

Interactive comment on “Short Communication: Monitoring rock falls with the Raspberry Shakes” by Andrea Manconi et al.

F. Fuchs (Referee)

florian.fuchs@univie.ac.at

Received and published: 28 September 2018

Dear Authors, dear Andrea, dear Editor,

first of all, I wasn't able to find the ESurf criteria for "Short Communication" compared to "Research Article" so I'm not sure where the limits in terms of Figures/Pages and requirements in terms of scientific impact are ... I also think it doesn't matter too much.

I think putting more emphasize on the instrumental part (as suggested in the reviews) and the performance of the sensors in such environments would already significantly improve the manuscript, while still allowing to keep it rather short.

In my view it's alright if you decide to leave a detailed discussion on detection algorithm / event classification / rockfall catalog for future work (there's a lot one could do and it

C1

will take time). Anyways, I believe some of the points raised in the review can be answered at least briefly without overly expanding the manuscript (e.g. briefly outline how the 250 events database was compiled, state some criteria, etc.).

You don't have to rush it, I think, so if switching to "Research Article" gives you more time and space - go for it.

If you still prefer "Short Communication" but are running out of space: a very drastic solution (but somewhat OK in my view) would be to drop the example events section (4.1 - 4.3) completely, or drastically shorten it, or move it in great parts to Supplemental Material (e.g. show example records in Supplemental, without describing in greater detail).

This is my personal view, I'm not sure if the others would agree.

Best regards, Florian Fuchs

Interactive comment on Earth Surf. Dynam. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-2018-62>, 2018.

C2