

Interactive comment on “Automatic classification of manual snow profiles by snow structure” by F. Techel and C. Pielmeier

T. Wiesinger (Referee)

thomas.wiesinger@boku.ac.at

Received and published: 1 February 2014

I am very pleased with the paper. I understand the motivation (optimizing the classification of snow profiles and reducing the labor to do so). However, with the shown results it appears that still a considerable amount of labor seems necessary to check the automatic classification. remarks / comments referring to page + paragraphs 7452-5 – The observation procedure is highly standardized – and that is good so, better than in other Alpine Countries. 7453-5:a disadvantage of stab01 was that there was no rule how to deal with a surface that could become a weak layer in the near future 17: ram profile used: and that is good so – however I cannot find the importance of a ram profile in your method. It has less bias than hand hardness, therefore I like it. see also in

C2453

7459-19 18 Rutschblock: and that is good so 7463 table 2: how do you automatically classify whether or not a new layer of new snow or partly decomposed grains is a slab or just a fluffy layer. This is a key question, isn't it? Here the expression of the observer “snow is bonded” would be very very helpful. 7469-fig.2, word 1: BoxplotS I am happy about you extensive investigation an hope it will rely help you with your daily business. In most of my studies that do not yield beneficial results it is because valuable snow pack information is missing – but this is THE KEY information. Good luck, Thomas

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 1, 7449, 2013.

C2454