality (line 211 in revised manuscript)

RC: Again what does “smaller-scale” mean?

AC:Response: We have clarified the text on ‘smaller scale processes’ with examples in lines 215 in revised manuscript.

RC: A key point you have not made and this becomes evident at start of the results is that SfM is an order of magnitude lower in precession than the MEM.

AC:Response: We agree and now include that highlights the relatively lower resolution when compared to the T/MEM. We emphasise that this would render the approach unsuitable for measuring change due to processes, such platform swelling, which operate at finer spatial scales. Lines 558-564.

RC: Lines 368-69, actually I think the key is not factors such as cost (they are actually pretty similar if you cost the camera) but what questions are being asked and so at what scale are measurements required.

AC:Response: We agree and have emphasised this in the text (Line 431-432 and 435-436)

RC: Installation times are way off here, it does not take 80 minutes to install a MEM site. An experienced operator with a good drill, can install a site in 20 minutes or less. If two people are operating together it can be very fast. The other factor is the rock type, more resistant rock, then yes a bit slower.

AC:Response: We have altered the time given to show the range of installation times and stated that these will depend on operator experience and rock type. (Line 440-441 and Figure 7.)

RC: In section 3.3 you need to discuss the benefit the T/MEM provides for investigating rock swelling, something you have not really dealt with, and not (yet) shown to be detectable by the SfM method. You need to say something about this in your discussion section as well.

AC:Response: We have added text to highlight the efficacy of the T/MEM for measuring processes which operate at a higher spatial resolution that is obtainable using the SfM MVS approach (section

3.3.6 line 480-486) and note its importance for measuring of phenomena such as platform swelling in the discussion line 558-564.

RC: Minor typos Line 63 Stephenson and Kirk 1966 – probably 1996 or is it 1998??

AC:Response: Corrected to Stephenson and Kirk, (1996) (line 71).

RC: Cullen and Bourke 2018 not in reference list.

AC:Response: Completed - Cullen and Bourke 2018 have been added to reference list.

RC: Verma and Burke without year or in press.

Response: Completed – year included

RC: Line 62 use and between moulds and gypsum

AC:Response: 'and' inserted between moulds and gypsum (Line 185

Response to Reviewer 2 comments:

RC: The article "A comparison of Structure from Motion Photogrammetry and the Traversing Micro Erosion Meter for measuring erosion on rock shore platforms" compare a methodological implementation of SfM-MVS photogrammetry to evaluate submillimetre erosion processes of shore platform, with classical direct measurements from TMEM system.

RC: The structure of this paper is composed of: 1) an introductory part resuming the methodologies used to measure gentle topographic changes over rock shore surface with focus on TMEM and SfM-MVS photogrammetry; 2) a detailed methodological section; 3) the results, segmented between a quality assessment of DEMs, a comparison of the level of geomorphological changes detection regarding the rugosity of surface, and a comparison between SfM-MVS photogrammetry tools and TMEM; 4) a discussion and conclusion.

RC: My opinion about this article is that it proposes a very interesting approach to quantify and map small scale erosion processes over shore platform at low cost and with accuracy. The SFM-MVS photogrammetry protocol and results are very detailed, especially regarding vertical error assessment. The results show that the method is able to reach small and medium scales detection of erosion over low rugosity surface but are clearly limited to detect loss of rock fragment over more complex topography. The SfM-MVS photogrammetry results show typical errors of geometry reconstruction associated to the technique such as shadow effect. I really appreciated the discussion part because the authors detailed the issues of the implementation of SfM-MVS and TMEM techniques in field. The article structure is clear and readable. I think that this paper will be very useful for the coastal scientists working on the evolution of shore platforms which are common objects over many shores in the world. Moreover, protocol enhancements can be also possible such as accurate error mapping from James et al. (2017) to increase the level of detection of changes.

AC:Response: We thank reviewer 2 for their detailed and constructive critique of this manuscript. We appreciate the time and effort taken to review this manuscript in such detail and are pleased with positive response.

RC: However, I suggest to detail more the photographs recording protocol. Indeed, do you take random oblique pictures or sub-vertical ones? This information will be very useful for non-specialist readers if they want to reproduce your protocol for their own research.

AC:Response: We agree and now highlight that the specifics of data collection and processing procedures are provided in the companion paper to this manuscript (Verma and Bourke (2018)).

RC: Then, on field, depends on the type of rock and the degree of brightness, you can have specular reflection which lead to bad quality photograph. I suggest using diffuser to reduce and homogenise brightness over the object. This can be a suggestion into the discussion.

AC:Response: We agree and have included reference to lighting in the discussion. We also added the recommendations by Guidi et al. (2014), they demonstrated that use of polarising filter and digital pre-processing with HDR imaging can help to homogenise brightness over the subject subsequently improving image matching. We have included a reference to this paper in this discussion (lines 535 – 537).

RC: Then, I also appreciate to have topographic profiles from DEMs and DoD graphs crossing erosion features, between stage 0 and 3 for example. This will strengthen the demonstration and the advantages of SfM-MVS photogrammetry for sub millimetre measurements.

Response: We agree and include a new figure (Figure 4) with topographic profiles crossing erosion features on B1 for each stage.

RC: Finally, I also suggest adding the size of simulated erosion features practiced over the block experiments. I also think that there is a lack of direct measurements of block geometry, using TMEM for example, with SfM-MVS photogrammetry results.

AC:Response: We are unclear on the suggestion provided here. As we understand reviewer 2's comment, we agree that independent measurements of erosion feature geometry would be advantages. However, we feel that the independent horizontal and vertical error checks done for each block during each stage of the experiment demonstrate the accuracy of the SfM MVS reconstructions.

RC: Globally, I have notified minor revisions, described below, for this paper.

RC: General forms remark: Homogenise figure calling into the text,

RC: Line 99 - "...utilising widely available software (e.g. ArcMap, CloudCompare) for geomorphic

change detection to quantify... " I suggest to replace " ArcMap " by " GIS software such as ESRI ArcGIS desktop or QGIS "

AC:Response: We have changed this, for example, 'GIS software (e.g. ESRI ArcGIS desktop or QGIS) and other programs (e.g. CloudCompare)' (Line 113-114).

RC: line 102 - " ...Westoby et al. (2012), Verma and Bourke (for more ... " close the parenthesis and indicate "in review" may be

AC:Response: Completed changed to (year) (line 116)

RC: line 153 - "...to capture different scales of erosion from granular scale abrasion ..." forgot a blank space

AC:Response: Space inserted

RC: line 178 - "We used a Nikon D5500 with a variable zoom lens set up at 24 mm focal length." The focal length set at 24mm from variable zoom lens is noted into EXIF file of picture, or Photoscan estimate it?

AC:Response: The variable zoom lens is fixed by the operator at 24mm. Note: The sensor in Nikon D5500 camera is APS-C, so the 35 mm film equivalent focal length is 36 mm.

RC: Lines 187 – 191 – I suggest to provide the magnitude (globally) of simulated erosion processes in mm, such as deep of shallow scratch or abrasion, the size of rock block removed, etc. : :

AC:Response: We have included a new figure (Figure 4 with topographic profiles of erosion features on B1 in response to comments made by reviewer 2 regarding Figures 3, 4 and 5 see below). This figure illustrates the geometry of erosion features on B1 for stages 1, 2 and 3 and have included reference to this in the text (Lines 351-353). Due to the erroneous results for blocks with higher rugosity we do not use the SfM MVS reconstructions to measure geometry of erosion features on blocks 2 and 3 although we do state that the geometry of erosion features are of similar scale to B1 (Line 351-353)

RC: Lines 204 – 206 – Do you enhance image rendering and texture using some treatments (increase contrast for example) or you just convert RAW in TIFF format?

AC:Response: Images were converted straight from RAW to TIFF format with no treatments were carried out on the images prior to processing. Full details of the processing procedure used can be found in the companion paper to this manuscript (Verma and Bourke, 2018)

RC: Lines 207 – 208 - "Baseline DEMs..." Regarding non-specialist readers, I suggest to also indicate that DEMs raster grids need to be generated with common pixel coordinate origin in addition to common resolution.

AC:Response: Complete common pixel coordinates are also specified in text (Line 239)

RC: Lines 290 – 306 & 315-334 & 335-352 – Results: I suggest adding, if possible, direct measurements of surface topography and simulated erosion features to compare with reconstructed scene geometry. This will be useful especially for scratch because the magnitude of topographic changes due to this type of features can be always within the LoD.

AC:Response: This has been addressed with respect to comments regarding lines 187 – 191 above and Figures 3, 4 and 5 below.

RC: Figures:

RC: General remarks: I suggest using the same caption notation between figure graphic and legend

AC:Response: Complete - changed to same notation

RC: Figure 1: I suggest adding scale bar on the elements; moreover, I think that a caption

AC:Response: Complete- scale bars have been added to the figure showing the picture location over the surface or picture overlap map, such as some view from Photoscan, can illustrate photographs recording strategy.

AC:Response: Figure 1 has been edited to illustrate image acquisition strategy.

RC: Figure 2: I suggest to expand the scale of colour bar in order to observe the spatial variability of DoD between compared DEMs of control blocks.

AC:Response: The scale of colour bar has been expanded to show variability of DoD

RC: Figure 3, 4, 5 – I suggest to eventually used the same regular interval scale in mm for DoD and after LoD in order to increase readability of legend and colours.

AC:Response: The scale bars for DoD have been changed to show regular intervals of change.

RC: I also suggest to plot graphs presenting DEMs between stage 0 and 3 and DoD, crossing erosion features, in order to appreciate the quality of reconstruction with SfM-MVS.

AC:Response: We have included a new figure (figure 4) showing the topographic profiles of erosion features for B1. We do not include topographic profiles of erosion feature for B2 and B3 due to the error due to rugosity discussed.

RC: Figure 5 – The DoD after application of LoD captions in this figure display strange colour bars where the LoD limits not appear clearly.

AC: Response: Complete - The figure has been changed.

A comparison of Structure from Motion Photogrammetry and the Traversing Micro Erosion Meter for measuring erosion on rock shore platforms.

Niamh D. Cullen¹, Ankit K. Verma¹ and Mary C. Bourke¹

5 ¹Department of Geography, Trinity College Dublin, The University of Dublin, 2 College Green, Dublin 2, Ireland.

Correspondence to: Niamh D. Cullen (cullenni@tcd.ie)

Abstract

10 For decades researchers have used the Micro Erosion Meter and its successor the Traversing Micro Erosion Meter to measure microscale rates of vertical erosion (downwearing) on shore platforms. Difficulties with ‘upscaling’ of microscale field data in order to explain long-term platform evolution have led to calls to introduce other methods which allow measurement of platform erosion at different scales. Structure from Motion Photogrammetry is fast emerging as a reliable, cost-effective tool for
15 geomorphic change detection, providing a valuable means for detecting micro to meso-scale geomorphic change over different terrain types. Here we present the results of an experiment where we test the efficacy of Structure from Motion Photogrammetry for measuring change on shore platforms due to different erosion processes (sweeping abrasion, scratching and percussion). Key to this approach is the development of the Coordinate Reference System used to reference and scale the models, and
20 which can be easily deployed in the field. Experiments were carried out on three simulated platform surfaces with low to high relative rugosity to assess the influence of surface roughness. We find that a Structure from Motion Photogrammetry can be used to reliably detect micro (sub-mm) and meso (cm) scale erosion on shore platforms with a low Rugosity Index. As topographic complexity increases, the scale of detection is reduced. We also provide a detailed comparison of the two methods across a range
25 of categories including cost, data collection, analysis and output. We find that Structure from Motion

offers several advantages over the Micro Erosion Meter, most notably the ability to detect and measure erosion of shore platforms at different scales.

Keywords

30 Shore platforms, Structure from Motion Photogrammetry, Traversing/Micro Erosion Metre, erosion.

1 Introduction

There are numerous methods employed for measuring natural rates of change on rock surfaces. For decades researchers were restricted to direct measurement of change relative to a datum, however this method has been largely superseded by techniques which fall into two general categories; contact
35 methods which utilise erosion meters, and non-contact methods such as Terrestrial Laser Scanning (TLS) and Structure from Motion (SfM) Photogrammetry (Moses et al., 2014). On shore platforms, the Micro Erosion Meter (MEM) and its successor the Transverse Micro Erosion Meter (TMEM) are the most frequently applied instruments for quantifying micro-scale erosion. However, SfM Photogrammetry is fast emerging as a valuable tool for detecting and quantifying geomorphic change
40 across a range of scales and environments and represents a potential alternative to the MEM and TMEM for measuring erosion on shore platforms if a suitable level of resolution, accuracy and repeatability can be achieved. There is a large body of literature focussed on each of these methods (e.g. Carrivick et al., 2016; Gómez-Gutiérrez et al., 2014; Hanna, 1966; Kaiser et al., 2014; Smith et al., 2016; Snavely, 2006.; Stephenson and Finlayson, 2009; Stephenson et al., 2010; Stephenson and Kirk, 2001; Trenhaile,
45 2006; Trudgill, 1975; Trudgill et al., 1981; Westoby et al., 2012). A brief overview of the two methods is given below.

1.1 The Micro Erosion Meter and the Traversing Micro Erosion Meter

The MEM was developed and described by Hanna (1966) and High and Hanna (1970) as a tool for
50 measuring relatively slow lowering rates of bedrock surfaces. Since its inception, the MEM and its modified successor, the TMEM (Trudgill et al., 1981) (hereafter T/MEM) have been used by numerous

researchers to measure rates of surface lowering on shore platforms of varying lithologies. The spatial and temporal variability of measured erosion rates for shore platforms have allowed a more detailed understanding of processes operating on shore platform, contributing to the ongoing debate on the origin of shore platforms and the relative contributions of marine, biological and subaerial processes which drive their evolution (See Stephenson and Finlayson, 2009, for a more detailed review of the contribution of the T/MEM to rock coast research). The popularity of the T/MEM stems from the ability to detect sub-mm changes over very short (hours) as is the case with platform swelling and timescales comparative with the duration of many research projects (1-3 years), which are also considered representative of longer-term (decadal) measurements (Stephenson et al., 2010). Add to this, the often cited low cost of construction and portability of the instrument and its popularity among rock coast researchers is easily understood.

Moses et al. (2014) outlined some limitations associated with the T/MEM that had been identified by previous research (e.g. Andrews and Williams, 2000; Ellis, 1986; Foote et al., 2006; Spate et al., 1985; Swantesson et al., 2006; Trenhaile, 2003). Authors studying erosion on (relatively soft) chalk platforms noted that the probe might cause erosion of the platform surface. This ‘probe erosion’ was also noted early on by Spate (1985). However, this does not constitute a problem where erosion rates are rapid (Foote et al., 2006; Swantesson et al., 2006). In addition, Moses et al., (2014) also pointed to previous research which showed that where rapid rates of erosion occur, this may result in the loosening or dislodgement of the bolts on which the T/MEM is placed on annual (Ellis, 1986; Andrews, 2000), or decadal timescales (Stephenson and Kirk, 1996). Trenhaile (2003) noted that although the T/MEM records small amounts of platform downwearing, it cannot record wave quarrying of larger blocks or loss of rock fragments due to frost riving.

Additional significant limitations have also been identified. For example, the location of a T/MEM measurement station is limited to surfaces with low topographic complexity. This is an issue for shore platforms with highly variable meso and macro scale roughness and which only broadly conform to the Sunamura’s (1992) traditional Type A and Type B classification. Excluding these more complex platform morphologies significantly limits our ability to quantify rates and identify processes and styles

of shore platform erosion across the complete spectrum of platform morphologies. Second, while
80 decades of measuring micro-scale erosion using the T/MEM have provided valuable insights into rates
and processes of downwearing on shore platforms, there are difficulties associated with ‘up-scaling’
these field data to explain meso and macro-scale landform development (Warke and McKinley, 2011).
Stephenson and Naylor (2011) noted a tendency towards micro and macro scale studies of shore
platform erosion. A recent study that reviewed 95 publications on shore platforms (Cullen and Bourke,
85 2018) also highlighted this concentration of micro and macro scale studies.

In comparison, meso-scale processes have received less attention, although research at this scale has
increased significantly in the last two decades (Cullen and Bourke, 2018). Indeed, Stephenson et al.
(2010) advocated the introduction of new techniques which capture the full range of scales of erosion
on shore platforms. SfM Photogrammetry is one such technique that has this potential.

90

1.2 Structure from Motion Photogrammetry

Significant developments in digital photogrammetry techniques over the last decade have
revolutionised the collection of 3D topographic data in the geosciences. Traditional photogrammetry
requires a knowledge of the 3D location and orientation of the camera and accurate 3D information of
95 control points in the scene of interest. While methods which allow the accurate calibration of non-metric
cameras and reliable automation of the photogrammetric process have enhanced the use of
photogrammetry in the geosciences (e.g. Carbonneau et al., 2004; Chandler, 1999; Chandler et al.,
2002), it still requires expert understanding and practice (Carrivick et al., 2016). In the last decade,
there have been significant workflow advancements which have dramatically reduced the expertise
100 required. Structure from Motion (SfM) photogrammetry, uses a standard camera for collecting image
data of a three-dimensional (3D) landform.

Multiple overlapping images are taken from different spatial positions and used to reconstruct the 3D
geometry of the target. Unlike traditional photogrammetry, the SfM workflow does not require prior
knowledge of the 3D location, the camera orientation or 3D information on control points before

105 reconstruction of scene geometry. Rather, Scale Invariant Feature Detection (SIFT) (Lowe, 2004) is used to match points between images, and a least square bundle adjustment algorithm is used to align images and produce a ‘sparse’ point cloud representing the most prominent features in the images. A further development utilises Multi-View Stereo (SfM-MVS) algorithms (e.g. Furukawa et al., 2010) to intensify the sparse cloud and merge the resulting 3D point cloud into a single dense point-based model.

110 This can then be used to generate a high-resolution ortho-photo, mesh or Digital Elevation Model (DEM). Successive point clouds and DEMs of the same location or feature can be analysed utilising widely available GIS software (e.g. ESRI ArcGIS desktop or QGIS) and other programs (e.g. CloudCompare) used for geomorphic change detection to quantify erosion and deposition. A large amount of literature has been published on SfM, and the reader is referred to Carrivick et al. (2016);

115 (Fonstad et al., 2013); Micheletti et al. (2015a, 2015b); Özyeşil et al. (2017); Smith et al. (2016); Thoeni et al. (2014); Walkden and Hall (2005); Westoby et al. (2012) and Verma and Bourke (2018) for more detailed discussions of SfM techniques and workflows.

The SfM-MVS workflow has been widely applied in the geosciences at varying scales of resolution from small scale (mm - cm’s) scale studies of soil erosion to morphodynamic studies of beaches, coastal

120 cliffs and braided rivers (e.g. Balaguer-Puig et al., 2017; Brunier et al., 2016a; Brunier et al., 2016b; Javernick et al., 2014; Kaiser et al., 2014; Lim et al., 2010). SfM-MVS offers several advantages over traditional surveying techniques, specifically its relatively low cost and portability of required equipment, i.e. a camera, compared to that of TLS. In addition, the availability of free and relatively low cost commercial software, a semi-automated workflow and the decreasing cost of high-end desktop

125 computers have resulted in the increasing application of this method in geomorphological research. While SfM MVS offer significant advantages at a range of scales, it is worth noting that the scale of some processes operating on shore platforms, for example, platform swelling, operate at resolution currently not obtainable using SfM MVS, and other tried and tested approaches (i.e. the T/MEM) remain the most suitable method of measurement .

130 It is worth noting that the accuracy and resolution of SfM-MVS derived DEMs relies heavily on the quality of the images used and the accuracy of the coordinate reference system. For work on shore

platforms, the accuracy of the DEM is limited by the accuracy of the Ground Control Points (GCPs) used. These are often determined using a Differential GPS (dGPS) or total stations which have reported accuracies of centimetres and millimetres respectively. However, a number of rock breakdown processes, such as granular disintegration (Viles, 2001) and features, such as weathering pits (Bourke et al., 2007; Thornbush, 2012; Viles, 2001) occur at cm to sub-mm scale.

Our work has three foci: First, to test the SfM-MVS for measuring micro-scale erosion on shore platforms. Second to determine the potential of SfM-MVS for meso-scale geomorphic change detection. Third, to provide a robust assessment and comparison of the two methods (T/MEM and SfM-MVS) for measuring erosion on shore platforms. Key to our approach is to adapt the local coordinate reference system (CRS), and SfM-MVS workflow developed by Verma and Bourke (2018). Their system was developed to generate sub-mm scale DEMs of rock surfaces ($<10 \text{ m}^2$) in difficult to access terrains (e.g., cliffs and steep-sided impact crater walls). Their method can produce high resolution (sub-mm) DEMs with sub-mm accuracy. We advance this work through the design and manufacture of a field-hardy Coordinate Reference System (CRS) which can be quickly deployed, repeatedly at the same site. Our approach will enable the application of SfM-MVS for geomorphic change detection on shore platforms at both the micro and meso scale.

In this paper, we present the results of a series of experiments on simulated platform surfaces using our newly developed CRS.

2 Methods

2.1 A manufactured Coordinate Reference System for SfM-MVS

We have adapted the local coordinate reference system of Verma and Bourke (2018) which utilises a precisely measured equilateral triangle with a coded marker (downloaded from Agisoft Photoscan)

attached at each vertex (Figure 1a and b). The x, y and z coordinates of each coded marker are calculated using trigonometry and serve as the GCPs for generating the DEMs in the SfM-MVS workflow. When used for a small surface area ($\leq 6.76 \text{ m}^2$), this method has been proved to produce high resolution (0.5 mm per pixel) DEMs with sub-mm accuracy (Verma and Bourke, 2018).

We mounted the coded markers onto a specifically designed stainless-steel platform (Fig. a and b) based on the design of Verma and Bourke (2018). The platform consists of a 15 cm equilateral triangle with three square steel plates (4 cm x 4 cm x 0.5 cm) and a specially machined leg. Each plate is engineered so that the centre of a plate is fixed precisely ($\pm 0.01\text{mm}$) on one vertex of the triangular base. The centre of each plate is also permanently marked during manufacture to aid the application of coded markers. The base of the leg is machined to fit a stainless-steel square head bolt to a depth of 1.5 cm and is fixed at the centre of gravity on the underside of the triangular base plate.

In the field, the square headed bolt is fixed to the platform by drilling a hole and fixing the bolt with marine grade epoxy resin, using a digital inclinometer to make sure the bolt head is level. This is similar to the approach used to install T/MEM stations. When mounted onto the bolt, this design secures the base plate with the coordinate system in place with a high degree of relocation precision (see section 3.2). This permits repeated measurements and the georeferencing of DEMs for high resolution change detection of field sites.

2.2 The experiments

The experiments were designed to capture different scales of erosion from the granular scale (sub-mm) abrasion of the platform surface to the removal of rock fragments (mm -cm). The accuracy of the SfM-MVS generated DEMs used to calculate DEMs of Difference (DoDs) for geomorphic change detection were assessed by means of horizontal and vertical checkpoints. We also investigated the influence of surface roughness on the accuracy of DEMs and resultant DoDs.

The experiment was set up outdoors on a level table (1.2 m x 0.6 m). Two scaled coded markers (0.25 m) and a series of 2.5 cm x 2.5 cm and 1 cm x 1 cm checkboard pattern, non-coded markers and eight,

evenly spaced wooden blocks of known dimensions were fixed onto the table surface (Figure 1 C). These were used to calculate the horizontal and vertical error of the DEMs (as recommended by Verma and Bourke, 2018). Four simulated platform surface blocks were constructed using moulds and gypsum plaster. Stainless steel, square-headed bolts for mounting the CRS, as described above, were installed on each block. A digital inclinometer (Examobile Bubble Level for iPhone) was used to ensure the surface of the bolt was level. The surface of the experimental blocks was constructed to represent a range of micro (<mm - mm) to meso scale >mm - cm) roughness that is observed in the field. These include low (B1), medium (B2) and high (B2) relative surface roughness (Figure 1 D-F). All blocks were sprayed with matte grey paint to allow easy identification of 'erosion' areas and provide additional visual validation of the models. A set of three 1 cm x 1 cm checkboard non-coded markers were fixed to each experimental block to serve as additional checkpoints for horizontal error. One block (B-con) was used as a control. The remaining three blocks (B1, B2 and B3) were used to carry out the experiment. Each block was placed at the centre of the table when acquiring images.




Figure 1. The experimental setup. a) The CRS top view with scale shown and b) underside with the square headed bolt (inset) c) The experimental platform with markers and wooden blocks used to

calculate the horizontal and vertical error. d, e, f) The simulated platform and g) example of the camera
200 positions for image acquisition.

2.3 Data collection

In order to replicate field conditions as closely as possible, all images of the experimental blocks were
acquired outdoors during a single day. The CRS was placed on the pre-installed square head bolt (Stig
205 Fasteners , SQHM8x75) , and orientation was noted. We used a Nikon D5500 with a variable zoom
lens set up at 24 mm focal length, on a tripod to reduce effects of handshake. Approximately 100 images
of each block were obtained. This number of images was required to capture the full extent of the table
with the non-coded markers and the wooden blocks used for the error analysis. We expect that 40-50
images would be sufficient to generate a high-resolution DEM for a smaller area (e.g. <0.5 m²) in the
210 field. In this study, ~70 images were acquired at a distance of ~1m from the experimental blocks with
the camera mounted on a tripod to reduce the effect of handshake on image quality, and then a series
(25-30 images) of close-range shots at <0.5 m (Figure 1). All three experimental blocks and the control
block were imaged on the table prior to simulating erosion on the blocks.

Recent work has demonstrated the potential efficacy of smaller-scale physical erosion processes (e.g.
215 abrasion, scratching, percussion impact) on high energy Atlantic shore platforms (Cullen and Bourke,
2018). However accurate quantification of these features has not been possible. We, therefore, tested
simulations of three known types of erosion: 1. Sweeping abrasion was simulated by gently abrading
the surface of all three blocks with medium grit sandpaper to variable depths up to approximately 1
mm. 2. Scratches were simulated using a screwdriver 3. Impact percussion marks were simulated
220 on one block using a hammer and chisel.

The CRS was removed and replaced between each stage of data collection, as would be practical for
carrying out repeat surveys in the field. Images of the blocks were taken following simulated erosion
as outlined above.

2.4 Repeatability

225 The utility of this approach for microscale change detection using the CRS developed for this study is
contingent on the exact replacement of the CRS during successive surveys in the field. To test the
repeatability of this approach, we used a control block to acquire images for DEM generation using the
data collection and processing procedure outlined above. At the end of the experiment, the CRS was
replaced and the second series of images were acquired for DEM generation for comparison. DEM
230 accuracy and error propagation were calculated as described below.

2.5 Data processing

2.5.1 Digital Elevation Models

All the images were acquired in the raw format during the experiment. RAW images were converted to
235 14-bit uncompressed tiff format with AdobeRGB colour space in Adobe Lightroom. We used Agisoft
Photoscan (version 1.4.1). Image quality (Q) was assessed using the Estimate Image Quality tool in
AgiSoft and images with Q values < 0.5 were removed. The CRS was used to scale and georeference
the model. Baseline DEMs and orthophoto mosaics for each block were generated and exported at the
highest, common pixel resolution (0.3mm/pixel) and common pixel coordinates.

240

2.5.2 DEMs of Difference

DEMs were exported in ArcMap, and a polygon shapefile was drawn over the area of interest for each
block. The area of interest, i.e. the erosion area of the simulated platform surface, was extracted for
analysis using the Extract by Mask' tool in Spatial Analyst tools. DoDs were generated using the Raster
245 was Math tool (minus) in ArcMap (version 10.5) using Eq. (1),

$$B1 DoD_1 = B1 DEM_1 - B1 DEM_0 \quad (1)$$

where the subscript refers to the experimental stage.

2.5.3 Rugosity

250 To permit evaluation of the impact of different degrees of surface roughness on the accuracy and reliability of our generated DEMs, a rugosity index for each block was calculated in ArcMap using the standard Surface Area ratio method (Dahl, 1973; Risk, 1972) where,

$$Rugosity = \frac{Contoured\ area}{Planar\ area} \quad (2)$$

255 A rugosity index (RI) of 1 indicates a planar surface while increasingly higher values indicate increasingly 'rougher' surfaces. The contoured area for each block was calculated using the relevant baseline DEM. A TIN surface was generated using the Raster to TIN tool in ArcMap. The contoured surface area for the specified region was calculated using the Polygon Volume tool in ArcMap. The planar surface area of the same region was derived using the calculate geometry tool assuming
260 negligible change in slope over the specified area. The RI was calculated using Eq. (2).

2.5.4 DEM accuracy and error propagation

The coded and non-coded markers fixed to the table were used as checkpoints to determine the horizontal (XY) error of the DEMs produced using the CRS developed by Verma and Bourke (2018).
265 For each DEM, the model and its respective orthophoto were imported into ArcMap (version 10.5) and the distance between 30 randomly selected checkpoints and the two coded scale bars (Figure 1) were measured using the measurement tool. The horizontal error was calculated as the Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) of the difference between the measured length and known length.

To determine the vertical accuracy of the DEMs, eight wooden blocks were used as checkpoints (Figure
270 1). The DEMs and orthophotos were imported in ArcMap where the height of wooden blocks were measured using the Interpolate Line tool, by drawing a line across one of the sides of the wooden block and extending it to the ground surface. We ensured that the line drawn was straight. Height was estimated as the difference in mean elevation between wooden block top surface and the surrounding

ground surface on each side. The actual height of wooden blocks was measured by an electronic digital
275 Vernier Caliper. The Vernier Caliper has an accuracy of 0.03 mm and measurement repeatability of
0.01 mm. We obtained five measurements along the same side of wooden block measured in ArcMap.
We used the mean of these five measurements to calculate the height of the wooden block. The actual
height was subtracted from the estimated DEM height to calculate the vertical error.

The calculation of a DoD can result in propagation of error associated with the DEMs used in the
280 computation process. As such, an error analysis is required to increase confidence in the DoD results.
This is particularly important when the scale of geomorphic change being detected is of similar
magnitude to uncertainties of the DEMs used in the DoD calculation.

We determined the minimum level of detection as the most suitable method of error analysis for this
study as the development of shore platforms is primarily an erosional process and as such, the spatial
285 coherence of erosion and deposition (Wheaton et al., 2010) is unsuitable as a method for error analysis
in this study. Additionally, while probabilistic approaches produce reliable estimates of morphological
change (e.g. Brasington et al., 2003; Brasington et al., 2000; Lane et al., 2003), small changes in
elevation, such as those measured in this experiment, may be disguised as noise (Williams, 2012). The
minimum Level of Detection (LoD) uses the quadratic composition of errors in the original DEMs to
290 estimate the propagated error of the calculated DoD (Brasington et al., 2003; Gómez-Gutiérrez et al.,
2014; Lane et al., 2003; Wheaton et al., 2010; Williams, 2012):

$$E_{DoD_{1-2}} = \sqrt{(E_{DEM_1}^2 + E_{DEM_2}^2)} \quad (3)$$

Where $E_{DoD_{1-2}}$ refers to the LoD calculated as the square root of the combined squared errors of the
DEM₁ and DEM₂ used to generate the DoD. If values of E_{DEM_1} and E_{DEM_2} are known, this method can be applied
295 at a global or local scale where the spatial variability of the error terms are known (Lane et al., 2003).
We applied Eq. (3) to determine the minimum threshold of detection for each DEM (Williams, 2012)
for each stage of the experiment. Changes detected that fall within the limits of detection ($+ LOD_{min}$ or
 $- LOD_{min}$) calculated using Eq. (1) are considered noise and interpreted as no change.

300 **3 Results**

3.1 Accuracy and error propagation

DEM generation resulted in a maximum and minimum horizontal (XY) RMSE of 0.23 mm and 0.03 mm respectively. Maximum vertical (Z) RMSE was 0.52 mm with a minimum of 0.23 mm. The minimum limit of detection was calculated at 0 ± 0.27 mm while the maximum LoD was 0 ± 0.71 mm.

305

Table 1. The horizontal (XY) and vertical (Z) RMSE error for the control block (B-con) and the experimental blocks B1, B2 and B3. LoD for each DoD is also shown.

DEM	XY RMSE (mm)	Z RMSE (mm)	LoD ($0 \pm$ mm)
B-con			
1	0.03	0.45	N/A
2	0.12	0.23	0.27
B1			
Stage 0	0.23	0.37	N/A
Stage 1	0.12	0.39	0.54
Stage 2	0.22	0.44	0.56
Stage 3	0.12	0.52	0.71
B2			
Stage 0	0.1	0.40	N/A
Stage 1	0.2	0.46	0.53

Stage 2	0.1	0.35	0.49
Stage 3	0.2	0.45	0.56
B3			
Stage 0	0.2	0.39	N/A
Stage 1	0.1	0.37	0.54
Stage 2	0.1	0.39	0.54
Stage 3	0.1	0.45	0.60

310

3.2 Repeatability

The change in vertical elevation for the control block calculated from the DoD is shown in Figure 2 below. The maximum change in elevation (- 0.29 mm) is within the LoD and is interpreted as no change.

315




Figure 2. (a) The control block (B-Con) orthophoto and (b) DoD showing a change in surface elevation between successive DEMs. Note that detected change is within the calculated LoD (± 0.27 mm).

3.3 Rugosity

320 The RI calculated for each block is shown in Table 2. The control block (B-con) had the lowest rugosity (planar surface) while B1 had a very low RI followed by B2 and B3 in order of increasing rugosity.

Table 2. Contoured surface area (SA), planar surface area and Rugosity Index (RI) for each of the experimental blocks.

Block ID	Contoured SA	Planar SA	R Index
	(mm)	(mm)	
B-con	8.9	8.9	1.00
B1	9.0	8.9	1.01
B2	11.7	10.9	1.07
B3	9.9	8.2	1.21

325

3.3.1 Very low rugosity platform: B1

The results for experimental block B1 are shown in Figure 3 (a-i). The surface area of B1 used in the analysis is shown in (a) where light grey indicates the area of abrasion. For B1 Abrasion, a maximum negative surface change of 1.06 mm was detected, while an increase of 0.30 mm was observed (b) before the LoD was applied. The area of negative surface change between 0.1 mm and 1.06 mm corresponds to the actual area abraded. After thresholding at the LoD, the area of change detected is significantly lower (less than half) the area where the actual change occurred. No increase in surface elevation was detected. For B1 Scratches, the scratched surface is shown in d (black arrows). Before thresholding, the maximum negative change on the surface of B2 was 0.35 mm while an increase in surface elevation of 0.26 mm was detected. Negative changes corresponded well to the observed


330

335

locations of scratches. After thresholding at the LoD, no changes were detected on the block surface (f). For B1 impact percussions, the locations where block fragments were removed are shown in G (black arrows). Maximum negative change detected, i.e. predicted the depth of percussions, was 1.49 mm, while a positive change in surface elevation of 0.30 mm was detected before thresholding (H).

340 After thresholding, no positive change in surface elevation was detected and predicted negative change corresponded well to the actual location of percussions (i).

To summarise, for a simulated platform with a very low RI, sweeping abrasion and chips were reliably detected in the thresholded DoD. Scratch depths were less than the LoD and as such were not detected in the thresholded model.




345

Figure 3. (a) B1 Stage 1 Orthophoto showing abraded surface of simulated platform surface (light grey). (b) DoD for B1 Stage 1 before thresholding at LoD and the thresholded DoD (c). (d) B1 Stage 2 orthophoto showing location of scratches, (e) B1 Stage 2 DoD before thresholding and (f) DoD shown in E thresholded at LoD. (g) B1 Stage 3 orthophoto showing locations of percussions. (h) B1 Stage 2 DoD before thresholding at the LoD and the thresholded DoD (I).

350

The topographic profiles of erosion features on B1 for stages 1, 2 and 3 are shown in Figure 4. The profiles show the geometry (i.e. max depth and width) of erosion features on B1 which are similar in scale for all experimental blocks.




355 **Figure 4.** Location and topographic profiles of ‘erosion’ features on the simulated platform surface of B1 for (a) stage 1 (profile shown in d), (b) stage 2 (e and f, top and bottom respectively shown in b) and (c) stage 3 (g, h and i, top, middle and bottom profiles respectively shown in b). Grey shaded areas in d-i show the LoD.

360 3.3.2 Moderate rugosity platform (B2)

The results for experimental block B2 are shown in Figure 5 (a-i). The abraded surface area is indicated by lighter tone areas in Figure 5a. While this abrasion is visible in the DOD (Figure 5b), a significant component of the detected change occurred where no change was expected. This corresponds to ‘shadow zones’ associated with topographic highs. This result was not affected by thresholding at the
365 LoD (Fig. 5c).

Scratches are evident in Figure 5d. Furthermore, the location of negative change corresponds well to the location of scratches (Fig. 5e). However, similar to B1, a small area of change is detected around the deepest scratch where none is expected (Fig. 5f). The impact percussion features are shown in (Fig. 5g). The maximum negative change in the surface elevation detected (i.e. the depth of percussions),
370 was 3.35 mm, while the maximum positive change was 0.57 mm (h). Following thresholding, no positive change in elevation was detected (Fig. 5i) and negative change corresponded well to the actual location of percussions.



375 **Figure 5.** (a) B2 Stage 1 Orthophoto showing abraded area (light grey) of simulated platform surface, (b) B2 Stage 1 DoD before thresholding at LoD and the thresholded DoD (c). (d) B2 Stage 2 orthophoto showing scratched surface of B2 (black arrows). (e) B2 Stage 2 DoD before thresholding and (f) DoD shown in E thresholded at LoD. Note change detected in shadow zones in F (white arrow) where none is expected. (g) B2 Stage 3 orthophoto percussed surface. (h) DoD before thresholding at LoD and (i) 380 DoD thresholded using calculated LoD.

To summarise, for a simulated platform with a moderate RI, only scratches and impacts were detected in the thresholded DoD.

3.2.3 Relatively high rugosity platform (B3)

385 The results for B3 are shown in Figure 6 (a-i). The light-toned areas in (a) indicate the abraded surface of the experimental block. In general, the maximum negative change detected (red and orange areas in b) correspond well to the abraded area. However, there are significant increases and decreases (>3 mm) in surface elevation where no change was expected. As above, the largest of these errors generally occurred in ‘shadow zones’. Thresholding did not significantly improve the resultant DoD (i). For scratches (Fig. 6d) there was a reduction in surface elevation of 3.45 mm detected where no change was expected. As with the previous stage, these changes were observed to occur in shadow zones. Thresholding at the LoD did not improve the resultant DoD, and both increases and decreases were recorded where no change was expected (white arrows in i). The location percussions are shown in Figure 6g. Maximum negative change detected corresponded mainly to the location of percussion
395 however negative change was recorded where none was expected (h). As before, an abnormal change occurred in shadow zones. Thresholding improved the resultant DoD (i), and the majority of negative change observed corresponded well to the location of percussions, except in some small areas (white arrows in i), associated with shadow zones. Maximum percussion depth was recorded at 5.43 mm.

To summarise, for a simulated platform with a relatively high RI, only impacts were reliably detected
400 in the thresholded DoD. However, there were errors (larger than in B2) in the data, which are concentrated in topographic ‘shadows’.




Figure 6. (a) B3 Stage 1 Orthophoto showing abraded surface area (light grey) of simulated platform surface. (b) DoD for B3 Stage 3 before thresholding and (c) DoD at LoD shown at 50% transparency
 405 overlain onto the orthophoto shown in A. Note significant geomorphic change detected in shadow zones (white arrows) where no change is expected. (d) B3 Stage 2 orthophoto showing scratched the surface of the simulated platform (black arrows), (e) DoD before thresholding and (f) DoD thresholded at LoD. As in C, note change higher than the LoD detected in shadow zones (white arrows) in f where no change
 410 is expected. (g) B3 Stage 3 orthophoto showing the location of percussions (black arrows), (h) B3 Stage

3 DoD before thresholding at LoD and (i) B3 Stage 3 DoD thresholded using calculated LoD. Note shadow zones (white arrows) where DoD indicates change, but none is expected.

3.3 Comparison of the T/MEM and SfM-MVS for measuring erosion on shore platforms

415 The T/MEM has, over decades, cemented its position as a low-cost method for measuring microscale erosion on shore platforms, while SfM-MVS is fast emerging as a valuable tool in the geomorphologists toolkit for the detection and measurement of geomorphic change at a range of scales. Both approaches have advantages and limitations, and the choice for use one method over another will depend on a number of factors such as cost, the ease of data collection, quality and value of the data required to
420 answer a specific research question.

We have compared our experience of using the T/MEM to that of the SfM-MVS (based on the CRS and workflow used in this study) as a means for detecting geomorphic change on shore platforms under the following headings. We evaluated both techniques for; ease of data acquisition (including both installation and data collection), data processing, hardware costs, software costs, model resolution,
425 accuracy and overall ease of use. Our reported installation, data collection and data processing times refer to a single measurement station. Hardware costs for the T/MEM are based on initial outlay for SDS drill, drill bits, the T/MEM platform and engineers gauge. Hardware for the SfM-MVS workflow described in this study refers to initial outlay for the manufacture of CRS and cost of the camera. Basic hardware costs (e.g. computer for processing) are not included. Overall ease of use for each method is
430 based on our experience of data acquisition in the field (installation and collection) and data processing.

An overall comparison is provided based on the above factors in addition to the value of the data obtained.

A comparison of the T/MEM and the SfM-MVS approach as a means for detecting geomorphic change on shore platforms is shown in Figure 7. Both methods have clear advantages and disadvantages, and
435 the comparison is intended to be a guide to assist researchers in choosing the most appropriate method for specific project deliverables.

3.3.1 Installation

To install a single T/MEM measurement station, three holes are drilled at the apex of an equilateral triangle and pins set into each hole with a marine grade epoxy resin. The time needed to install a single

440 **TMEM station varies between 20 and 80 minutes depending on operator experience and rock hardness.**

For the workflow used in this study, the time needed to install a single bolt to mount the CRS will take approximately one-third of the time.




Figure 7. Comparison of TMEM and the SfM – MVS workflow presented in this study under different categories. Values showed (cost, time etc) increase from left to right apart from ‘Resolution’ where decreasing values from left to right indicate increasing resolution.

445

3.3.2 Data collection

In our experience, the time needed to collect data from a single station (based on 100 measurements) using a TMEM varies between 15-30 mins (grey bar in figure 6). This will depend on whether the digital gauge being used has a USB memory, which automatically stores measurements as they are taken (e.g. Stephenson, 1997), or whether measurements are recorded manually which increases the time required. In comparison, acquiring the 40-50 images as are necessary for SfM-MVS took approximately 15 minutes.

455

3.3.3 Data processing

The time required to process TMEM data will depend on the number of measurements collected and the method used to record data in the field, i.e. whether they are stored automatically (e.g. Stephenson, 1997) or manually. Automatic recording reduces the time needed to process data however manual processing can take up to 30 minutes per station (based on 100 measurements). Data processing takes significantly longer for SfM-MVS (2-3 hours per DEM) depending on a number of images and the processor used.

3.3.4 Hardware costs

The cost of a TMEM platform varies considerably depending on whether it is made in-house or commercially. In-house construction is considerably less (~€900 for materials and labour), while a commercial TMEM costs approximately €2000 (based on 2017 prices). The cost of the digital gauge also varies depending on the manufacturer, model, resolution, accuracy and Ingress Protection (IP) needed and range from €200-€500. Most rock types will also require an SDS drill with masonry bits which cost in the region of €600. The cost of the 316 stainless steel pins also varies depending on whether they are constructed 'in-house' or purchased commercially.

470

3.3.5 Software costs

Software cost for T/MEM data processing is negligible while there are free open source software
475 available for processing of images for SfM–MVS (e.g. Visual SfM). However, commercial packages
such as Agisoft Photoscan can cost between €600 and €3500 depending on the licence type (e.g. Pro,
Standard, Educational, Stand alone or Floating).

3.3.6 Resolution and Error

480 Depending on the digital gauge used, T/MEM measurements can have a resolution of up to 0.001 mm
with a reported measurement error of ± 0.005 mm (Gómez-Pujol et al., 2007). This resolution permits
detection of change at a scale not currently achievable using the SfM MVS approach described here.
Resolution for SfM-MVS (achieved in this study) was 0.3 mm per pixel. For some DEMs it was less
than this (0.15 mm per pixel) however differencing of DEMs requires that pixel resolution be the same
485 for both DEMs being compared. The CRS and SfM-MVS workflow employed for this study achieved
maximum XY and Z RMSE errors of 0.2 mm and 0.5 mm respectively.

4 Discussion

The T/MEM has contributed significantly to our understanding of microscale erosion processes on
490 shore platforms. Measurements of microscale platform erosion using a T/MEM are limited to repeated
point measurements over time which provides a mean rate of surface downwearing within the
measurement area for that measurement period with the dominant process(es) being inferred from the
spatial and temporal variation in downwearing rates (Trenhaile, 2003). However, the method's inability
to measure erosion at different scales was noted by Stephenson and Finlayson (2009) as a limitation
495 and the authors advocated the introduction of new methods for measuring shore platform erosion at a
range of scales. We have developed a CRS which can be quickly deployed by researchers in the field
for detection of micro and meso-scale erosion on shore platforms using SfM-MVS Photogrammetry
and a geomorphic change detection approach. The CRS described in this study permits rigorous

georeferencing of DEMs derived using the SfM-MVS workflow. Although we demonstrate the potential of the method on a simulated shore platform, the approach is not limited to shore platforms and has potential as a means for measuring bedrock erosion at similar scales in other environments (see Turowski and Cook, 2017 for examples).

We have demonstrated that SfM-MVS Photogrammetry can be used to reliably detect sub-mm changes on shore platforms where the platform surface has a low RI. This approach successfully detected 0.3 mm downwearing of the simulated platform surface of B1 caused by abrasion of the surface. While we were also able to identify shallow scratches on the surface of the experimental block, applying the LoD obscured this finding due to the shallow depth of scratches (< 0.3 mm). However, we were able to detect loss of mm-cm sized rock effectively. This demonstrates that our approach offers a method for cross scalar analysis of erosion on shore platforms, offering a much-needed means to examine relationships between micro and meso-scale processes of shore platform erosion and morphologies.

Our results indicate that as RI increases, the reliability of SfM-MVS for detection of fine scale (sub-mm) erosion is reduced due to increased topographic complexity. Despite areas of reduced elevation, i.e. erosion, aligning well with areas where the surface had been abraded, there were areas of change where clearly none was expected. Despite this, our approach successfully detected the loss of rock fragments on the simulated platform surface of B2 (higher RI) once the LoD was applied. Similarly, for B3, which had the highest RI, fine-scale erosion and scratches were not detected reliably, and while the loss of rock fragments was detected, the effect of complex topography in creating shadows zones produced abnormal change. The orthophotos were important in this regard as they provided visual validation of the models and highlighted the influence of shadow zones in introducing error into the models. The additional uncertainty introduced into the models due to the surface complexity was not accounted for using the LoD approach. This resulted in abnormal change detection associated with meso scale (> 1 mm) slopes and troughs. Indeed, this is a well recognised limitation of SfM MVS approach to geomorphic change detection, and appropriate solutions (e.g. precision mapping) have been proposed. While the strong influence of surface complexity may be considered a limitation, it should be noted that the T/MEM is largely restricted to measurements of downwearing on small surface areas

with low topographic complexity. As such, it does not exclude this approach as an alternative for measuring change on this type of surface.

Precision mapping (James et al., 2017) offers a potential approach to address this as there is an opportunity to increase confidence in the accuracy of point clouds derived for more complex platform morphologies. While the LoD assumes a global uniform distribution of error, precision mapping explicitly accounts for the spatially variable precision characteristic of photo-based surveys (James et al., 2017) and has been demonstrated to improve change detection in areas with complex topography. Future work will test this approach.

Another possible contributor to the erroneous results may be variable lighting conditions and specular reflection. In a study by Guidi et al. (2014) demonstrated that the use of polarising filter and digital pre-processing with HDR imaging could help to homogenise brightness over the subject subsequently improving image matching We recommend these approaches to overcome this problem.

This study and our experience in the field using a TMEM suggest that the time required for data collection (installation and acquisition) collection is shorter using an SfM-MVS approach compared to the TMEM. The requirement of just one bolt per measurement site for the CRS described here, compared to three bolts per measurement site for the TMEM, reduces the time needed for initial installation in the field. Add to that the time required to collect images for the SfM-MVS workflow compared to the time needed to obtain 100 TMEM measurements, and SfM-MVS has notable advantages. This reduced installation and data acquisition time are of particular worth for shore platforms with meso to macro tidal ranges, where time in the intertidal zone is limited to, at most, a couple of hours either side of low tide. For larger platforms, where a number of measurement stations are located in the intertidal zone, time is a limiting factor, and methods which allow rapid installation data collection are preferable. Regarding data processing, the time required depends on the gauge used to collect the TMEM data, i.e. manual or automatic and the desired output (point measurements or 3D surface). Regardless, the processing time required for SfM-MVS is significantly higher (2-3 hours per DEM generated). Nevertheless, batch processing options in Photoscan mean that DEM generation process/steps can be automated and the user time on the computer is reduced. With respect to image

acquisition for SfM-MVS, we used a Nikon D5500 and had included this in our overall analysis however expensive cameras are not a prerequisite. For example, in a recent experimental study of surface features in sand caused by sublimation of CO₂ ice, of a similar scale to this study, Mc Keown et al. (2017) used an iPhone to acquire images and utilised the same CRS developed by Verma and Bourke (2018) to scale and reference DEMs, achieving similar accuracy and resolution (<1 mm).

It is important to note that the resolution of the SfM MVS approach, while capable of detecting sub-mm scale change, is still 2 orders of magnitude lower than that achievable with a T/MEM. The T/MEM offers considerable resolution and accuracy for measurements of very small surface changes, which is particularly useful for measuring very slow rates of downwearing and detection of very small changes due to processes which operate at much finer spatial scales such as platform swelling (e.g. Gómez-Pujol et al., 2007; Hemmingsen et al., 2007; Porter and Trenhaile, 2007; Stephenson and Kirk, 2001; Trenhaile, 2006). For faster-eroding rocks, the precision obtainable using a T/MEM is not required (Stephenson and Finlayson, 2009). While the highest common resolution of the DEMs produced for this study were 0.3 mm/pixel, this is demonstrated to be sufficient for measuring micro-scale and meso scale erosion on surfaces with low RI and loss of rock fragments on more topographically complex surfaces.

In terms of data output, the T/MEM produces a series of surface point measurements. These can be compared directly to point measurements made from previous surveys or plotted as a digital elevation model for 3D visualisation of the surface at the bolt site (e.g. Stephenson, 1997). The spatial and temporal variation in downwearing rates can be used to infer the efficacy of erosion processes. In this, we suggest that SfM-MVS has a clear and important geomorphic advantage. The technique produces point clouds and DEMs which can be used to identify and classify surface features as well as detect geomorphic change at different scales. This added value in the approach is significant. Orthophotograph mosaics offer additional means for validating meso scale changes on the rock surface and identifying erosion styles.

5 Conclusions

580 1. This study demonstrates that SfM can be used to detect sub-mm changes due to erosion on shore
platforms. However, we find that as the complexity of the rock surface topography increases, the
reliability of SfM to detect sub-mm changes decreases. We note that the application of TMEM is also
limited to relatively planar surfaces. Future work will test the precision mapping approach of James et
al. (2017) to determine the spatial distribution of error and increase confidence in results on more
585 topographically complex platform surfaces.

2. While TMEM has higher resolution and accuracy compared to SfM, it offers a limited number of
point measurements over a small area. In comparison, SfM produces 3D topographic data from dense
point clouds and DEMs which can be used to identify, classify and quantify different styles and scales
of erosion.

590 3. In this study, we have provided a detailed comparison between TMEM and SfM methods to measure
change due to erosion of rock surfaces in the coastal environment. The approach is not limited to shore
platforms and has potential as a means for measuring erosion at similar scales in a range of
environments.

595

Data availability

All data is available upon request from the corresponding author at cullenni@tcd.ie

Author contributions

600 N.D.C. prepared and wrote the main body of the manuscript with discussion and contributions from
A.K.V. and M.C.B. N.D.C. designed the experiment with input from A.K.V. and M.C.B. A.K.V.
designed the original coordinate reference system, and N.D.C. designed the field adapted version with
input from A.K.V. and M.C.B. N.D.C. and A.K.V. carried out the experiments. A.K.V. processed images

and generated the digital elevation models. N.D.C. carried out data analysis. A.K.V. and M.C.B.
605 reviewed and edited the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

N.D.C and A.K.V were supported by the Trinity College Dublin Postgraduate Studentship, Faculty of
Engineering, Mathematics and Science. The authors would also like to thank the Geography
610 Department at Trinity College Dublin for additional support in carrying out this research. Our thanks
also to Neil Dawson from J.F. Dunne Engineering for expertise in the manufacture of the field adapted
coordinate reference system used in the experiment.

References,

615 Andrews, C. and Williams, R. B.: Limpet erosion of chalk shore platforms in southeast
England, *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 25, 1371-1381, 2000, doi:10.1002/1096-
9837(200011)

Balaguer-Puig, M., Marqués-Mateu, Á., Lerma, J. L., and Ibáñez-Asensio, S.: Estimation of
620 small-scale soil erosion in laboratory experiments with Structure from Motion
photogrammetry, *Geomorphology*, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.geomorph.2017.04.035

Bourke, M. C., Brearley, J. A., Haas, R., and Viles, H. A.: A photographic atlas of rock
breakdown features in geomorphic environments, Planetary Science Institute, 2007.

Brasington, J., Langham, J., and Rumsby, B.: Methodological sensitivity of morphometric
625 estimates of coarse fluvial sediment transport, *Geomorphology*, 53, 299-316, 2003, doi:
10.1016/S0169-555X(02)00320-3

Brasington, J., Rumsby, B., and McVey, R.: Monitoring and modelling morphological change
in a braided gravel-bed river using high resolution GPS-based survey, *Earth Surface
Processes and Landforms*, 25, 973-990, 2000, doi:10.1002/1096-9837(200008)

Brunier, G., Fleury, J., Anthony, E. J., Gardel, A., and Dussouillez, P.: Close-range airborne
630 Structure-from-Motion Photogrammetry for high-resolution beach morphometric surveys:
Examples from an embayed rotating beach, *Geomorphology*, 261, 76-88, 2016a,
doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2016.02.025

Brunier, G., Fleury, J., Anthony, E. J., Pothin, V., Vella, C., Dussouillez, P., Gardel, A., and
635 Michaud, E.: Structure-from-Motion photogrammetry for high-resolution coastal and fluvial
geomorphic surveys, *Géomorphologie: relief, processus, environnement*, 22, 147-161,
2016b, doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2016.02.025

- Carbonneau, P. E., Lane, S. N., and Bergeron, N. E.: Catchment-scale mapping of surface grain size in gravel bed rivers using airborne digital imagery, *Water resources research*, 40, 2004, doi:10.1029/2003WR002759
- 640 Carrivick, J. L., Smith, M. W., and Quincey, D. J.: *Structure from Motion in the Geosciences*, John Wiley & Sons, 2016.
- Chandler, J.: Effective application of automated digital photogrammetry for geomorphological research, *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 24, 51-63, 1999, doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1096-9837(199901)24:1<51::AID-ESP948>3.0.CO;2-H
- 645 Chandler, J., Ashmore, P., Paola, C., Gooch, M., and Varkaris, F.: Monitoring river-channel change using terrestrial oblique digital imagery and automated digital photogrammetry, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 92, 631-644, 2002, doi:10.1111/1467-8306.00308
- 650 Cullen, N. D. and Bourke, M. C.: Clast abrasion of a rock shore platform on the Atlantic coast of Ireland, *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 43 (12) 2627-2641, 2018, doi:10.1002/esp.4421
- Dahl, A. L.: Surface area in ecological analysis: quantification of benthic coral-reef algae, *Marine Biology*, 23, 239-249, 1973, doi:10.1007/BF00389331
- 655 Ellis, N.: *Morphology, process and rates of denudation on the chalk shore platform of East Sussex*, Brighton Polytechnic, PhD Thesis, 1986.
- Fonstad, M. A., Dietrich, J. T., Courville, B. C., Jensen, J. L., and Carbonneau, P. E.: Topographic structure from motion: a new development in photogrammetric measurement, *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 38, 421-430, 2013, doi:10.1002/esp.3366
- 660 Foote, Y., Plessis, E., Robinson, D., Hénaff, A., and Costa, S.: Rates and patterns of downwearing of chalk shore platforms of the Channel: comparisons between France and England, *Zeitschrift Fur Geomorphologie*, 144, 93-115, 2006, doi:N/A
- Furukawa, Y., Curless, B., Seitz, S. M., and Szeliski, R.: Towards internet-scale multi-view stereo, 2010, 1434-1441, doi:10.1109/CVPR.2010.5539802.
- 665 Gómez-Gutiérrez, Á., Schnabel, S., Berenguer-Sempere, F., Lavado-Contador, F., and Rubio-Delgado, J.: Using 3D photo-reconstruction methods to estimate gully headcut erosion, *Catena*, 120, 91-101, 2014, doi:10.1016/j.catena.2014.04.004
- Gómez-Pujol, L., Stephenson, W. J., and Fornós, J. J.: Two-hourly surface change on supra-tidal rock (Marengo, Victoria, Australia), *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 32, 1-12, 2007, doi:10.1002/esp.1373
- 670 Guidi, G., Gonizzi, S., and Micoli, L.: Image pre-processing for optimizing automated photogrammetry performances, 2014, 145-152, doi:10.5194/isprsannals-II-5-145-2014.
- Hanna, F.: A technique for measuring the rate of erosion of cave passages, *Proceedings University of Bristol Speleology Society*, 83-86, 1966,
- 675 Hemmingsen, S. A., Eikaas, H. S., and Hemmingsen, M. A.: The influence of seasonal and local weather conditions on rock surface changes on the shore platform at Kaikoura Peninsula, South Island, New Zealand, *Geomorphology*, 87, 239-249, 2007, doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2006.09.010

- 680 James, M. R., Robson, S., and Smith, M. W.: 3-D uncertainty-based topographic change detection with structure-from-motion photogrammetry: precision maps for ground control and directly georeferenced surveys, *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 2017, doi:10.1002/esp.4125
- Javernick, L., Brasington, J., and Caruso, B.: Modeling the topography of shallow braided rivers using Structure-from-Motion photogrammetry, *Geomorphology*, 213, 166-182, 2014, doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2014.01.006
- 685 Kaiser, A., Neugirg, F., Rock, G., Müller, C., Haas, F., Ries, J., and Schmidt, J.: Small-scale surface reconstruction and volume calculation of soil erosion in complex Moroccan gully morphology using structure from motion, *Remote Sensing*, 6, 7050-7080, 2014, doi::10.3390/rs6087050
- 690 Lane, S. N., Westaway, R. M., and Murray Hicks, D.: Estimation of erosion and deposition volumes in a large, gravel-bed, braided river using synoptic remote sensing, *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 28, 249-271, 2003, doi:10.1002/esp.483
- Lim, M., Rosser, N. J., Allison, R. J., and Petley, D. N.: Erosional processes in the hard rock coastal cliffs at Staithes, North Yorkshire, *Geomorphology*, 114, 12-21, 2010, doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2009.02.011
- 695 Lowe, D. G.: Distinctive image features from scale-invariant keypoints, *International journal of computer vision*, 60, 91-110, 2004, doi:10.1023/B:VISI.0000029664.99615.94
- Mc Keown, L., Bourke, M., and McElwaine, J.: Experiments On Sublimating Carbon Dioxide Ice And Implications For Contemporary Surface Processes On Mars, *Scientific reports*, 7, 14181, 2017, doi:10.1038/s41598-017-14132-2
- 700 Micheletti, N., Chandler, J. H., and Lane, S. N.: Investigating the geomorphological potential of freely available and accessible structure-from-motion photogrammetry using a smartphone, *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 40, 473-486, 2015a, doi:10.1002/esp.3648
- 705 Micheletti, N., Chandler, J. H., and Lane, S. N.: Structure from Motion (SfM) Photogrammetry. In: *Geomorphological Techniques*, 2 (2.2), British Society for Geomorphology, Loondon, 2015b.
- 710 Moses, C., Robinson, D., and Barlow, J.: Methods for measuring rock surface weathering and erosion: A critical review, *Earth-Science Reviews*, 135, 141-161, 2014, doi:10.1016/j.earscirev.2014.04.006
- Özyeşil, O., Voroninski, V., Basri, R., and Singer, A.: A survey of structure from motion*, *Acta Numerica*, 26, 305-364, 2017, doi:10.1017/S069249291700006X

- 715 Porter, N. J. and Trenhaile, A.: Short-term rock surface expansion and contraction in the intertidal zone, *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 32, 1379-1397, 2007, doi:10.1002/esp.1479
- Risk, M. J.: Fish diversity on a coral reef in the Virgin Islands, The Smithsonian Institution,, Washington, Atoll Research Bulletin, Report No. 153, 1972.
- 720 Smith, M., Carrivick, J., and Quincey, D.: Structure from motion photogrammetry in physical geography, *Progress in Physical Geography*, 40, 247-275, 2016,
- Snively, N.: Bundler: SfM for unordered image collections, <http://phototour.cs.washington.edu/bundler/>.(15.09. 10).2006.
- 725 Spate, A., Jennings, J., Smith, D., and Greenaway, M.: The micro-erosion meter: use and limitations, *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 10, 427-440, 1985, doi:10.1002/esp.3290100504
- Stephenson, W. and Finlayson, B.: Measuring erosion with the micro-erosion meter— contributions to understanding landform evolution, *Earth-Science Reviews*, 95, 53-62, 2009, doi:10.1016/j.earscirev.2009.03.006
- 730 Stephenson, W., Kirk, R., Hemmingsen, S., and Hemmingsen, M.: Decadal scale micro erosion rates on shore platforms, *Geomorphology*, 114, 22-29, 2010, doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2008.10.013
- Stephenson, W. and Naylor, L.: Within site geological contingency and its effect on rock coast erosion, *Journal of Coastal Research*, 61, 831-835, 2011,.
- 735 Stephenson, W. J.: Improving the traversing micro-erosion meter, *Journal of Coastal Research*, 236-241, 1997,.
- Stephenson, W. J. and Kirk, R. M.: Measuring erosion rates using the micro-erosion meter: 20 years of data from shore platforms, Kaikoura Peninsula, South Island, New Zealand, *Marine Geology*, 131, 209-218, 1996,doi:10.1016/0025-3227(96)00008-4
- 740 Stephenson, W. J. and Kirk, R. M.: Surface swelling of coastal bedrock on inter-tidal shore platforms, Kaikoura Peninsula, South Island, New Zealand, *Geomorphology*, 41, 5-21, 2001,doi:10.1016/S0169-555X(01)00100-3
- Swantesson, J., Moses, C., Berg, G., and Jansson, K. M.: Methods for measuring shoreplatform micro-erosion; a comparison of the micro-erosion meter and the laser scanner, *Zeitschrift fur Geomorphologie Supplementband*, 144, 1-17, 2006,.
- 745 Thoeni, K., Giacomini, A., Murtagh, R., and Kniest, E.: A comparison of multi-view 3D reconstruction of a rock wall using several cameras and a laser scanner, *The International Archives of Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences*, 40, 573, 2014, doi:10.5194/isprsarchives-XL-5-573-201
- 750 Thornbush, M. J.: A site-specific index based on weathering forms visible in Central Oxford, UK, *Geosciences*, 2, 277-297, 2012,doi:10.3390/geosciences2040277

- 755 Trenhaile, A.: Tidal wetting and drying on shore platforms: an experimental study of surface expansion and contraction, *Geomorphology*, 76, 316-331, 2006, doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2005.11.006
- Trenhaile, A. S.: Modeling shore platforms: present status and future developments. In: *Advances in Coastal Modeling*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, Lakhan, V. C. (Ed.), Elsevier Science B.V. , 2003.
- 760 Trudgill, S.: Measurement of erosional weight loss of rock tablets, *British Geomorphological Research Group Technical Bulletin*, 13-20 pp., 1975.
- Trudgill, S., High, C., and Hanna, F.: Improvements to the micro-erosion meter, *British Geomorphological Research Group Technical Bulletin*, 3-17 pp., 1981.
- 765 Turowski, J. M. and Cook, K. L.: Field techniques for measuring bedrock erosion and denudation, *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 42, 109-127, 2017, doi:10.1002/esp.4007
- Verma, A. K. and Bourke, M. C.: A Structure from Motion photogrammetry-based method to generate sub-millimetre resolution Digital Elevation Models for investigating rock breakdown features, *Earth Surf. Dynam. Discuss.*, <https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-2018-53>, in review, 2018. , <https://www.earth-surf-dynam-discuss.net/esurf-2018-53/>
- 770 Viles, H. A.: Scale issues in weathering studies, *Geomorphology*, 41, 63-72, 2001, doi:10.1016/S0169-555X(01)00104-0
- Walkden, M. and Hall, J.: A predictive mesoscale model of the erosion and profile development of soft rock shores, *Coastal Engineering*, 52, 535-563, 2005, doi:10.1016/j.coastaleng.2005.02.005
- 775 Warke, P. A. and McKinley, J.: Scale issues in geomorphology, *Geomorphology*, 130, 1-4, 2011, doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2011.04.031
- Westoby, M., Brasington, J., Glasser, N., Hambrey, M., and Reynolds, J.: 'Structure-from-Motion' photogrammetry: A low-cost, effective tool for geoscience applications, *Geomorphology*, 179, 300-314, 2012,
- 780 Wheaton, J. M., Brasington, J., Darby, S. E., and Sear, D. A.: Accounting for uncertainty in DEMs from repeat topographic surveys: improved sediment budgets, *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 35, 136-156, 2010, doi:10.1002/esp.1886
- Williams, R.: DEMs of difference. In: *Geomorphological Techniques*, 2 (3.2), British Society for Geomorphology, London, UK, 2012.

785