

Interactive comment on “Monitoring Tropical Debris Covered Glacier Dynamics from High Resolution Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Photogrammetry, Cordillera Blanca, Peru” by Oliver Wigmore and Bryan Mark

C. R. Stokes (Editor)

c.r.stokes@durham.ac.uk

Received and published: 12 June 2017

Dear Oliver,

You will, by now, have received formal notification that the open discussion of your manuscript has closed.

I would like to thank Christian Huggel, the anonymous referee and Mauri Pelto for their comments on your manuscript. All three sets of comments support publication of the manuscript, but they also identify a number of issues that would need to be addressed

C1

in a revised manuscript, and which would likely constitute major revisions. A common theme is the rather unbalanced nature of the manuscript, with too much background, some objectives that are not fully-addressed, and an emphasis on the methods, rather than a more detailed discussion of the results and their implications. The latter would clearly increase the impact of your work and is something I would like to see addressed for publication in this journal.

Indeed, my own reading of the manuscript is that the study has clear potential to be published in The Cryosphere, but I would like to see some of the key structural issues addressed. I would recommend that sections 1, 1.2 and 2 are merged into a concise introduction (e.g. the summary of methods of identifying glacier change is unnecessary), and you might want to consider re-visiting the four objectives (e.g. perhaps set up a broader aim or fewer number of objectives that you specifically address). I would then recommend that Section 5 (Results and Discussion) is organised into a more orthodox structure that details the results and then presents some discussion in a separate section. This re-structuring should allow you to address many of the questions/issues raised by the reviewers and more clearly expand on some of the key results. Whilst I feel strongly that these structural issues must be addressed, and the manuscript would benefit from a clearer discussion of some of the key results, there may be a few instances where you do not necessarily want to broaden the manuscript and over-reach the results. This would be acceptable, but I would require a detailed rebuttal/justification.

If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Kind regards,

Chris Stokes Editor

Interactive comment on The Cryosphere Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-2017-31>, 2017.

C2