Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2018-13-RC2, 2018

Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences
Discussions

Interactive comment on "The Role of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) In Monitoring Rapidly Occuring Landslides" *by* Servet Yaprak et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 1 March 2018

In this paper, the authors explore the use of UAVs for rapidly-deforming landslide monitoring. At the first time I saw the title, I was very much excited because I expected an innovative approach of 4D monitoring of a landslide from UAVs, but in fact, the work is not such one but with rather an ordinary approach of repeated measurements at a monthly scale. Also, this manuscript can be strengthened if some more additional analyses are provided, including pixel-based movement detection of the landslide not only with the 73 points. Otherwise, the work remains just as a technical report and is unsuitable as a scientific paper for NHESS.

Below are some minor comments regarding the manuscript.

* Abstract. Please provide the information on the time periods of measurements (monthly).

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

* Introduction. The literature cited regarding the UAVs are relatively old. More recent, plenty amount of papers can also be cited. The last paragraph of Introduction should be presented in the Method or Study site section. Instead, please provide the research motivation – why UAVs for landslide monitoring, at what scale or frequency??

* Figure 3. This figure may be unnecessary. Also, please check there is no infringement of the copyright.

* Study area. Please provide more information on the landslide itself. When did it begin to slide? What triggered the landslide? Such basic information is missing. Furthermore, this long section includes the methods and results. Please reorganize.

* Figure 6. How was this image derived? Please suggest appropriate courtesy.

* Figure 8. Why is the aspect distribution presented? To show the differences, any other maps (hillshade, slope angle) should be more helpful.

* Figures 10-14. These figures can be merged into one. Moreover, showing the number data in the X-axis is rather meaningless.

* Line 366. What is the “typical structure”?

* Results and Conclusions. This section does not include Results, but some concluding remarks. The Discussion is completely missing. . .

* Line 420. I did not understand why the authors could say it “impossible” to monitor the landslide motion.

* Figures. In many figures, the scale and north-direction mark are missing. Captions are too short and not fully informative.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2018-13, 2018.