

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “A century of ice retreat on Kilimanjaro: the mapping reloaded” by N. J. Cullen et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 24 November 2012

I find this a solid, thorough and in general well written paper that deserves to be published in TC. The authors give a detailed assessment of the maps and image sources of the glaciers of Kilimanjaro. The glaciers in Kilimanjaro may not have a big importance on a global scale as they represent very little area and volume, but much work has been done and indeed it will be of interest to others. The authors also deserve praise for providing all their map data to GLIMS so they are available for others to use, excellent!

Minor comments.

The paper is well written, but could be even better with adding some commas before but (check all occurrences), fewer adjectives and cut/break up some of the very long sentences. I find also the use of the same references over and over a bit too much,

C2273

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive
Comment

could be done differently, although the authors clearly seem to know the literature and give proper credits to previous work.

4238, extremely valuable, a bit too much to use extremely I think, remove, explain the data source, not conclusions here. see also 4244 4239, 10-11, was it nos also used for the extent? 4240, 27, how can it be replaced if it was not used, just say therefore not used or not used. 4244, here extremely valuable is repeated... 4245, honours? 4248, 7-10, could be rewritten and shortened to clarify the message 4253, the conclusion session could be shortened, and be less talkative and more direct. no need to have reference here (remove all or most), everything should already been referred to. Motivation should have been stated in the introduction, acknowledgements placed in the acknowledgements and so on. 4259, what does formally mean hear, seems odd, suggest to remove. 4260, table not so easy to read, but maybe this is due to the TCD layout 4262, fig 2. years instead of periods

Interactive comment on The Cryosphere Discuss., 6, 4233, 2012.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)