

Point-by-point reply

Referee #1 text is grey.

Referee #2 text is black.

Response text is blue.

Changes are red.

General comments:

I think that the reasoning of the specific experimental setup should be explained.

The first sentence of 2.4 Experimental setup has been changed to:

The experimental setup was designed regarding the following requirements: (i) an exact and rapid triggering mechanism, (ii) multiple repetitions with identical boundary conditions due to homogeneous and dry material and (iii) flexibility for future studies.

Upscaling considerations to the larger scale, real world, landslides should be discussed including scaling analysis, as is expected from physical experiments.

Scaling of laboratory experiments is a complex topic. Various corresponding articles exist for different research objectives (e.g. hydraulic experiments: Heller, 2011; landslide and debris flow experiments: Iverson, 2015; gravity-scaled and unscaled debris flow experiments: Turnbull et al., 2015; granular slide experiments: Kessler et al., 2020). We agree that estimating scaling effects and treating them appropriately is essential to transfer experimental findings to real world scenarios. In the present study, however, these aspects were not included, because the overall applicability of the probe for experimental application was investigated, no physical properties. These aspects will be the research objective of future studies with the Smartstone.

The following paragraphs will be added as new subsection to the discussion between Sect. 4.2 and Sect. 4.3:

Scaling

A scaling of the recording ranges will be necessary if the Smartstone method is adapted to other experimental scales or velocities. Additionally, the scaling of temporal persistence of movements has to be respected as the Nyquist frequency to observe the motion without undersampling changes with the rate of movement changes (Yang et al., 2009). This means that a small pebble in a fast-moving landslide will show more abrupt changes in its velocity, trajectory and mode than a large block in a slow landslide. Thus, the ranges of the sensors and the sampling frequency have to be adjusted depending on the landslide velocity *and* the particle size. Several aspects concerning the sensor recording range for different experimental applications have to be considered:

Acceleration range: The expected acceleration depends on the velocity of the landslide, as the strongest peaks occur during nonelastic collisions of moving particles with stationary boundaries, e.g. bedrock. Thus, the range needs to be increased (by choosing a different accelerometer chip in the Smartstone) with velocity. However, to choose a gratuitously large range to avoid clipping is counterproductive, as the quantisation error will also increase, as there is only a limited number of steps within the range. A deliberated balance needs to be chosen, e.g. by performing preliminary tests.

Gyroscope range: The rotational velocity depends on the movement of the landslide but also on the size of particles. For instance, if the mass moves with 1 m s^{-1} , a single rolling pebble with 30 mm diameter will show a rotational velocity of $3820 \text{ }^\circ\text{s}^{-1}$ (pebble circumference 942 mm, thus 10.6 rotations per second). Thus, the expected range can be calculated using the shortest circumference of the Smartstone's host particle and the expected landslide velocity. Again, choosing a gratuitously large range to avoid clipping will increase the quantisation error.

I suggest to send the manuscript to grammatical editing.

We will engage English copy-editing services of Copernicus.

Also some typos should be cleaned from the manuscript.

We corrected the typos mentioned by both referees. See also previous comment.

Repetitions between figure captions and main text – unneeded redundancy.

Some readers may only read captions; others will read the text and have afterwards a look at the figures. We believe, the explanation of figures should deal with both cases. Probably most readers will not do both.

Add a bit more about the implication of this method in the Abstract.

The implication of recording motion data of clasts embedded in moving artificial landslides was clarified in the abstract:

Compared to other observation methods Smartstone probes allow for the quantification of internal movement characteristics and, consequently, a motion sampling in landslide experiments.

The presented technology is interesting, and the manuscript shows the potential of this technology for analyzing the movement of individual grains within a granular flow. However, the manuscript focuses solely on the interpretation of the recordings and one of the main findings is that the technology requires further improvements. For example, the manuscript indicates that the system is not really stable (one sensor out of five did not work appropriately, and another produced false results).

The Smartstone probe is a prototype and not ready for serial production. Nevertheless, it already has practical applications (e.g. helicopter rotor blades, building stability surveillance). Of course, for other applications like landslide assessments, some issues have to be addressed by further improvements. During the experimental campaign, a total number of 10 experiments was performed. In each run, 5 Smartstone probes were used in the same way as described in the manuscript, meaning a total number of 50 data sets. From these, a total number of 36 data sets were successfully recorded and could be analysed. This means a rate of more than 70 %, which we believe is quite good for a prototype. The critical task is not to build the devices in a better way. Nevertheless, a deeper understanding of the data is necessary. This is discussed in detail in the text.

Moreover, the statements at L483 and following indicate that the data analyses need to be further improved and that the current analyses are, to some extent, premature.

We agree, as mentioned in the discussion. But from our point of view, also single (complete) steps in the knowledge gaining process should be published (see next comment). To our knowledge, this is the first article that tries to go beyond only plotting the acceleration time series (which has been done quite often before) and describing trivial statistical properties of the time series. We describe how to interpret the time series from a motion's point of view.

The presented material is interesting, but I do not see substantial and original scientific results which warrant publication of the manuscript as a research article.

We disagree with this statement. Scientific research progresses step by step. We believe it is good scientific practice to publish single step progress in detail. In addition, we believe that the presented method, corresponding results and analysis are scientifically relevant due to the following reasons: (i) We identified an important methodological gap in studying landslide motion processes. Only a sensor-based autonomous instrumentation allows for an observation of the interior of a moving landslide mass, as outlined already in the introduction. (ii) We documented a significant methodological improvement. The recent probe version was technically enhanced compared to the former version, which was presented by Gronz et al. (2016). Furthermore, advanced data post-processing and analysis algorithms were used. These sensor fusion techniques are well established in other disciplines like robotics but must be adapted to geoscientific research objectives, which is - to our knowledge - done for the first time in landslide science within the presented study (although rudimentarily in the first instance). Of course, there are limitations of the current probe and data analysis that must be communicated clearly, which is - again - good scientific practice from our perspective. Beyond that we outlined future improvements, which are already in preparation (e. g. casing modifications allowing larger batteries). (iii) Moreover, the Smartstone sensor-based probes were successfully used in diverse experimental settings such as single clast transport experiments (Gronz et al., 2016), breakwater experiments (Santos et al., 2019), and rockfill dam overtopping experiments (Ravindra et al., under review).

Resubmission as brief communication.

The presented material fits to the journal objectives that are listed on the journal's web page. One main scope thereby is the presentation of "design, development, experimentation, and validation of new techniques [...]". This is exactly what we did in the submitted article. The submitted paper presents substantial scientific results within this scope. From our perspective, it is not possible to identify the research gap, propose an approach to contribute to filling this gap, present an appropriate methodological description, explain the new kind of data for geoscientists, and discuss the technical and scientific results within the format of a short communication. We are aware that not each of these aspects intrigues every reader. But we also believe that it is good scientific practice to draw the whole picture and to document all aspects of a study with an appropriate level of detail, rather to publish individual short reports.

The presented study and consequently the content of the submitted article exceeds the frame of a short communication significantly and must therefore be presented in a research article.

Specific comments:

P1, L2: I am not convinced that every reader understands what is meant by external and internal information.

It would be a solution to describe corresponding meanings at the beginning of the abstract. This will result in a lengthy abstract. From our point of view, the explanation should be given in the introduction, which already contains it.

P1, L4: The first "internal" can be deleted.

We disagree. *Internal* behaviour can – to a certain extent – be inferred from *external* observation. Or we can measure *internal* behaviour by *internal* measurements. Both of which are different approaches and to distinguish between them, both "internal" are needed.

P1, L6: "artificial laboratory-scale landslide" - artificial may be deleted

The word "artificial" was deleted.

P1, L7-10: Is this detailed information really adequate for the abstract?

Yes, it is! If a researcher scans literature searching for an appropriate sensor for his or her own experiment, he or she wants to efficiently exclude the sensors not applicable due to their size right at the beginning in the abstract.

L11 - mention the size\type of pebbles is more interesting than the entire mass.

We added the size and type:

Using the Smartstone probe, the motion of single clasts (gravel size, d_{50} of 42 mm) within approx. 520 kg of a uniformly graded pebble material was observed in a laboratory experiment.

P1, L11: I partly disagree with this statement - the movement of individual pebbles was observed with the Smartstone probe, but not the motion of 520 kg of the pebble material...

This aspect was clarified within the text.

Using the Smartstone probe, the motion of single clasts (gravel size, d_{50} of 42 mm) within approx. 520 kg of a uniformly graded pebble material was observed in a laboratory experiment.

P1, L12: Which mass is meant - the mass of the pebble-material?

The pebble material is meant.

Single pebbles were equipped with probes and placed embedded and superficially in/on the material.

P1, L13-21: This is mainly a description of what has been done - what is lacking is a more generalized description of the results - i.e. the novelty aspect of the study should be better highlighted.

The ending of the abstract has been changed:

Compared to other observation methods Smartstone probes allow for the quantification of internal movement characteristics and, consequently, a motion sampling in landslide experiments.

P2, L28: In my opinion the paper would benefit from additional considerations (including a review) on granular flow mechanics and how these can be described using the sensor data.

The article does not deal with the physics of granular flows. The material has been chosen due to different reasons: to prove the concept of the Smartstone and to allow for multiple repetitions under similar conditions, like described in Sect. 2.4.

P2, L32: What is meant by "some depositional features"? A more general description of the landslide processes would be helpful.

Meant is the extraordinary spreading of very large granular avalanches. This has been clarified in the text:

For instance, Davis & McSaveney (1999) reproduced dry granular avalanches and concluded that the extraordinary spreading of very large granular avalanches may be caused by phenomena like rock fragmentation.

P2, L36: What is meant by precess? Is "process" meant? I am also not sure that I understand what is meant here.

Process is meant. It has been corrected. No change in relative position means that blocks that started in the frontal part of the body stopped at the frontal part of the deposit as well (and vice versa).

P2, L37: Include year for reference Okura et al.

Has been included.

P2, L38: My understanding of the word "collusion" seems to be different from the understanding of the authors. Maybe "collisions" is meant by the authors?

Yes, collision was meant. Has been corrected.

P2, L40: The authors use specific terminology which has not been defined before. As indicated above, a more general description of landslide mechanics and granular flow would be helpful (also for the better understanding of the subsequent passages).

The submitted article is not intended as a review of granular flow experiments or landslide mechanics.

P2, L48: Please specify what kind of 2D section of the body is meant.

Has been clarified.

By means of (high-speed) video analysis such as particle image velocimetry (PIV) or the so-called fringe projection method (e. g. Manzella, 2008), only the surface or transversal sections of the body can be analysed.

P2, L51: This is true - but is the information also relevant for the description of the movement of the granular material?

This is correct, but we try to summarize the different types of instrumentation of landslides experiments, and this one should also be mentioned.

P2, L57: Replace "got" by "became"

Has been changed.

P2, L58: What is the technical aspect of so called 'smart tracers' for natural transport? These tracers can be helpful to collect data for the description of natural transport processes but have no effect on natural transport... (please try to be specific language wise throughout the manuscript).

Has been clarified.

Several studies focused on technical aspects (i. e. hardware and software development) of so called 'smart tracers' used to investigate natural transport processes (e. g. Spazzapan et al., 2004; Cameron, 2012).

P3, L59: What is the significance of this sentence?

It should demonstrate the wide range of applications for this method. It has also been clarified within the text.

Others applied these techniques to geoscientific or geotechnical questions, such as the impact of waves on armour units of breakwaters (e. g. Hofland et al., 2018).

P3, L65 and following: This could be more concise.

Has been clarified.

Additionally, the SSP needs wires for energy supply and data transmission and these wires confine a free movement of the device within the soil.

P3, L75: As already mentioned - the physics of the movement of granular material should be better highlighted. I fully agree with the next statement that the manuscript focuses on sensor application (i.e. on the method), and this is exactly why I see limits regarding the significance and novelty of the scientific findings. Therefore I finally recommended to resubmit the manuscript as a brief communication instead of a research paper.

The paper does not try to draw new conclusion on the physics of granular flows. In fact, this type of landslide was chosen as an example to test the usage of the Smartstone probe for experimental landslide science and what additional information can be collected (see also response to Referee #1).

L79 - what is the former version? – maybe I missed.,,

The former prototype version is now mentioned earlier in the text. The reference is Gronz et al. (2016).

P3, L79: Please improve the description of the objectives.

The description of our objectives has been modified:

- 1 There has been a significant technical improvement since Gronz et al. (2016) introduced the first version of the Smartstone prototype. Therefore, one objective is the description of the recent Smartstone probe. In addition, we document major changes to the former version and the corresponding technical specifications.
- 2 Beyond that, we explain additional information that is supplied by smart sensors and illustrate the specific properties of motion data. Based on a quantitative interpretation, we give an introduction how to read motion data in terms of flume-scale landslide movements.
- 3 Subsequently, we demonstrate how physical movement characteristics can be derived from the measured raw data and in what way they are different.
- 4 Further, we highlight the potentials of two- (2D-) and three- (3D-) dimensional visualisation of the paths a clast took during the movement and how these visualisations allow for an easy recognition of complex motion patterns.
- 5 Finally, we investigate the limitations of the Smartstone prototype and discuss what developments will be necessary to improve the probe and data handling further.

P4, L93: Why "mainly"?

Because high-speed video observation was used as well but the focus of data analysis laid on probe data.

P4, L100: Why "available"?

The word was deleted.

L105 - The sampling rate (100 Hz) is low. Most probably, it cannot record the sharp impulse during a collision with another rigid body. Miss recording such impulse can lead to significant errors in the velocity and position, calculated by integrating the recorded acceleration. The authors should address this issue, provide an estimate of a typical collision duration in their experiment, and show that it is longer than $1/\text{sampling rate}$. In case the above condition is not fulfilled in the experiment, the authors should explain the implications. A

short discussion on the sampling rate in a broader context of a real landslide can be illuminating for the reader.

During the data analysis we did not notice any issues resulting from the sampling rate. Generally, the needed frequency does not depend on the duration of accelerations but on the uniformity of the movement. The sensor does not miss single strong acceleration peaks shorter than the sampling frequency due to its principle of operation: Inside the chip is a small movable piece shaped like a comb (for each axis). It is positioned inside a stationary second comb. Lateral movement due to accelerations changes the distance between the two combs, resulting in an electric capacity change, which is measured to derive acceleration. If a short, abrupt acceleration occurs, the movable comb will be displaced in any case, even if the acceleration does not last as long as the sampling period, due to its inertia. The chip integrates inherently during the sampling period. However, if the sensor is moved several times forward and backwards within a sampling period, the sensor will miss this information, as the movement's frequency is higher than the sampling frequency. Thus, the correct movement cannot be observed. Again, preliminary tests facilitate choosing the correct sampling frequency.

P4, L122: Different dimensions have been mentioned before (L96) which is confusing - I find it also confusing that the dimensions are given only "approximately" - what are the exact dimensions?

As described in the text, the length of the casing can be adapted depending on the size of the plastic plugs that close the tube (see lines 96 to 101). Numbers are given as "approx.", because they may vary slightly as the probe is a prototype and not a standardised device: each tube is manually shortened using a saw.

L124 - needed?

This information demonstrates that the Smartstone probe can be adapted to different research objectives.

P4, L124: What is meant by "lager objects"? Is "larger objects" meant? Please check the language throughout the manuscript (I stop here giving comments on the language).

Has been corrected. We will engage English copy-editing services of Copernicus.

P5, L125: Sentence starting at L124 - what is the significance of this sentence for the study?


This information may not intrigue everyone but is intended for researchers who would like to use this technique. We believe it is helpful to be informed about the options of adaptation during planning of other experimental campaigns.

P5, L127: This information could be given in the Acknowledgements or incorporated in the above text. The sentence that further improvements are planned already indicates that the presented findings are premature (similar statements are given at the end of the manuscript).

From our perspective it is good scientific practice to indicate that a measuring instrument was developed in cooperation with a private enterprise company and that the device is a prototype, which will be developed further in future. The company is mentioned within the text, because demonstrating the improvement and development process is a key feature of the article.

L133 - It appears that the system of coordinate of the ACC is not following the convention of the "Right-hand rule". Can the authors comment on that. In any case this is an important information for the reader.

Thanks for spotting the error in the figure. The figure has been modified. Of course, the axes follow the convention. Fig. 1 (b) has been modified:



L137 - 1. The term "higher-order" may not be the best choice as the position of a body/point is always relative.
 2. The "real" axis system is not suitable for comparison of different probes; the "flume" system suits this purpose; this is why the authors used it for the graph in Figure 6 that compares the movements of different probes.

We modified the description in Sect. 2.2 beginning at L135 including the previous comment as follows:

Therefore, its x- and y-axis are also rotated. Following the right-hand rule, positive rotational directions are indicated by small curved black arrows.

To compare relative movement characteristics like distance or velocity of different probes, the inner data / coordinate system p must be transformed into an outer reference system rel (Fig. 1, c). The simplest way to do this is the construction of a reference system using the probe's starting position as coordinate origin. The system is defined by the sensor's inner coordinate system of the first timestep rotated so that the z-axis follows gravity. The axes of this *relative* (to the starting position) outer coordinate system are denoted with x^{rel} , y^{rel} and z^{rel} . After the motion has started, the probe's inner orientation will change while the outer reference system keeps its axes configuration. Consequently, within this reference system, it is possible to calculate the probe's orientation and the covered distance in each timestep. In Fig. 1 (c) for instance, the probe has changed its orientation significantly compared to its starting position while moving along the assumed trajectory.

However, the different probe-specific outer coordinate systems must be transformed into the same local reference system to compare different probes' trajectories. For the present study, this local reference system is oriented towards the experimental flume (see section 2.4). Following the former conventions, the axes were denoted as x^f , y^f and z^f . Note that the axes orientations of the outer (rel) and the local reference system (f) may not be identical, except of z^{rel} and z^f , as they follow gravity.

In different applications, where a global positioning is required, reference points of the outer coordinate systems must be known in the global system to determine the absolute probe position in the global system.

P5, L137: The reference systems could be introduced better... I find the presentation of Figure 1c rather confusing (as the reference system 'f' is only introduced at L150).

The description has been entirely rewritten. See previous comment.

P5, L140: Why is 'relative' in italics? I don't think that "donated" is adequate terminology... (throughout the paper)

Italics are typically used to emphasize a word. Which is what we wanted to do. Donated should mean denoted. Has been changed (throughout the paper).

P5, L143: Why 'probably'?

Because it is almost certain but not sure.

P5, L151: I don't understand - please improve the description and be more precise (e. g., it is only mentioned below that z follows the direction of gravity).

The description has been rewritten completely, please check response to RC P5, L137.

P5, L153: What is meant by higher-order global system (i.e., why higher-order)?

The description has been rewritten completely, please check response to RC P5, L137.

P5, L154: Why was this not done?

The natural magnetic field is disturbed within the experimental facility due to ferro-concrete surrounding. Additionally, the description has been rewritten completely, please check response to RC P5, L137.

P6, L162: I am not sure that I understand what is meant by (i) as well as (ii and iii).

All these errors result from the sensor technology. We simplified the description to:

The recorded acceleration values of each axis (a_x^p , a_y^p , a_z^p) are generally erroneous due to two reasons: (i) A (quasi-) constant misreading. The mass inside the sensor, which moves to measure acceleration, is not precisely equal in all sensors (manufacturing tolerance), resulting in a bias as well as a linear scaling of true values. (ii) The imprecise orthogonal alignment of the sensor axes and crosstalk. This means that a fraction of each axis acceleration will result in readings at the two other axes.

P6, L163: 'describes' must be 'describe'.

Has been corrected.

P6, L165: All this remains a black box and could be explained in some more detail. I also find that the 'damaged probe' is mentioned too often...

The black box is described in the given reference Frosio et al. (2009). We removed the sentence regarding the damaged probe in this paragraph, as it is not necessary here.

P6, L170: Some more details would be desirable (or at least references where relevant information can be found). I find this important section rather short.

We merged this paragraph with the next one, where the explanation as well as the reference are given.

P6, L178: What is meant by 'various studies'?

Future studies are meant.

The design of the experimental setup focussed on an exact and rapid triggering mechanism of the artificial landslide and flexibility for future studies.

P6, L180: A more precise length is given in the figure, which I find confusing (why approx. when the exact length is known?).

We changed the number to 4.24 m.

P6, L181: I find this difficult to read - please improve language.

Has been improved.

Some clasts also reached the lower part of the flume, which is inclined by 10 °.

P7, L206: Please check language. What was the accuracy of these measurements?

Has been changed:

This was done using a laser distance meter (accuracy +/- 1 mm).

P7, L210: This statement defines the scope of the study - the demonstration of the applicability of the sensor to monitor the motion of individual pebbles within a landslide - this calls again for publication as a brief communication instead of a research article.

As argued above, presenting the scientific progress (technical, analytical) of this technique since 2016 is not possible in the form of a brief communication.

P7, L211: The information on the date should be presented in Section 2.4 (is this information important)?

Has been deleted.

P7, L216: As mentioned above, the calibration of the sensor remains partly foggy, and I am not sure that the terminology "calibrated raw data" is adequate - it seems to me that raw data are presented which were obtained by a calibrated sensor?

The calibration description has been modified as written at comment concerning P6, L162. Details are described in the given reference. The word "raw" has been removed. This correction has been done in the complete article.

P7, L217: Could this be measured without activated IMU? If not, the statement in brackets could be deleted.

Has been deleted.

P7, L217/218: I had first difficulties to understand this sentence when looking at the figure - this could be formulated more clearly.

Has been clarified.

Note that the three curves of x^p , y^p and z^p (Fig. 3, a) show the acceleration along the particular axis (see below). The gyroscope data curves (Fig. 3, c) show rotation around these axes. At the top of each plot, white bars indicate stationary (no motion) and black bars non-stationary (motion) periods.

P8, L222: Why does the time series begin at a 'negative time'? When exactly was the landslide triggered? This should be mentioned/explained more clearly. Also, the statements relate to accelerations along the considered axes, this should be better highlighted in the text (x_p and y_p show low values - but strictly speaking, these are coordinate axes; the same applies to the statements given in the next sentences).

Negative time has been clarified:

The start of motion of pebble 4 was defined as 0.0 s.

All statements related to "axis shows values" have been changed to "values along this axis".

L223 - Can you clarify 0.0 g means?

Within the gravitational field of the earth, zero g can only be achieved if and only if an object moves in pure free fall without aerodynamic drag. In this case, the resultant acceleration vector of motion and the acceleration vector due to earth's gravitational acceleration exhibit the same magnitude. These vectors, however, point in the opposite direction compensating each other. This results in a measured acceleration magnitude of 0.0 g at a measuring device, such as the Smartstone probe.

P8, L223: Why 'seems'? The data show this higher level.

Has been changed.

Before the actual motion begins (stationary conditions, left white bars in Fig. 3), low values were recorded along x^p and y^p , though x^p -readings are on a slightly higher level (approx. 0.0 g).

L225 - The whole section (3.1) is very long and tedious. The formulas are trivial, in any case, the authors do not use the projections of g in the discussion.

We expect different subsets of so-called trivial knowledge at different readers. Thus, this section is an introduction on how this kind of data has to be read and interpreted. In discussions with colleagues it emerged that it is often not clear what is displayed within the graphs (e.g. Fig. 3). To our knowledge, there is no publication that describes spatiotemporal motion data adequately in a geoscientific context. Therefore, we decided to give a detailed description in this article.

P8, L230: Please improve - this is difficult to read and understand (suggestion: alpha, beta and gamma define the angle between x_p , y_p and z_p and the gravity vector).

Suggestions are thankfully accepted.

[...] where α , β , and γ give the angle between x^p , y^p , and z^p and the gravity vector, respectively.

P8, L230 - L312: This qualitative presentation of the raw data is difficult to read and understand - it should, in my opinion, be coupled with the derived trajectory.

This section is intended to be an introduction on how this kind of data has to be read and interpreted. We still see the need of a detailed explanation, what motion features are displayed by the data. The paper is structured from low complexity to higher complexity (single clast raw data - single clast derived data - single clast spatiotemporal visualisation - multi clast spatiotemporal visualisation). From our perspective, explanation and understandability of the content would not benefit from the mixing of these complexity levels.

P8, L231: 'downwards direction' is, in my opinion, a rather confusing terminology.

Has been changed.

Accordingly, under static conditions the probe's orientation relative to the gravity vector (vertical direction) can be calculated from the three readings of a_x^p , a_z^p and a_y^p .

P8, L234: If the pebble is stationary, it is clear that it cannot rotate...

Constant readings (except for noise) do not necessarily indicate stationary conditions, as we always have non-zero readings due to gravity. The probe might also move. If also the gyroscope indicates that no rotations occur, the conclusion that the probe is not moving becomes more probable. It is correct that this sentence should be placed above. The new sentence in line 224 is:

This pattern represents non-motion conditions, where only gravitational acceleration is recorded. This assumption is supported by the zero readings of the GYR.

P8, L234: I guess the landslide was triggered at 0.00 s? This should be mentioned in the text. Define 'the change' in the plots more clearly.

This has been explained before (see comment P8, L222) and is also clarified within the text.

A sudden change in the axes-readings at 0.0 s is visible in all three plots.

P8, L235: The text implies that the z^p -axis drops, which is not the case (and which is rather confusing). What drops is the acceleration value, and this needs to be described more clearly (also in the following passages).

Has been clarified.

Between 0.0 s and approx. 0.03 s, a clear drop of z^p -recordings to the halve of the former level is visible in the acceleration plot (Fig. 3, a).

P8, L238: This could be explained better and the motion characteristics 'free fall' and 'hampered free fall' should be defined more clearly.

Has been clarified.

Low absolute values of acceleration can only be achieved if free fall (unconfined acceleration within the earth's gravitational field into the direction of its centre of mass) is mixed with an additional. Thus, values between 0 g and 1 g imply a hampered free fall (no completely developed free fall, confined motion) and/or an additional lateral acceleration.

P9, L248: This seems to be rather speculative - a statement like 'a conclusion might be...' is very vague...

Has been changed.

We conclude that the surrounding part of the mass moves coherently downwards.

P9, L251: Note that the values range between 1 g and -1 g (and do not correspond to 1 g and -1 g as presently stated).

We mixed up the letters in the description. Correct description:

Along y^p , values around -1 g were recorded; along z^p , values around 1 g were recorded.

P9, L257: However, I can see other spikes which are defined by two data points.

Therefore, we wrote "most of the other peaks". These features indicate short periods of pronounced acceleration instead of single hits, which is worth mention. Moreover, from these observation distinct motion patterns can be interpreted as demonstrated within the text.

The strongest peak of the whole sequence (approx. 4.6 g) is measured at z^p for two subsequent readings. Thus, the change in velocity is bigger than all other changes as the strongest absolute acceleration also lasts longer than most other acceleration peaks, which only consist of one reading.

P9, L260: Indicate which axis is analyzed here.

Has been clarified.

Here, the phase begins with relatively low ω of approx. 260° s^{-1} at 0.898 s on y^p .

P10, L289: 'Of cause'?

Has been corrected.

P10, L290: Why?

Because we know that the flume is oscillating after the impact of the material. We clarified the text:

Concerning the whole time series, some interesting aspects shall be mentioned: The small deviations from the mean axes readings of the ACC after the motion (right white bar) can be interpreted as oscillation of the flume construction after the impact. This is supported by the data pattern exhibiting uniform oscillations which are gradually decreasing in amplitude.

P10, L290: This is trivial - I would be surprised if the pebble would not change its orientation.

Yes, one can see and would also expect that the orientation will change during the motion. Apart from that, one can interpret this from the data. Consequently, this interpretation could be done as well if the object would not be visible (e. g. embedded into the material).

P10, L313: The above qualitative statements regarding the motion mode should be coupled with the considerations of the movement with respect to position and time.

Has been changed.

This is also supported by the alternating pattern of high a peaks and almost zero acceleration magnitude. This pattern results from saltation as the pebble bounces at the flume bottom before it rebounds and falls again.

P10, L315: This could be mentioned earlier.

It is mentioned there, because the statement serves as a bridge passage to the quantitative movement analysis.

P11, L316: Are these relationships really that simple?

Simple has been replaced by basic.

P11, L317: Check language ('calculated after...').

Has been changed:

[...] according to Eq. 1 [...]

P11, L318: Why were the angles 'received'? How can the accelerations be 'rearranged'? Please check language throughout.

"Received" has been changed to "calculated". "Rearranged" has been changed to "rotated".

P11, L320: This is a description of a method which is described in detail in the literature - it could therefore be included into Section 2.

The methodological aspects are described at this part of the text, because it is one of the key features of the study that we apply these algorithms on geomorphic motion data, which was not done before. Again, this is also why we describe it in detail.

P11, L328: 's_{rel}' is not integrated. It is obtained from integration.

Has been changed.

After the rearrangement of the recorded accelerations and with respect to time t , the movement characteristics v^{rel} and s^{rel} can be obtained from the integration

P11, 336: I am not sure that I understand what is meant here. Please improve.

Has been changed.

During stationary periods these values are defective. This can be seen at x^{rel} (Fig. 3, a), where values of approx. -4 m s^{-2} were calculated. Obviously, this cannot be true as the pebble does not move. However, these false calculations are excluded from further integration (compare Fig. 3), b and c) and do not influence the following interpretations.

P11, L337 and following: All this could be combined with the qualitative discussion.

The paper is structured with increasing degree of complexity. Mixing different levels would not be beneficial (see response to comment P8, L230 - L312).

P11, L338: I disagree with this statement: $a_{z\text{rel}}$ does not increase but decrease from 0 to -9.4 . It also does not do this continuously decrease as clearly shown by the fluctuations in the plot.

This important aspect was already discussed within the text. An acceleration reading on a particular axis represents the magnitude of acceleration along this axis. The positive or negative algebraic sign refers exclusively to the direction. It does not imply an increase or decrease. Consequently, if the values change from 0 g to -9 g , acceleration increases (the object is accelerated more) against the direction this axis is pointing to.

We agree that "continuously" is the wrong description.

As displayed in Fig. 4 (a), a_z^{rel} generally increases until at approx. 0.32 s a local maximum of approx. -9.4 m s^{-2} occurs.

P11, L339: Why? This should be explained better. I also cannot see in the Figure that the pebble 'swims'. Please improve.

This aspect was explained before for acceleration in "g"-units. The explanation only has to be adapted to the other unit. Only if earth's gravitational acceleration is calculated as resultant acceleration magnitude, pure free fall conditions are present. If the calculated resultant acceleration magnitude is $\neq 9.81 \text{ m s}^{-1}$, other motion components (or the underlying material, for instance) confine a free fall.

The verb "swim" has been replaced by "moves".

P11, L342: What is the significance of the maximum velocity $v_{y\text{rel}}$? Why is $v_{z\text{rel}}$ decreasing afterwards while it further increased simultaneously? This is confusing.

The variables v_y^{rel} and v_z^{rel} were swapped. This has been corrected.

P11, L343: Why 'covered'?

“Covered” has been replaced by “calculated”.

P11, L345: I disagree again - the plots for the y-axis do not really exhibit a major change. I am also not sure about the relevance of the capture of the high-speed sequence.

Modified text:

At 0.389 s after the start, a discontinuity at x- and z-axes is visible in fig. 4 (a) and (b).

P11, L346: Is the 'acceleration curve' really smooth before 0.389 s?

No, it is not. Modified sentence:

The variability of the acceleration time series increases.

P12, L349: This is difficult to understand and should be explained better.

If no hits would be present between the clasts, no acceleration peaks would occur. This means: a peakier curve indicates pronounced contacts. However, it is not necessarily friction but, more general, energy dissipation. New sentence:


Additionally, the peaky pattern of the acceleration and velocity curves indicates pronounced clast contact and energy dissipation.

P12, L351: What is the significance of this observed maximum?

It is the maximum velocity for this probe.

P12, L353: Please explain better - this is hard to see from Figure c.

We added a detail figure in Fig. 4 (c).



P12, L355: Figure 4 d shows photographs and not displacement plots?

This was a wrong cross reference. It has been corrected to Fig. 4, c.

P12, L355: I do not see these staircases (if plot c was meant).

See detail figure two comments above.

P12, L372: This was mentioned before.

The sentence was removed.

P13, L390: I am not sure that I understand what is meant.

The sentence has been modified:

On the side view plot (Fig. 5, a), y^p and z^p are almost drawn in full length, whereas x^p is short, indicating its orientation towards the viewer's perspective.

P13, L390 and following: This could be combined with the previous analyses.

Again, the paper is structured with increasing degree of complexity. Mixing different levels would not be beneficial (see previous responses).

L432 - the end of the sentence is missing.

Corrected:

It is visible that pebble 1 and 2 were embedded into the material, whereas pebble 3 and 4 were placed at the surface of the material (see Fig. 2).

P14, L432: This sentence is incomplete.

Has been corrected. See previous comment.

L437-442 - The most probable reason for the wrong trajectory of pebble 3 is miss recording of collision with another pebble due to the slow sampling rate of the used IMU.

As explained above (comment L105), missing an acceleration peak is not possible due to the design of the acceleration sensor (as long as the motion frequency does not exceed the sampling frequency, which is given in this case). Therefore, this cannot be an explanation for the erroneous inclination of the trajectory. In addition, an overestimation of the vertical trajectory component occurs right from the beginning of the motion. The peak would have to be occurred before the motion starts, which obviously is not possible (not least because pebble 3 was placed at the surface of the material).

P14, L437: This indicates that further work is required.

From our point of view, it is common and good scientific practice to communicate advantages as well as deficiencies that have to be dealt with if a method is presented to the scientific community. Nevertheless, further improvements are necessary. This will always be the case if scientific progress is sought. Apart from that, necessary improvements are discussed in detail within the text. This includes also comments for benefits that are expected from particular improvements.

L446-447 This statement does not fit the description of the behavior of one body, out of many, in a multi-body system where collisions between bodies redistribute the energy of the system in a random way.

This is correct and we had to rethink this explanation. New text:

Whereas Okura et al. (2000) observed that blocks positioned at the front were also deposited in the distal zone, the top pebbles travelled the longest distance in our experiment. Regarding the high-speed video, the explanation is given by the tilted gate: The pebbles positioned on the top start their movement both downwards and to the right (from the camera perspective), thus not transferring energy to material formerly placed underneath in the storage box. The higher the pebbles are placed, the bigger is their overhang, resulting in less material vertically underneath. Compared to the uniform initiation (multiple blocks slid coherently) of the motion in Okura et al. (2000), less energy dissipation occurs in our experiment.

P15, L470: This is a drawback for field applications, but not really for laboratory experiments.

This might also be problem under laboratory conditions. For instance, if the probe is built within a model slope that will fail due to artificial rain. Here, the time of failure is not known, but batteries cannot be changed. This issue is currently the objective of our work.

L472-473 - Too much details.

Deleted.

L510 - In the present study, the probe monitored movements over a short period of ~ 2 sec. A brief discussion regarding the expected error in retrieving the trajectory over more extended periods can help to assess the type and scale of landslides that can be monitored in this way.

We agree that the duration of recorded motion is a critical aspect of this technique. Because the estimation of the displacement components requires double-integration, absolute errors will increase with time – depending on the motion. Therefore, longer durations will generally result in less accurate absolute results. The relative error will remain stable for certain kinds of movements. However, a general extrapolation of the expected error is not trivial, as it depends on the ratio of noise, quantisation error etc. to the magnitude of the true accelerations.

Figures:

Figure 3 - change the axis title to the same side.

Modified:




Figure 5a,c - add the flume reference as well.

To improve the orientation within the figure, the flume bottom (grey dashed line) has been added to Fig. 5 (a). Adding the flume bottom in Fig. 5 (c) as well would reduce the clearness of the trajectory visualisation. Fig. 5 (a) was modified as follows:





Fig 6 - color coding has a few cycles so it is not injective and a bit hard to follow, maybe add time stamps at the end of each cycle?

Repetition of cycles allows for a more precise identification of time compared to only one cycle. As the trajectory is continuous in time, the colour coding might not be injective, but it is distinct: The first time, red occurs again along the trajectory, must equal 1 s. However, we can add timestamps although we think that this is content overload.



Additional References:

Heller, V. (2011). Scale effects in physical hydraulic engineering models. In: *Journal of Hydraulic Research* 49 (3), pp. 293–306. DOI: 10.1080/00221686.2011.578914.

Iverson, R. M. (2015). Scaling and design of landslide and debris-flow experiments. In: *Geomorphology* 244, pp. 9–20. DOI: 10.1016/j.geomorph.2015.02.033.

Kessler, M.; Heller, V.; Turnbull, B. (2020). Grain Reynolds Number Scale Effects in Dry Granular Slides. In: *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface* 125 (1). DOI: 10.1029/2019JF005347.

Ravindra, G.; Gronz, O.; Dost, B.; Sigtryggsdóttir, F. (under review): Description of failure mechanism in placed riprap on steep slope with unsupported toe using smartstone probes. In: *Engineering Structures*.

Santos, J. A.; Pedro, F.; Coimbra, M.; Figuero, A.; Fortes, C. J. E.M.; Sande, J.; Körner, M.; Lemos, R.; Bornschein, A.; Weimper, J.; van den Bos, J.; Dost, B.; Hofland, B.; Carvalho, R. F.; Alvarelllos, A.; Peña, E.; Pohl, R.; Kerpen, N. B.; Reis, M. T. (2019): 3-D Scale Model Study of Wave Run-Up, Overtopping and Damage in a Rubble-Mound Breakwater Subject to Oblique Extreme Wave Conditions. In: *Defect and Diffusion Forum* 396, pp. 32–41. DOI: 10.4028/www.scientific.net/DDF.396.32.

Turnbull, B.; Bowman, E. T.; McElwaine, J. N. (2015). Debris flows: Experiments and modelling. In: *Comptes Rendus Physique* 16 (1), pp. 86–96. DOI: 10.1016/j.crhy.2014.11.006.

Yang, W. Y.; Chang, T. G.; Song, I. H.; Cho, Y. S.; Heo, J.; Jeon, W. G.; Lee, J. W.; Kim, J. K. (2009). *Signals and Systems with MATLAB*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg: Berlin, Heidelberg.

The Potential of Smartstone Probes in Landslide Experiments: How to Read Motion Data

Bastian Dost¹, Oliver Gronz¹, Markus Casper¹, and Andreas Krein²

¹Trier University, Campus II, Behringstraße, D-54296 Trier

²Luxembourg Institute of Science and Technology, Maison de l'Innovation, 5, avenue des Hauts-Fourneaux, L-4362 Esch-sur-Alzette

Correspondence: Bastian Dost (s6jodost@uni-trier.de)

Abstract. Currently, findings in landslide laboratory experiments are limited by observation techniques, which either deliver only external information (e. g. [surface displacement](#) using high-speed videos), or internal information ([e. g. velocity profiles](#)) using wired sensors that confine the free motion of the mass. However, an unconfined internal observation of the internal dynamics of a moving landslide mass is essential for an adequate understanding of these natural hazards.

5 The present study introduces an autonomous and wireless probe to characterise motion features of single clasts within [artificial](#) laboratory-scale landslides. The Smartstone probe is based on an inertial measurement unit (IMU) and records acceleration and rotation at a sampling rate of 100 Hz. The recording ranges are ± 16 g (accelerometer) and ± 2000 ° s⁻¹ (gyroscope). The plastic tube housing is 55 mm long with a diameter of 10 mm. The probe is controlled and data is read out via active radio frequency identification (active RFID) technology. Due to this technique, the probe works under low-power conditions enabling
10 the use of small button cell batteries and minimising its size.

Using the Smartstone probe, the motion of [single clasts \(gravel size, d₅₀ of 42 mm\) within](#) approx. 520 kg of a uniformly-graded pebble material was observed in a laboratory experiment. Single pebbles were equipped with probes and placed embedded and superficially in/on the [mass-material](#). In a first analysis step, the data of one pebble is interpreted qualitatively, allowing for the determination of different transport modes, such as translation, rotation and saltation. In a second step, the motion was
15 quantified [myby](#) means of derived movement characteristics: The analysed pebble moved mainly in vertical direction during the first motion phase with a maximal vertical velocity of approx. 1.7 m s⁻¹. A strong acceleration peak of approx. 36 m s⁻² was interpreted as pronounced hit and led to a complex rotational motion pattern. In a third step, displacement was derived and amounts to approx. 1.1 m in vertical direction. The deviation compared to laser distance measurements was approx. -10 %. Furthermore, a full 3-dimensional spatiotemporal trajectory of the pebble was reconstructed and visualised supporting the inter-
20 pretations. Finally, it is demonstrated that multiple pebbles can be analysed simultaneously within one experiment, [allowing for motion sampling of different parts of a moving landslide..](#) [Compared to other observation methods Smartstone probes allow for the quantification of internal movement characteristics and, consequently, a motion sampling in landslide experiments.](#)

1 Introduction

25 The spatiotemporal progression of moving slope material is subject of research in various geoscientific disciplines (e. g. Wang et al., 2018; Aaron and McDougall, 2019; Schilirò et al., 2019). Laboratory experiments are a well-established instrument to investigate the physical behaviour of landslide motion processes. However, the observation of internal characteristics of a moving landslide mass poses a critical challenge. Nevertheless, an exact description of the internal behaviour is crucial to understand the mobility of these natural phenomena. The present study introduces an autonomous and wireless measuring device to observe the spatiotemporal motion of single clasts within a moving landslide mass in laboratory experiments.

30 1.1 Experimental investigation of landslide processes

To understand the physics of both dry and fluid-containing landslide processes on different scales and velocities, multitudinous experimental studies were undertaken during the last decades. For instance, Davies and McSaveney (1999) ~~tried to reproduce~~ large rock avalanches dry granular avalanches and concluded that ~~some depositional features~~ the extraordinary spreading of very large granular avalanches may be caused by phenomena like rock fragmentation. Okura et al. (2000) conducted outdoor experiments to investigate the runout behaviour of rockfalls. They found that even though the centre of mass moved over shorter distances, the frontal part of the rockfall body spread over a larger area. In addition, they observed by means of a visual particle tracking method that individual blocks did not change their relative positions during the motion ~~precess~~ process. This means that frontal blocks were deposited in a distal zone. To explain these findings, Okura et al. (2000) argued that the frontal blocks gain additional dissipation energy because of clast ~~collisions~~ collisions within the rockfall body. In contrast, rear blocks lost energy due to the ~~collisions~~ collisions. Beyond that, Manzella and Labiouse (2009, 2013) investigated the influence of randomly or orderly stored blocks prior to the material release of artificial granular landslides. These contrasting initial condition was used as an indicator for fragmentation. They found that the potential internal and external friction strongly influences the energy dissipation during the displacement process. For instance, if the bricks are stored randomly (high grade of fragmentation) or a sharp slope break exists (induces fragmentation), frictional and collisional conditions are pronounced and energy dissipation is intensified. In turn, this results in a strong spreading of the material.

These studies have in common that the displacing material is considered as one body changing its shape. Thereby, the motion process is observed from the outside and conclusions of the internal behaviour are drawn indirectly. This is a consequence of limited observation techniques. By means of (high-speed) video analysis such as particle image velocimetry (PIV) or the so-called fringe projection method (e. g. Manzella, 2008), only the surface or ~~a 2-dimensional section~~ transversal sections of the body can be analysed. To overcome these restrictions, several methods were developed for the measurement of internal motion characteristics. For instance, Yang et al. (2011) presented a detection system for impact pressure within debris flows and subsequently calculated the internal velocity. Additionally, wired devices such as piezometers, load cells and sensors for pore water pressure and deformation are common instrumentations for landslide experiments of various scales and objectives (e. g. Moriwaki et al., 2004; Ochiai et al., 2007; Ried et al., 2011).

55 Microelectronic devices for motion detection became common during the last years. Experimental studies use acceleration sensors of Micro-Electro-Mechanical-Systems (MEMS) or combined acceleration- and rotation instruments such as inertial measurement units (IMU). After the early works of Ergenzinger et al. (1989) and Hanisch et al. (2003), who developed an intelligent boulder equipped with multiple sensors, sensor technology ~~got~~became more accessible and cheaper during the last decade. Several studies focused on technical aspects (i. e. hardware and software development) of so called 'smart tracers' ~~for~~
60 used to investigate natural transport processes (e. g. Spazzapan et al., 2004; Cameron, 2012). Others applied these techniques to geoscientific or geotechnical questions, such as the impact of waves on armour units of breakwaters (e. g. Hofland et al., 2018). Volkwein and Klette (2014) presented a relatively large probe that could be embedded into boulders to record movement parameters of rockfalls. Although acceleration and rotation were recorded with high sampling rates to capture hard impacts of the rock, a further processing of the data was not carried out. The position of the rock during the displacement was tracked
65 via wireless LAN. Another recent example of sensor techniques to describe gravitational induced movements is the Smart Soil Particle (SSP) presented by Ooi et al. (2014). Although acceleration data was interpreted quantitatively, a derivation of movement characteristics of the landslide motion was not performed. ~~Another drawback of the SSP lays in the need of wires for energy supply and data transmission, which confines a free movement of the device within the soil.~~Additionally, the SSP needs wires for energy supply and data transmission and these wires confine a free movement of the device within the soil.
70 The need of an autonomous and wireless device to investigate geomorphic transport processes was recently identified by Spreitzer et al. (2019). They presented a sensor based-probe to monitor the movement of artificial tree trunks during laboratory-scale flood experiments. Although a qualitative interpretation of the transport behaviour was done, a further processing of the data and a reconstruction of the trunks' trajectories were not carried out. Because under flood conditions, wood is mostly transported at the water table, the trajectory can be followed visually. In terms of landslide processes, this might not be possible.
75 Here, it is of great importance to track material components that are embedded within the moving landslide body.

1.2 Scope of the present study

The present study introduces the Smartstone probe v2.0 as a device to measure movement characteristics of single clasts *in situ* within a surrounding mass. Thereby, methodological and technical progress compared to the former probe version, presented by Gronz et al. (2016), will be demonstrated. An experimental setup was developed that reproduces artificial landslides of a
80 dry granular flow type. The experimental design focused on sensor application and not on natural landslide reproduction. The Smartstone probe is object of investigation in the present study. Photo/video documentation as well as reference measurements were carried out to verify the results (see Sect. 2). The present study deals with the following aspects:

1 ~~A detailed description of the recent Smartstone probe prototype is given. Thereby, major changes to the former version are explained and the technical specifications are outlined.~~There has been a significant technical improvement since Gronz et al. (2016) introduced the first version of the Smartstone prototype. Therefore, one objective is the description of the recent Smartstone probe. In addition, we document major changes to the former version and the corresponding technical specifications.
85

- 2 An introduction of the additional information that are supplied by smart sensors is given. Specific properties of motion data are illustrated. Further, exemplary data patterns that emerged from the recordings are interpreted qualitatively. This includes an introduction on how to read motion data in terms of flume-scale landslide movements. Beyond that, we explain additional information that is supplied by smart sensors and illustrate the specific properties of motion data. Based on a quantitative interpretation, we give an introduction how to read motion data in terms of flume-scale landslide movements.
- 3 ~~Subsequently, it is demonstrated how physical movement characteristics (see Sect. 3.2) can be derived from the raw measurements. The difference between sensor readings and movement characteristics are explained.~~ Subsequently, we demonstrate how physical movement characteristics can be derived from the measured and calibrated data and in what way they are different.
- 4 ~~Another key aspect of the present study is to highlight the potentials of two- (2D-) and three- (3D-) dimensional visualisations of the path a clast took during the movement. These visualisation allows for an easy recognition of complex motion patterns.~~ Further, we highlight the potentials of two- (2D-) and three- (3D-) dimensional visualisation of the paths a clast took during the movement and how these visualisations allow for an easy recognition of complex motion patterns.
- 5 ~~Finally, a critical review of the limitations of the Smartstone probe prototype is carried out and future developments are outlined.~~ Finally, we investigate the limitations of the Smartstone prototype and discuss what developments will be necessary to improve the probe and data handling further.

105 2 Material & methods

2.1 The Smartstone probe v2.0

In the present study, motion processes of single clasts were mainly observed by means of the Smartstone probe v2.0. The current prototype version is an improvement of the device that was presented by Gronz et al. (2016). A summary of the recent technical specifications is given in Table 1. All Smartstone kit components necessary to control the probe are shown in Fig. 1 (a). Contrary to the former version, which used a metal casing, the recent probe consists of an approx. 55 mm long and 10 mm wide plastic tube that holds the entire hardware. Therefore, the former external antenna could be replaced by an internal antenna, which allows an easier handling under experimental conditions. Energy is supplied by a single 1.5 V button cell battery (type AG 5). Two plastic plugs enable a waterproof closing. In standard configuration, the plugs have two sealing lips ~~available~~. Under dry conditions, plugs with only one sealing lip can be used as well, reducing the probe's total length to approx. 50 mm.

Centrepiece of the probe is the approx. 30 mm long conductor plate holding an IMU with a combined accelerometer (ACC) and gyroscope (GYR) sensor – the Bosch BMI 160 (Bosch Sensortec GmbH, 2015). The 16 bit triaxial ACC measures accelerations (a) within the range of ± 16 g, which strongly enhances the recording range comparing ± 4 g of the former version

("g" as unit for gravitational acceleration). It exhibits a noise level of 1 mg at 100 Hz sampling rate. The 16 bit triaxial GYR
120 measures rotations in terms of angular velocity (ω) within the range of $\pm 2000 \text{ }^\circ \text{ s}^{-1}$ at a noise level of $0.04 \text{ }^\circ \text{ s}^{-1}$. The IMU is
placed in the centre of the conductor plate. In addition, the probe is equipped with a magnetic sensor ('e-compass', MAG). For
this purpose, the Bosch BMC 150 (Bosch Sensortec GmbH, 2014) is used to record within the range of $\pm 1300 \text{ } \mu\text{T}$ (x-/y-axes)
and $\pm 2500 \text{ } \mu\text{T}$ (z-axis). Depending on the measuring range, the noise level is between $1 \text{ } \mu\text{T}$ and $2 \text{ } \mu\text{T}$ (the earth's magnetic field
strength ranges between $22 \text{ } \mu\text{T}$ and $67 \text{ } \mu\text{T}$). Sensor data and corresponding timestamps are stored on an internal 1 MB memory.
125 To allow an undisturbed motion, the Smartstone probe was developed as a wireless and autonomous instrument. The entire
communication between the probe and a control software is performed by active radio frequency identification (active RFID)
via the 868 MHz-band. Contrary to other communication techniques (such as wireless LAN), active RFID works under low
power conditions enabling the use of small batteries for energy supply. Additionally, it offers a higher operation range compared
to Bluetooth. Because of this low-power communication technique the total size of the probe can be minimised. An USB-
130 gateway works as interface between the probe and the controlling software with a graphical user interface (GUI). This enables
the adaptation of probe settings, start of recording and data readout. For instance, a recording threshold can be set to avoid
that minor signals (e. g. vibrations due to environmental perturbations) fill the internal memory before the considered motion
begins. Moreover, single sensors can be switched off and the sampling rate can be adjusted (see Table 1). These settings will
influence the time until the internal memory is completely filled. For instance, using all sensors (ACC, GYR, MAG) at a
135 sampling rate of 100 Hz fills the memory in approx. 8 min of continuous measurement.

The previously mentioned probe dimensions ~~of approx. 50 mm by 10 mm (minimal values)~~ were chosen, because the probe
should be embedded into representative clasts of the investigated material (see below). For this reason, a small button cell was
used being aware that its capacity is limited. Yet, the Smartstone probe hardware could also be used to investigate the motion
of ~~lager-larger~~ objects. Hence, longer plastic tubes and larger batteries (type AAAA) could be used for this propose. For the
140 present study, five probes were used, whereof one was damaged and could not be included into the analysis (see below).

The Smartstone probe v2.0 was developed and manufactured in cooperation with the company Smart Solutions Technology
GbR, Germany. Further improvements are planned and part of ongoing continuous research.

2.2 Axes conventions and reference systems

The following notations and conventions have to be considered during data description and interpretation. Due to the triaxial
145 architecture, sensor data is supplied by a triplet of values in each timestep. The triplet represents a vector with three space
components (Fig. 1, b). For instance, the ACC reading is composed of a_x^p , a_y^p and a_z^p , where the subscript denotes the axis and
the superscript indicates that the values are probe readings (compare also Fig. 1, c). Note that ACC and GYR are mounted
on one side of the conductor board resulting in the same axis configurations. Contrary, the MAG is mounted on the opposite
side of the conductor board (rotated by 180 °). ~~Therefore, its x- and y-axis are inverted. Following the right hand rule, positive
150 rotational directions are indicated by a small curved black arrow.~~ Therefore, its x- and y-axis are also rotated. Following the
right-hand rule, positive rotational directions are indicated by small curved black arrows.

To compare the movement characteristics of different probes, the data must be displayed in higher-order reference systems (1, c). The simplest way to do this, is the construction of a reference system using the probe's starting position as coordinate origin. During the motion process, the probe follows a path (trajectory) that can be expressed as a time-dependent position vector *relative* to the starting point. Therefore, the axes of this frame are denoted with x^{rel} , y^{rel} and z^{rel} . Note that the horizontal trajectory component (x - and y -axes) of the probe and the relative reference system are identical for the first timestep. In contrast, the deviation of the z^p -axis from the vertical direction can be determined exactly (for a detailed explanation see Sect. 3.1). Therefore, it probably differs from the z^{rel} -axis. After the motion has started, the probe's orientation will change while the relative reference system keeps its axes configuration. Consequently, within this reference system it is possible to calculate the probe's orientation and the covered distance in each timestep. This enables both qualitative and quantitative descriptions (see Sect. 3). In Fig. 1 (c) for instance, the probe has changed its orientation significantly compared to its starting position while moving along the assumed trajectory.

To compare relative movement characteristics like distance or velocity of different probes, the inner data / coordinate system p must be transformed into an outer reference system rel (1, c). The simplest way to do this is the construction of a reference system using the probe's starting position as coordinate origin. The system is defined by the sensor's inner coordinate system of the first timestep rotated so that the z -axis follows gravity. The axes of this relative (to the starting position) outer coordinate system are denoted with x^{rel} , y^{rel} and z^{rel} . After the motion has started, the probe's inner orientation will change while the outer reference system keeps its axes configuration. Consequently, within this reference system, it is possible to calculate the probe's orientation and the covered distance in each timestep. In Fig. 1 (c) for instance, the probe has changed its orientation significantly compared to its starting position while moving along the assumed trajectory.

However, a local reference system must be found to compare different probes with respect to the corresponding movement characteristics and trajectories. For the present study, a local reference system relative to the experimental flume (see section 2.4) was defined. Following the former conventions, the axes were denoted as x^f , y^f and z^f . Note that the axes orientations of the relative and the flume reference system may not be identical, except of z^{rel} and z^f . This is due to the distinct deduction of the vertical direction (direction of gravity) from ACC readings under stationary conditions (for a detailed explanation see Sect. 3.1). Additionally, the local reference system (x^f , y^f , z^f) is not identical with a higher-order global system. To transform local coordinates into a global system, the recording of magnetic data would be necessary, which was not done in the present study.

However, the different probe-specific outer coordinate systems must be transformed into the same local reference system to compare different probes' trajectories. For the present study, this local reference system is oriented towards the experimental flume (see Sect. 2.4). Following the former conventions, the axes were denoted as x^f , y^f and z^f . Note that the axes orientations of the outer (rel) and the local reference system (f) may not be identical, except of z^{rel} and z^f , as they follow gravity.

In different applications, where a global positioning is required, reference points of the outer coordinate systems must be known in the global system to determine the absolute probe position in the global system.

185 2.3 Data calibration and processing

Prior to the calculations of movement characteristics, ~~raw~~ sensor data has to be calibrated. As further data processing uses ACC readings to derive movement characteristics, calibration is essential for the ACC. ~~The recorded acceleration values of each axis (a_x^p , a_y^p , a_z^p) are generally erroneous due to three reasons: (i) a (quasi-) constant misreading, (ii) the imprecise orthogonal alignment of the sensor axes, and (iii) the so-called cross talk. Components (ii) and (iii) lead to the fact that a fraction of acceleration along an arbitrary axis will be measured on the two other axes.~~ The recorded acceleration values of each axis (a_x^p , a_y^p , a_z^p) are generally erroneous due to two reasons: (i) A (quasi-) constant misreading. The mass inside the sensor, which moves to measure acceleration, is not precisely equal in all sensors (manufacturing tolerance), resulting in a bias as well as a linear scaling of true values. (ii) The imprecise orthogonal alignment of the sensor axes and crosstalk. This means that a fraction of each axis acceleration will result in readings at the two other axes. All of them can be corrected by adding a sensor- and environment depending vector (i) to the readings and multiply them with a scale factor matrix (~~ii and iii~~).

190 Frosio et al. (2009) ~~describes an optimisation algorithm that estimates these three components simultaneously~~ describe an optimisation algorithm that estimates these error components simultaneously. In the present study this approach was applied for the first time on Smartstone probe data. Because one probe was somehow damaged during the experiments, ACC ~~raw~~ data of the remaining four probes was calibrated by means of the optimisation algorithm using MATLAB software. Subsequently, only these probes were analysed.

200 By means of the recorded acceleration and rotation data, the movement characteristics and the probe's trajectory can be reconstructed. Basically, these calculations ~~are based on~~ use Newton's physical laws and integration of the recorded accelerations. Practically, if the pebble is in motion, gravitational acceleration and acceleration due to the motion will interfere. Nevertheless, position and orientation in each timestep can be estimated by combining the ACC and GYR readings. This approach is termed *sensor fusion* (e. g. Koch, 2014). In the present study a quaternion-based estimation algorithm was used that was originally developed to track the human gait. It was adapted from Madgwick et al. (2011) and x-io Technologies (2013) and supplies the movement characteristics velocity v and displacement s relative to the starting position. Additionally, it enables a 3D-visualisation of the trajectory. For a detailed description of the computation see Sect. 3.2.

2.4 Experimental setup

210 ~~The design of the experimental setup focussed on an exact and rapid triggering mechanism of the artificial landslide and flexibility for various studies.~~ The experimental setup was designed regarding the following requirements: (i) an exact and rapid triggering mechanism, (ii) multiple repetitions with identical boundary conditions due to homogeneous and dry material and (iii) flexibility for future studies. Figure 2 (a) shows the configuration that was used for the present study. A spring-based triggering mechanism allowed a rapid release of the material stored in a box on top of the flume. Eight single springs supplied a total spring force of approx. 1660 N. After the release, the material moved along an approx. 4.2 m long plane inclined by 20°. ~~A small portion of the total material also entered the lower part of the flume that was inclined by 10°.~~ Some clasts also

reached the lower part of the flume, which is inclined by 10 °. Lateral barriers limited the width of the flume to approx. 2.2 m. The bottom of the flume was covered by dimpled sheet to provide uniform basal frictional conditions.

A high-speed camera was placed close to the storage box to document the initial motion of the material. A camera of type
220 Optronis CR4000 x 2 and Tamron XR DiII (17-55 mm, 1:2.8) lens were used. High-speed sequences were recorded with
500 fps, a resolution of 2304 x 1720 pixels and were stored as *.jpeg-files. The camera was mounted with an inclination of
20 ° at the left side of the flume (direction of motion). The recorded pictures were mirrored during post-processing to achieve
a better comparability between high-speed sequences and probe data. Therefore, motion proceeds from left to right in all
attached figures and the supplementary high-speed video (Video 1). The video facilitates the verification of the interpretation
225 (if the pebble is visible) of the sensor data and the concluded motion modes. We will refer to it several times.

For the present study, a uniformly-graded pebble material of fluvial origin (fluvial deposit of Moselle river) was used. Litho-
logically, it mainly consists of quartzite with smaller portions of greasy quartz and slate. Therefore, pebbles show laminated
and rounded to well-rounded shapes. The particle size range was specified to 32 mm to 64 mm and the effective unit weight
amounts to 1.55 t m⁻³ (manufacturer information, EIDEN, 2017). A median particle diameter d₅₀ of 42 mm and a uniformity
230 coefficient C_U of 2.1 was determined by sieving analysis. Clasts with diameters ≥ 60 mm amount to approx. 12 % (w/w) of
the material. A total mass of approx. 520 kg was used for the present study.

From the material several pebbles were taken to be equipped with Smartstone probes. For this purpose, a hole was drilled
through the pebble and modified in the way that a snug fit of the probe was achieved. Therefore, the probe could not move
within the hole during the motion process. Additionally, the pebbles were marked and numbered to be easily identified in
235 the high-speed sequences. The specific unit weight of each prepared pebble was determined by immersion weighing before
and after the preparation procedure. In this study, a detailed analysis of quarzitic pebble 4 will be carried out. By means of
immersion weighing a change in density (2.66 g cm⁻³) was not detectable.

The storage box was filled with about 50 % of the material prior to the experiment. Two probe equipped pebbles were placed
and their position was measured at the temporal surface as displayed in Fig. 2 (b). Afterwards, more pebble material was filled
240 into the storage box and three more equipped pebbles were placed at the final surface. Figure 2 (c) and (d) show the initial
conditions prior to the experiment. The positions of each equipped pebbles were additionally measured relative to the upper
edge of the storage box. ~~This was done by means of a laser distance meter.~~ This was done using a laser distance meter (accuracy
±1 mm). Measures were conducted for y^f- and z^f-direction for both, the starting and the depositional position.

3 Motion data of landslide experiments and how to read it

245 The present study intends to demonstrate the motion behaviour of single pebbles that are transported within a moving mass
by means of IMU sensors. Exemplarily, one experiment, ~~which was carried out in 2017,~~ was chosen to present (i) sensor ~~raw~~
recordings (Fig. 3), (ii) the derived movement characteristics (*a*, *v*, *s*, Fig. 4), and (iii) 2D- and 3D-visualisations (Fig. 5,
Fig. 6). The latter illustrate the complex motion trajectory of a single pebble within the landslide mass. Subsequently, data of
one pebble are analysed (sections 3.1 to 3.3) before the motion of multiple pebbles is considered in Sect. 4.1.

250 3.1 Qualitative description and interpretation of probe raw data

Fig. 3 shows the calibrated raw data of pebble 4. For this test, only acceleration in g ($1 g = 9.81 \text{ m s}^{-2}$, Fig. 3, a) and rotation in $^\circ \text{ s}^{-1}$ (Fig. 3, c) were recorded (activated IMU). Note that the three curves of x^p , y^p and z^p (Fig. 3, a) show the acceleration along the particular axis (see below). The gyroscope data curves (Fig. 3, c) show rotation around these axes. At the top of each plot, white bars indicate stationary (no motion) and black bars non-stationary (motion) periods of each plot. The previously explained data processing (see section 2.3) was only applied to non-stationary periods. The whole motion sequence can be subdivided into six phases (A to F) with distinct properties characterising a specific motion behaviour. Additionally, two discrete time points (diamond I and II) indicate major changes within the motion sequence. These phases and time markers highlight the same events in Fig. 3 to Fig. 5 and the supplementary video.

The motion data sequence of pebble 4 covers a total duration of 2.1 s. The start of motion of pebble 4 was set to 0.0 s. Before the actual motion begins, x^p and y^p show very low values, though x^p on a slightly higher level (approx. 0.0 g). Before the actual motion begins (stationary conditions, left white bars in Fig. 3), low values were recorded along x^p and y^p , though x^p -readings are on a slightly higher level (approx. 0.0 g). At y^p , low negative values were recorded. Only at z^p higher values of approx. 1 g can be seen. This pattern represents non-motion conditions, where only gravitational acceleration is recorded. This assumption is supported by the zero readings of the GYR. The plot of Fig. 3 (b) shows that the resultant acceleration $|a|$ is approx. 1 g. According to the conventions from Sect. 2.2, $|a|$ can be written as

$$|a| = \left| \begin{pmatrix} a_x^p \\ a_y^p \\ a_z^p \end{pmatrix} \right| = \sqrt{a_x^{p2} + a_y^{p2} + a_z^{p2}} = 1g. \quad (1)$$

Each axis reading reflects a fraction of the gravity vector and is given by

$$a_x^p = \cos \alpha \cdot 1g; \quad a_y^p = \cos \beta \cdot 1g; \quad a_z^p = \cos \gamma \cdot 1g, \quad (2)$$

where α is the angle between x^p , β is the angle between y^p , and γ is the angle between z^p and the gravity vector, respectively. α , β and γ define the angle between x^p , z^p , y^p and the gravity vector, respectively. Accordingly, under static conditions the probe's orientation relative to the gravity vector (downwards-vertical direction) can be calculated from the three readings of a_x^p , a_y^p and a_z^p . Furthermore, the GYR data also shows that no rotation occurred before 0.0 s (Fig. 3, c), which also indicated stationary conditions.

Phase A (light yellow shading): The motion begins with a sudden change. A sudden change in the axes-readings at 0.0 s is visible in all three plots. Between 0.0 s and approx. 0.03 s, a clear drop of z^p -recordings to the half of the former level is visible in the acceleration plot (Fig. 3, a). Simultaneously, the values of x^p increase slightly above zero and those of y^p

slightly decrease.¹ Generally, relatively low acceleration readings are visible on all three axes during phase A, reflected by the resultant acceleration (Fig. 3, b). ~~Low absolute values of acceleration can only be achieved if free fall is mixed with an additional component. Zero is only measured during pure free fall. Values between 0 and 1 imply a hampered free fall and/or an additional lateral acceleration.~~ Low absolute values of acceleration can only be achieved if free fall (unconfined acceleration within the earth's gravitational field into the direction of its centre of mass) is mixed with an additional. Thus, values between 0 g and 1 g imply a hampered free fall (no completely developed free fall, confined motion) and/or an additional lateral acceleration.

In phase A the resultant acceleration is between zero and one. Hence, the pebble moved more or less downwards but was not ~~free to fall in free fall~~. In fact, it was confined by the surrounding mass (see below). During phase A, angular velocities of about $\pm 250^\circ \text{ s}^{-1}$ are visible in Fig. 3 (c). It is conspicuous that between 0.0 s and approx. 0.2 s, negative values are visible on x^p and y^p , while z^p shows positive values. Between approx. 0.2 s and 0.38 s, oppositional axes configurations with low absolute values at z^p and positive angular velocities at x^p and y^p are displayed. These features show a forward- and backward rotation of the pebble mainly around x^p and y^p . Generally, phase A is characterised by relatively smooth curves without any large peaks and comparably low sensor readings for both, the ACC and the GYR. Thus, it appears that during this phase, a relatively calm motion behaviour was present without any stronger collisions between the pebble 4 and the surrounding clasts. ~~One conclusion might be~~ We conclude that the surrounding part of the mass moves coherently downwards.

Diamond I and phase B (light grey shading): At 0.389 s (diamond I) a distinct transition in the data sequence is visible. Contrary to phase A, uneven and peaky curves can be seen in all plots. In Fig. 3 (a), z^p generally shows high acceleration peaks of approx. 3.0 g. ~~From 0.389 s to approx. 0.7 s, x^p and y^p show values of about +1 g and -1 g, respectively. Along y_p , values around -1 g were recorded; along z^p , values around 1 g were recorded from 0.389 s to approx. 0.7 s.~~ The resultant acceleration (Fig. 3, b) also shows a peaky curve with values between 0.2 g and approx. 3.0 g. Looking at the GYR data, high angular velocities of about 600° s^{-1} at x^p and y^p are visible around diamond I. This indicates a strong rotation around these axes and may be a hint for major changes in direction. After that, relatively low ω values $< 500^\circ \text{ s}^{-1}$ are recorded during phase B.

Diamond II and phase C (light yellow shading): At diamond II another strong transition is visible in the time series. ~~The strongest peak of the whole sequence (approx. 4.6 g) is measured at z^p . Accelerations with this magnitude were actually recorded in two timesteps (0.898 s and 0.908 s). This is conspicuous since most of the other peaks consist of only one data point.~~ The strongest peak of the whole sequence (approx. 4.6 g) is measured at z_p for two subsequent readings. Thus, the change in velocity is bigger than all other changes as the strongest absolute acceleration also lasts longer than most other acceleration peaks, which only consist of one reading. Because of the low acceleration recordings of x^p and y^p , the resultant acceleration is calculated to approx. 4.7 g. Diamond II introduces phase C, where higher sensor reading in GYR data are visible as well (Fig. 3, c). Here, the phase begins with relatively low ω of approx. 260° s^{-1} at 0.898 s on y^p . After that, a strong increase on y^p is visible until at 0.918 s, a local maximum of approx. $1230^\circ \text{ s}^{-1}$ is reached. Interestingly, this peak was recorded after high

¹The sign of the reading does not imply an increase or decrease of velocity. A positive value is caused by acceleration along this axis; a negative value is caused by acceleration in the opposite direction. A positive value as well as a negative value might be due to an increase of the pebble's velocity or a decrease – depending on its orientation.

values were recognised at a_z^p , 0.01 s earlier. While the GYR readings of x^p and z^p are relatively low at approx. $-150^\circ \text{ s}^{-1}$,
310 values of y^p stay at a high level of approx. 750° s^{-1} . At the end of phase C, an increase of ω at y^p is visible.

These recordings can be interpreted in the way that pebble 4 changes its mode from lateral sliding to rotation and saltation. This point in time is also clearly visible in Video 1 at the position marked with diamond II. In the following, each saltation is characterised by single strong peaks on different axes (as the pebble also rotates).

Phase D (light red shading): The short period between 1.008 s and 1.038 s (4 data samples) can be easily identified within the
315 acceleration plots (Fig. 3, a and b). Low ACC readings of all three probe axes lead to a resultant a close to zero. As explained above, this is only possible under almost free fall conditions. Therefore, it can be reasoned that the pebble 4 fell for approx. 0.03 s. The gyroscope plot (Fig. 3, c) shows again high values of approx. 900° s^{-1} for y^p and relatively low values for x^p and z^p . This implies a pronounced rotation while the pebble ~~fell~~falls.

Phase E (light yellow shading): A strong rotation around y^p continues at the beginning of phase E. But contrary to the
320 former phases, ω_x^p and ω_z^p show increasing positive and negative values since approx. 1.07 s, respectively. At approx. 1.14 s a peak of ω of approx. $-820^\circ \text{ s}^{-1}$ occurs at z^p before the values decrease again. At about the same point in time, strong peaks are visible at the ACC readings at each probe axes. These lead to the second highest a resultant (approx. 4.2 g) of the whole time series. From approx. 1.23 s to approx. 1.24 s another short period of ACC readings around zero is visible, resulting in an a resultant of approx. 0 g. At the end of phase E, a last strong a peak (3.6 g) at z^p and a strong decline of the ω_y^p are visible. This
325 denotes a major change in motion behaviour with a transition from strong rotations in the phases C, D and E to less rotational but translational displacement.

Phase F (light grey) and the end of motion: During this last phase, a continuous decline of ω at all probe axes can be seen. Whereas values of approx. $\pm 200^\circ \text{ s}^{-1}$ are recorded at approx. 1.3 s, until the end of the movement an almost logarithmic decrease of these values is visible. This decline appears also at the ACC readings from approx. 1.53 s onwards. At 1.826 s the
330 end of the motion sequence is reached. GYR readings around 0° s^{-1} were recorded. At the ACC, only minor changes can be seen after this point in time. At z^p values vary slightly below 1 g. Readings of x^p and y^p are slightly higher than 0 g. As the pebble is stationary, only the gravitational acceleration vector is displayed by the data. This is also visible in Fig. 3 (b), where the calculated a magnitude varies around 1 g.

~~Concerning the whole time series, some interesting aspects shall be mentioned: The small deviations from the mean axes
335 readings of the ACC after the motion (right white bar) can be interpreted as either vibration of the flume construction or surrounding elasts that are still in motion and, therefore, induce smaller accelerations to pebble 4. Of cause, an overlay of these effects could also explain these recordings. Anyhow, these readings are too small to be induced by motion and are therefore excluded from further analysis. The same applies to the rotation data.~~

Concerning the whole time series, some interesting aspects shall be mentioned: The small deviations from the mean axes
340 readings of the ACC after the motion (right white bar) can be interpreted as oscillation of the flume construction after the impact. This is supported by the data pattern exhibiting uniform oscillations which are gradually decreasing in amplitude.

By comparing the ACC readings before and after the movement (white bars), a minor change of x^p and y^p can be seen. While x^p showed values of ± 0.0 g and y^p slightly negative readings before the start, low positive values were recorded after

the motion on both axes. Contrary to this, z^p shows slightly lower values after the motion compared to its readings before the start of the experiment. From this can be reasoned that the orientation of pebble 4 after the movement has changed. Because the ACC readings of z^p are slightly lower it follows that this axis does not point exactly into vertical direction after the motion and pebble 4 is somewhat tilted.

Further, different 'modes' of sensor readings occur during the motion sequence. The first mode is generally characterised by little ACC readings on all axes. In addition, the curves are relatively smooth and less peaky, which is particularly clear for the rotation data. This mode is present in phase A and for the short period of phase D. The second mode consists of peaky and relatively high acceleration values simultaneously with relatively low, but peaky GYR readings. The amplitude of ACC values is relatively high. This mode occurs during phases B and F. Contrary, a third mode shows smoother (less peaky) ACC readings with lower amplitudes and high, but less peaky, GYR recordings. This mode can be observed in phases C and E. These oppositional observations reflect the previously mentioned motion behaviour. The first mode is recorded when the pebble mainly falls downwards and clast contact is inhibited. The second mode is recorded if translational transport under confined conditions occurs. Pebble 4 moves within the mass and is exposed to pronounced collisional contacts due to surrounding pebbles. This results in frequent impacts and, consequently, acceleration peaks. Because the pebble is generally not free to move, larger rotation is inhibited and minor but sudden orientation changes occur. This is reflected by the relatively low but peaky GYR readings. Contrary, mode three occurs when the pebble rotates unconfined. This is only possible, while the pebble is not surrounded by other material. This means that the pebble must be above the moving mass. In other words and geoscientifically speaking: the pebble saltates. ~~A alternating pattern of high a peaks and almost zero acceleration magnitudes also fits to this process, because during saltation the pebble~~This is also supported by the alternating pattern of high a peaks and almost zero acceleration magnitude. This pattern results from saltation as the pebble bounces at the flume bottom before it rebounds and falls again.

3.2 Quantifying motion by means of derived movements characteristics

The previously explained data only focused on the motion mode. Now, we want to investigate the movement with respect to position and time. The recorded data is only a result of external influences (forces) that act on the pebble. However, from the recorded and calibrated **raw** data, the pebble's movement characteristics relative to its starting position (a^{rel} , v^{rel} , s^{rel}) can be derived by simple physical relations. The initial orientation of the pebble can be calculated ~~after~~according to Eq. 1 and Eq. 2. By means of the received Euler angles α , β and γ , the sensor readings a_x^p , a_y^p and a_z^p can be rearranged to a_x^{rel} , a_y^{rel} and a_z^{rel} (compare also Sect. 2.2). However, the representation by Euler angles may not be bijective and therefore may lead to an erroneous initial orientation ('gimbal lock'). Another method to derive initial orientation by means of acceleration and rotation data was presented by Madgwick et al. (2011). It is based on a quaternion representation and supplies bijective solutions (for detailed explanations the reader is referred to Madgwick et al. (2011) and specific literature as e. g. (Jazar, 2011)). It was implemented into a MATLAB algorithm, which was published online under the URL: <https://x-io.co.uk/gait-tracking-with-x-imu/> (CC license, x-io Technologies, 2013).

After finding the initial orientation, the vector \mathbf{a}^{rel} consequently gives the translational acceleration of the pebble within a reference system relative to the pebble's starting position (compare Fig. 1, c). Thereby, the direction of a_z^{rel} equals the gravity vector and thus points downwards. Hence, a_x^{rel} and a_y^{rel} give the horizontal component of \mathbf{a}^{rel} . After the rearrangement of the recorded accelerations and with respect to time t , the movement characteristics \mathbf{v}^{rel} and \mathbf{s}^{rel} can be ~~integrated~~obtained from the integration as

$$\mathbf{v}^{rel}(t) = \int \mathbf{a}^{rel}(t) dt \quad (3)$$

and

$$\mathbf{s}^{rel}(t) = \int \mathbf{v}^{rel}(t) dt. \quad (4)$$

By applying these formula, movement characteristics were calculated for the non-stationary period and are plotted in Fig. 4 (a-c). Individual phases and distinct points in time are indicated in the same way as displayed in Fig. 3. Additionally, captures of the high-speed sequence from diamonds I and II are shown in Fig. 4 (d). Note also, that acceleration values are plotted in the unit m s^{-2} . Data processing was applied from the start of motion (compare black bars in Fig. 3 to 5). Only \mathbf{a}^{rel} was rearranged before the motion starts (white bars). ~~Note that the values are defective during these stationary periods. During stationary periods these values are defective. This can be seen at x^{rel} (Fig. 3, a), where values of approx. -4 m s^{-2} were calculated. Obviously, this cannot be true as the pebble does not move. However, these false calculations are excluded from further integration (compare Fig. 3, b and c) and do not influence the following interpretations.~~

Relatively low acceleration values are calculated during phase A. As displayed in Fig. 4 (a), a_z^{rel} ~~continuously~~generally increases until at approx. 0.32 s a local maximum of approx. -9.4 m s^{-2} occurs. This is less than the gravitational acceleration (9.81 m s^{-2}). Therefore, it can be reasoned that free fall conditions were not totally developed during this phase. In fact, pebble 4 was confined by the underlying mass. This can also be seen in Fig. 4 (d), where pebble 4 'swims' at the surface of the moving material. Therefore, phase A could be termed as 'confined fall'. The highest derived velocity of v_y^{rel} ~~v_z^{rel}~~ during phase A was calculated to approx. 1.7 m s^{-1} at 0.379 s. Afterwards the v_z^{rel} velocity component decreased. Simultaneously, the ~~v_z^{rel}~~ v_y^{rel} velocity component increased further. During phase A, a cumulated vertical distance of approx. 0.35 m was covered. The s_y^{rel} component amounts to approx. 0.11 m at the end of phase A.

At 0.389 s after the start, ~~a major change is visible in all plots~~a discontinuity at x- and z-axis is visible in Fig. 4 (a) and (b). The corresponding capture of the high-speed sequence is shown in Fig. 4 (d). ~~The relatively smooth acceleration curves change to a more peaky pattern. The variability of the acceleration time series increases.~~ This ~~pattern~~ was already identified in Fig. 3. A first strong peak of approx. 14.7 m s^{-2} occurred at a_z^{rel} and marks the begin of phase B. At this time, a transition from confined fall to translational movement occurs. Additionally, the peaky pattern of the acceleration and velocity curves indicates pronounced clast contact and ~~frictional behaviour~~energy dissipation. This is particularly clear for v_z^{rel} . Because pebble 4 moves at the surface of the material, clast contact occurs mainly in vertical direction. During phase B, the vertical velocity component subsequently decreases. Meanwhile, v_y^{rel} increases until at 0.609 s the maximum of approx. 1.45 m s^{-1} is reached.

Phase C again is introduced by a sudden strong increase in a_z^{rel} at 0.898 s (diamond II). The acceleration peak at 0.908 s of approx. 35.9 m s^{-2} leads to a positive vertical velocity of approx. 0.21 m s^{-1} . The pebble consequently moves upwards at this point in time, which can be seen in the displacement plot (Fig. 4, c). Afterwards, the displacement tends again to downwards motion in phases D and E. During phases C to E, the displacement plot (Fig. 4, [dc](#)) shows stair-like features at the s_x^{rel} and s_z^{rel} curves. These features can only be achieved if the actual motion acts against the tendency of downwards movement parallel to the flume bottom (see Fig. 1). Together with the previously mentioned high ω around all probe axes (compare Fig. 3), a complex rotational motion pattern can be interpreted until 1.307 s. Note that only the first milliseconds of this complex motion are visible in Video 1 since pebble 4 left the field of view at approx. 1.0 s.

In phase F, translational acceleration and derived velocity components gradually decline, which leads to only little displacements. A total displacement of approx. 1.0 m in y^{rel} -direction and 1.3 m in x^{rel} -direction was calculated by means of the former mentioned algorithm. Additionally, in Fig. 4 (c) the covered distance measured with a laser distance meter in flume direction are plotted. Although being aware that y^{rel} and y^f do not necessarily have to be identical (compare Fig. 1 and Sect. 2.2), a high agreement between sensor-derived and manually measured displacements is displayed. It can be reasoned that the probe must be oriented more or less in flume direction, following that the probe axes x^{rel} and $y^{rel} \approx x^f$ and y^f . As the vertical direction is derived from ACC readings under stationary conditions z^{rel} equals z^f . Thus, the deviation between s_z^{rel} and s_z^f reflects the quality of sensor-derived position. Whereas a sensor-derived vertical displacement of 0.999 m was calculated, a true vertical displacement of 1.109 m was measured in fact. This means the calculations underestimate the vertical displacement by less than 10 %.

3.3 Visualising motion by trajectory reconstructions

As described in Sect. 1, high-speed video recording is one of the traditional methods to observe rapid movements. Such a video sequence was recorded for the present study as well (Video 1). Due to narrow conditions at the experimental facility, the high-speed camera had to be installed very close to the setup, resulting in a relatively small field of view. At the end of the high-speed sequence, nevertheless the start of a complex rotational motion of pebble 4 can be observed. However, the full motion feature is not visible.

Although only the first portion of this complex motion is visible on the high-speed sequence, the full trajectory can be reconstructed by means of the recorded Smartstone data. The trajectory is defined as the position vector composed of s_x^{rel} , s_y^{rel} and s_z^{rel} for each timestep (Fig. 4, c). As additional information, the pebble's orientation can be reconstructed by means of the previously described algorithm. Consequently, these variables can be plotted as a function of time within a Cartesian coordinate system, as displayed in Fig. 5. Thereby, the axes x^{rel} , y^{rel} and z^{rel} ~~denote~~ denote the distance axes relative to the starting position of the pebble. Note that z^{rel} always points into vertical direction (for explanation see above) and that diagram axes of Fig. 5 are not drawn in the same scale. Note further that contrary to Fig. 3 and 4, Fig. 5 shows no time series but visualises the pebble's position within the relative reference system.

In Fig. 5 (a), the trajectory projected on the $y^{rel}z^{rel}$ -plane can be seen, ~~representing the same perspective as Video 1 displayed~~ in the same orientation as in Video 1. Additionally to the side view perspective, data can also be visualised as top view,

where the trajectory is projected on the $x^{\text{rel}}y^{\text{rel}}$ -plane (Fig. 5, b). Moreover, the 3D-trajectory can be visualised as displayed in Fig. 5 (c). The pebble's position is marked by small black dots and probe's axes are shown in red (x^{p}), green (y^{p}) and blue (z^{p}), indicating its orientation at each position. Note that the axes are smaller if they point towards the viewer or opposite (off the displayed plane). Positions (black dots) are plotted with a constant frequency, which was reduced to $\frac{1}{3}$ of the recording frequency of 100 Hz, ~~due to clearness reasons~~for reasons of clarity.

On the side view plot (Fig. 5, a), y^{p} and z^{p} are almost drawn in full length, whereas x^{p} is short, indicating its orientation towards the viewer's perspective. It can be reasoned that the pebble is oriented almost horizontally before the motion begins. By comparing the three plots of Fig. 5, one can observe that the probe is slightly tilted around the y^{p} -axis towards the left side.

During phase A, mainly vertical displacement can be seen in Fig. 5 (a). Projected on the $y^{\text{rel}}z^{\text{rel}}$ -plane, the trajectory shows an almost linear pattern. On the $x^{\text{rel}}y^{\text{rel}}$ -plane (fig. 5, b), a slight rightward displacement is visible. The pebble's orientation remains more or less constant and only minor tilting can be observed as the y^{p} -axis (green) points a little downwards. At the end of phase A, the pebble rotates back again.

In phase B, a transition to a curved trajectory can be observed in Fig. 5 (a). Interestingly, a major change in movement direction emerges on the top view at diamond I as well (Fig. 5, b). Whereas the pebble moves slightly to the left during phase A, a change in movement direction towards the right is induced at this point in time. Additionally, a slow rotation of the pebble can be observed in phase B mainly around the y^{p} -axis. This rotation contains portions around the other axes as well. Note also that from the beginning of phase A to about the middle of phase B (approx. 0.5 m on y^{rel}), the distance between the small black dots (indicating its position) increases, indicating increasing velocity given a constant rate of displaying the position (33.3 Hz, see above). Afterwards, the distance between the position points decreases resulting from the deceleration of the pebble.

At diamond II, a major transition was identified above for both, ~~rawprobe~~rawprobe data and movement characteristics. The same transition is obvious Fig. 5 as well. While axes configurations only varied slightly during phases A and B, pronounced changes can be seen during the phases C to E. The whole complexity of the rotation in these phases can be recognised by comparing the three plots of Fig. 5. It is visible that the pebble rotates around all axes. Further, the distances between single black dots increases again, implying a repeated acceleration. Although these rotations were not completely documented by the high-speed sequence (Video 1), the reconstructed 2D- and 3D-trajectories reveal the complex rotation that was induced by a sudden impact at diamond II (compare also Fig. 3 and Fig. 4).

Phase F is again characterised by relatively small but continuous changes in axes orientations and by an almost linear trajectory pattern. The distances between the black dots decrease further, reflecting the decreasing velocity. In addition, Fig. 5 shows that the pebble's orientation at the end of motion differs significantly from its starting orientation. The pebble is strongly rotated as the x^{p} - and y^{p} -axes point towards the starting position. This could not be identified in the ~~rawprobe~~rawprobe data, plotted in Fig. 3. Here, only little changes in ACC readings were identifiable. This reflects critical states, where different orientations lead to similar (or equal) axes readings. To derive the correct orientation, advanced techniques have to be used, like a quaternion-based approach (compare e. g. Hanson, 2006). Apart from that, the z^{p} -axis points – slightly tilted – in an upward direction. Note also

that the flume bottom is inclined by 20° (compare Fig. 2). Therefore, the linear trajectory reflects parallel motion along the flume bottom.

4 Potentials and limitations of the Smartstone probe

480 4.1 Trajectories of multiple pebbles in one experiment

A detailed analysis of the reconstructed motion behaviour of a single clast within a moving mass was given above. Beyond that, three more pebbles were equipped with Smartstone probes in the same experiment and their trajectories could be reconstructed in the same way as for pebble 4. Consequently, the four trajectories can be plotted together within one diagram providing that a higher-ordered reference system is applied (see Sect. 2.2 and Fig. 1).

485 Fig. 6 shows the reconstructed spatiotemporal trajectories of four pebbles that were equipped with a probe. Note that vertical and horizontal axes of the diagram are drawn on same scale and the duration is colour-coded relative to the start of movement. Additionally, time stamps are displayed at 0.25 s, 0.5 s, 1.0 s, and 1.5 s for each trajectory, respectively. The first motion of the four analysed pebbles was set to 0.0 s (pebble 1). Therefore, both time and position coordinates differ from Fig. 3 and Fig. 5. Thick grey lines give the dimensions of the flume construction including the storage box with the simplified material body prior to the start. It is visible that pebble 1 and 2 were embedded into the material, whereas pebble 3 and 4 were placed at the surface of the material (see Fig. 2). ~~Pebbles 4 and 3 were placed at the surface of the~~

Looking at the four trajectories, it can be seen that the path of pebble 3 falls remarkably steeper than the others. This results in a reconstructed depositional position that is below the flume bottom. Here, the reconstruction obviously produces erroneous results. Comparing the end of the trajectory and the true deposition of pebble 3, the overall length (projected length of the 2D displacement on y^f/z^f -plane) fits quite well to the measured one. It seems that only the inclination of the reconstructed trajectory was ~~misinterpreted~~ wrongly estimated by the algorithm. A wrong estimation of the initial orientation is considered to be the main disturbance for the wrong orientation of the trajectory. A false reconstruction might occur if the probe did not record the stationary conditions prior to the start of motion. However, the time series of pebble 3 was found to be complete after a detailed review. Another reason could be that – contrary to the other clasts – pebble 3 might be strongly inclined under stationary conditions prior to the start of the experiment. This would result in a wrong estimation of the vertical direction leading to an overestimation of the vertical acceleration component and the double-integrated vertical displacement.

500 The other trajectories on the other hand show patterns that are reasonable compared to the reference measurements: The two embedded pebbles covered a shorter distance than the pebble placed at the surface. Additionally, at the same point in time – for instance at approx. 1.0 s since the start of the experiment (again red coloured) – pebble 4 has travelled approx. 0.4 m further than the embedded ones. ~~These observations are consistent with basic physical laws as objects on higher position exhibit higher potential energy that can be transferred within the motion process.~~ Whereas Okura et al. (2000) observed that blocks positioned at the front were also deposited in the distal zone, the top pebbles travelled the longest distance in our experiment. Regarding the high-speed video, the explanation is given by the tilted gate: The pebbles positioned on the top start their movement both downwards and to the right (from the camera perspective), thus not transferring energy to material

510 formerly placed underneath in the storage box. The higher the pebbles are placed, the bigger is their overhang, resulting in less material vertically underneath. Compared to the uniform initiation (multiple blocks slid coherently) of the motion in Okura et al. (2000), less energy dissipation occurs in our experiment.

Moreover, the embedded pebble 1 displaced roughly 70 % of the resulting distance (approx. 0.35 m of 0.50 m) within approx. 0.5 s (light blue colours). It is conspicuous that during this phase mainly vertical displacement occurs, whereas the latter 30 % of its trajectory it moves more or less parallel to the inclined flume plane. For this part of its trajectory the pebble needs another approx. 0.8 s until it finally deposits. It can be reasoned that a strong gradient in velocity magnitude after the transition from mainly vertical to lateral displacement occurs. This motion behaviour was only observed for pebble 1 in this experiment. Contrary to pebble 1, the trajectory of pebble 2, which was embedded as well, shows an uniform pattern. In addition, a smooth velocity gradient can be observed, indicated by gradually changing colours. Therefore, the two pebbles, which were embedded at opposite sides of the material (compare Fig. 2), show dissimilar motion patterns. Probably the motion behaviour is depended on the pebble's distance to the opening board of the flume. Clasts that are further to it – such as pebble 2 – are surrounded by more material confining a free motion. Therefore, almost free fall conditions will be easier to achieve closer to the opening as in the case of pebble 1. This is also in agreement with the reconstructed trajectory of pebble 4 that shows a similar pattern until approx. 1 s after the start.

525 Contrary to the uniform trajectories of pebbles 1 and 2, saltation can be recognised approx. 1.15 s after the start between approx. 1.3 m and 1.6 m horizontal distance (y^f) for pebble 4. This feature is the result of the complex rotations that were identified in data (Fig. 3) as well as the derived movement characteristics (Fig. 4) and were finally visualised in Fig. 5. Now, comparing all valid trajectories within the flume reference system, this bumping pattern of pebble 4 becomes very notable. During this phase the general lateral motion along the inclining plane – driven by gravitational acceleration and decelerated by friction – is interrupted. In fact, the pebble moves more or less horizontally before it falls again and proceeds its 'normal' motion. This extraordinary motion pattern was initiated by a strong hit visible in ~~raw-motion~~probe motion data (Fig. 3, a) at diamond II. Although the trigger can be identified in the ~~raw~~probe data, its actual meaning and, subsequently, a suitable interpretation is only possible if the movement is visualised within the correct spatiotemporal context. Hence, a rudimentary plotting of ~~motion-raw~~probe data is not sufficient to describe and interpret geomorphic movement processes adequately.

535 4.2 Probe restrictions and analytical limitations

The current Smartstone probe v2.0 exhibits one main drawback. Since the probe development focussed on the minimal possible size, only a small button cell battery can be used as energy supply. This means that battery life is restricted, especially under cold conditions. ~~Consequently, the batteries had to be changed before the data was read out during the experimental campaign.~~ This resulted in a pronounced battery wastage. During the future development of the Smartstone probe, alternative options for energy supply will have to be evaluated.

Beyond the battery issues, some probes seemed to be error-prone. As indicated before, it was not possible to record a calibration sequence with one probe. Although this probe was handled in the same way as all others, it was somehow damaged. In this case, an initiation of the recording mode was not possible anymore. The reason for this could not be evaluated.

Despite this, all other probes could be used during the experiments and the data could be used to reconstruct the 3D-
545 trajectories as described above. When comparing the end of each valid trajectory and the true depositional position, a particular
deviation of several centimetres is visible. In all cases the reconstructed trajectory is shorter than the actual distance that was
covered by the pebble. It can be reasoned that the displacement is generally underestimated by the calculations. This is in
contrast to the analytical results of Gronz et al. (2016), where mainly the clipping of ACC readings lead to an overestimation
of the displacement. In the present experiment, clipping was not observed due to the enhancement of the ACC recording range.

550 Another explanation for an erroneous displacement derivation might be an incorrect duration of the non-stationary period.
During data analysis, beginning and end of the non-stationary period were set manually since the primary filter approach of x-io
Technologies (2013) was not applicable for these kind of motion processes. As described before, the algorithm was originally
developed to track the human gait that is characterised by uniform and distinct motion patterns. Since the motion behaviour
of clasts within a moving granular material possesses a higher level of complexity and is less predictable, the necessary filter
555 parameter settings change significantly for each recorded motion. Consequently, for each pebble and in each experiment,
multiple filter parameters would have to be found. Therefore, a manual setting was considered to be more effective. Since the
start of the motion process is clearly visible in the sensor **raw** data (compare Fig. 3), the beginning of the non-stationary period
can be set easily. On the other hand, the motion process mostly declines gradually and slowly (compare sections 3.1 and 3.2).
Therefore, the end of motion was difficult to identify. In a consistent way, the end of non-stationary periods was set to a timestep,
560 were almost no rotation was recorded by the GYR. Around this time at the end of the recorded sequences, ACC readings were
low as well. This indicates that more or less only gravitational acceleration was acting on the pebble and acceleration due to
transport motion is negligible. Therefore, it is unlikely that a further transport of the pebble and, consequently, an unrecognised
displacement occurs. Accordingly, somewhat shorter or longer durations at low acceleration magnitudes do not significantly
influence the derivation of displacement. Although the manual definition of the end of motion will always be debatable, the
565 effect of a slightly longer or shorter motion is considered to be extremely small.

Other explanations for the deviation between true and calculated distances are (i) errors due to integration and (ii) imprecise
estimations of the probe's orientations. Besides others, these errors were discussed in detail by Gronz et al. (2016). Because
the **rawprobe** data with a finite sampling rate and resolution is integrated twice in each timestep, a deviation will always occur
and will increase with both, time and covered distance.

570 In the present study, the deviation is considered to be mainly caused by imprecise orientation estimations. As deduced by
Gronz et al. (2016), an orientation error of only 1° will lead to an erogenous displacement of approx. 0.34 m after 2 s of
motion. Compared to the former experiments of Gronz et al. (2016), MAG data was not recorded and could therefore not be
included into the sensor fusion analysis. Keeping this in mind, a deviation between true and reconstructed displacement of
approx. 10 % (pebble 4, see Sect. 3.2) demonstrates a good quality of the applied methodology. Especially the avoidance of
575 clipping errors contributes to this promising result. This was achieved by enhancing the ACC measuring range from ± 4 g to
 ± 16 g (compare Gronz et al., 2016).

4.3 Possible ways to enhance the probe accuracy

A comparable low deviation was achieved by merging only ACC and GYR data. Therefore, it can be reasoned that a further enhancement would be possible by the inclusion of MAG data. This would also allow to display the trajectory in a global reference system. The effect of these enhancements will be scope of further studies.

A further accuracy enhancement of the trajectory reconstructions could be achieved by applying methods that are well-established in different disciplines like pedestrian navigation or mobile robotics, like KALMAN-filtering or MARKOV Localization. The latter approach uses a probabilistic description of the possible position of the pebble as a density field, which is updated in the upcoming timestep(s) (Fox et al., 1999). Not only ~~motion raw~~probe data could be used but also information about the surrounding relief (flume geometry), for instance. Additionally, information of the pebble (e. g. geometry, specific unit weight) or the surrounding material could be implemented. Further studies will have to evaluate which of these information will lead to an even better reconstruction of the trajectory. Another aspect worth mentioning might be the automatic indication of the motion mode like proposed by Becker et al. (2015).

4.4 Scaling

A scaling of the recording ranges will be necessary if the Smartstone method is adapted to other experimental scales or velocities. Additionally, the scaling of temporal persistence of movements has to be respected as the Nyquist frequency to observe the motion without undersampling changes with the rate of movement changes (Yang et al., 2009). This means that a small pebble in a fast-moving landslide will show more abrupt changes in its velocity, trajectory and mode than a large block in a slow landslide. Thus, the ranges of the sensors and the sampling frequency have to be adjusted depending on the landslide velocity and the particle size. Several aspects concerning the sensor recording range for different experimental applications have to be considered:

Acceleration range: The expected acceleration depends on the velocity of the landslide, as the strongest peaks occur during non-elastic collisions of moving particles with stationary boundaries, e.g. bedrock. Thus, the range needs to be increased (by choosing a different accelerometer chip in the Smartstone) with velocity. However, to choose a gratuitously large range to avoid clipping is counterproductive, as the quantisation error will also increase, as there is only a limited number of steps within the range. A deliberated balance needs to be chosen, e.g. by performing preliminary tests.

Gyroscope range: The rotational velocity depends on the movement of the landslide but also on the size of particles. For instance, if the mass moves with 1 m s^{-1} , a single rolling pebble with 30 mm diameter will show a rotational velocity of $3820 \text{ }^\circ \text{ s}^{-1}$ (pebble circumference 942 mm, thus 10.6 rotations per second). Thus, the expected range can be calculated using the shortest circumference of the Smartstone's host particle and the expected landslide velocity. Again, choosing a gratuitously large range to avoid clipping will increase the quantisation error.

4.5 Potentials of the Smartstone probe

Although the exact depositional position could not be reconstructed quantitatively, which is particularly pronounced for pebble 4, qualitative depositional features were found correctly. For instance, pebbles 1 and 2 were embedded before and were also within the deposit after the experiment. This can be concluded from the relatively large vertical distance between the end of trajectory and the flume plane. Contrary to that, pebble 4 was originally deposited directly at the inclined plane which is also reproduced by means of probe data.

Furthermore, the complex rotational movement of pebble 4 can be identified in the reconstructed 3D-trajectory. This particular feature becomes also clear, if one compares the trajectory of pebble 4 with the other reconstructed transport paths (see above and Fig. 6). Contrary to pebble 4, the other clasts follow relatively simple trajectories. This can be explained by the position of these clasts embedded within the body. Therefore, the motion was strongly confined. Although only data of four probes could be analysed, prominent differences of the motion behaviour dependent on different position within the moving mass could be found.

These results demonstrate the potentials of using *in situ* motion sensors to characterise artificial landslide movements. Contrary to external observation methods, as high-speed videos or laser techniques (e. g. Manzella and Labiouse, 2009), the internal measurement supplies continuous movement characteristics for a single particle in 3D-space. The Smartstone probe thereby overcomes the issue of confining the motion process by wires. This problem emerged in many experimental studies that tried to measure the internal deformation or movement characteristics (e. g. Moriwaki et al., 2004; Ochiai et al., 2004, 2007; Olinde and Johnson, 2015). Although the influence due to wired sensors seems small, its exact effect on the motion process Video 1 be determined. By means of unwired sensors this methodological inaccuracy can be avoided.

During the last years, both wired and unwired sensors (IMU or other combinations of ACC, GYR, MAG) were used to observe geomorphic motion transport processes. Ooi et al. (2014, 2016) for instance used it to study the initiation process of small-scale laboratory landslides. They used the ACC data for qualitative interpretations concerning the timing of landslide initiation. Additionally, they interpreted a rotational failure process from changing vectorial portions of the gravity vector on different axes. Nevertheless, a quantitative characterisation was not carried out. The potential of recording motion data of geomorphic movements is far beyond a simple plotting of rawprobe data. In fact, it allows the sampling of movement characteristics. Therefore, the recording and analysis of geomorphic motion data expands the toolkit of landslide science.

Recently, Spreitzer et al. (2019) used a similar approach as in the present study to derive Euler angles of moving wood in laboratory experiences. They illustrate the suitability of this technique to characterise certain transport features. However, a deviation of movement characteristics or a reconstruction of the trajectory was not carried out. The present study, though, demonstrates that movement characteristics are essential to describe geomorphic motion processes adequately.

These derivations are possible even if only acceleration and rotation data is recorded by means of a 6-DoF-probe. Further, a full 3D reconstruction of multiple trajectories was achieved. This allows a comparison between different parts of the moving mass. Accordingly, the present study demonstrates that the 'sampling of motion' during geomorphic movement processes is possible.

5 Conclusions and final remarks

Laboratory experiments are a common tool to study landslide processes in detail. However, a critical – but also difficult – task is to capture the internal dynamics of the moving material. In the present paper, we presented the autonomous Smartstone probe v2.0 that is able to measure *in situ* motion data of single clasts moving embedded or superficially in/on a landslide mass.

645 The main conclusions of the present study can be summarised as follows:

- The Smartstone probe in its recent version fulfils all requirements to use it as an additional tool to capture single clast movements in laboratory-scale artificial landslides. Especially its size and measuring range satisfy the development aims. Additionally, the probe dimensions are adaptable to other experimental conditions or research objectives. The Smartstone probe can be used under dry and wet conditions and is able to move, record and transmit data autonomously and wire-
650 lessly. The communication works under low power consumption via active RFID (contrary to high power consuming wireless LAN).
- Already the calibrated **r_{aw}** data offers broad insights into the motion process. By means of the acceleration and rotation time series the motion sequence of pebble 4 could be subdivided into six phases with individual motion behaviour. A qualitative interpretation of the **r_{aw}probe** data reveals stationary-, (almost) zero-g-, translational- and rotational motion
665 modes. Moreover, a complex rotational motion could be identified, which is initiated by strong acceleration-peaks and characterised by angular velocities.
- Using sensor fusion algorithms, the motion sequence can be quantified within a local reference system. Quantifying motion requires a calculation of the movement characteristics (α^{rel} , v^{rel} , s^{rel}). This could be achieved satisfactorily by merging acceleration and rotation data. Sensor fusion allows the *in situ* measurement of movement characteristics inde-
660 pendently from visual contact to the object of interest and without confining wires. Therefore, smart sensor technology provides the opportunity to sample movement characteristics directly within a moving mass of individual clasts.
- By means of the calculated movement characteristics, a full 3D reconstruction of the trajectory was possible. This is a great tool to visualise motion and facilitates the qualitative interpretation of transport processes.
- Finally, it was demonstrated that multiple Smartstone probes can be applied in one experiment. To take the metaphor,
665 this allows to take multiple motion samples from different parts of a moving landslide body. This opportunity may shed light on the internal dynamics and potential deformation of moving landslide bodies.

Although the Smartstone probe prototype has to be further improved (see Sect. 4.2), the present study indicates a methodological enhancement by means of smart sensors and sensor fusion algorithms. Further studies will have to focus on the comparability to other well-established methods, for instance PIV.

670 Beyond that, new analytical solutions have to be found to deal with motion data in geoscience. Therefore, future studies will focus on the question how motion characteristics like the transport mode can be classified by means of **thesethis** kind of data.

Video supplement. A supplementary high-speed video (Video 1) is available online.

675 *Author contributions.* B. Dost planned and carried out the present study. He prepared and conducted the experiments, analysed, visualised and interpreted the data and wrote the present article. O. Gronz developed key parts of the experimental setup, helped to conduct the experiments, created the high-speed video, interpreted the data and wrote parts of the article. M. Casper was involved in the development process of the Smartstone probe and the experimental setup, supervised the work, interpreted the data and reviewed the article. A. Krein helped to develop the experimental setup, interpreted the data and reviewed the article.

Competing interests. The author declare that no competing interests are present.

680 *Acknowledgements.* The authors thank the Luxembourg Institute of Science and Technology for partly funding the experimental setup in the framework of the internship of Bastian Dost and the Smartstone probe v2.0. Many thanks to Yannick Hausener for his great work constructing the experimental flume. The authors additionally thank the former students Julius Weimper, Björn Klaes and Christoph Löber for their help conducting the experiments. Sieving analysis was kindly carried out by Grundbaulabor Trier Ingenieurgesellschaft mbH, Germany.

References

- Aaron, J. and McDougall, S.: Rock avalanche mobility: The role of path material, *Engineering Geology*,
685 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2019.05.003>, 2019.
- Becker, K., Gronz, O., Wirtz, S., Seeger, M., Brings, C., Iserloh, T., Casper, M. C., and Ries, J. B.: Characterization of complex pebble movement patterns in channel flow – a laboratory study, *Cuadernos de Investigación Geográfica*, 41, 63, <https://doi.org/10.18172/cig.2645>, 2015.
- Bosch Sensortec GmbH: BMC150: Data sheet: 6-axis eCompass, https://www.bosch-sensortec.com/bst/products/all_products/bmc150,
690 2014.
- Bosch Sensortec GmbH: BMI160: Data sheet: Small, low power inertial measurement unit, https://www.bosch-sensortec.com/bst/products/all_products/bmi160, 2015.
- Cameron, C.: A Wireless Sensor Node for Monitoring the Effects of Fluid Flow on Riverbed Sediment, Project report, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, 2012.
- 695 Davies, T. R. and McSaveney, M. J.: Runout of dry granular avalanches, *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*, 36, 313–320, <https://doi.org/10.1139/t98-108>, 1999.
- EIDEN: Kenner Betonwerk EIDEN GmbH: Schüttgüter - Preisliste, <http://www.kenner-betonwerk.de/de/produkte/sch%C3%BCttg%C3%BCter>, 2017.
- Ergenzinger, P., Schmidt, K. H., and Busskamp, R.: The pebble transmitter system (PETS): first results of a technique for studying coarse
700 material erosion, transport and deposition, *Zeitschrift für Geomorphologie*, 33, 503–508, 1989.
- Fox, D., Burgard, W., and Thrun, S.: Markov Localization for Mobile Robots in Dynamic Environments, *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 11, 391–427, <https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.616>, 1999.
- Frosio, I., Pedersini, F., and Borghese, N. A.: Autocalibration of MEMS Accelerometers, *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement*, 58, 2034–2041, <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIM.2008.2006137>, 2009.
- 705 Gronz, O., Hiller, P. H., Wirtz, S., Becker, K., Iserloh, T., Seeger, M., Brings, C., Aberle, J., Casper, M. C., and Ries, J. B.: Smartstones: A small 9-axis sensor implanted in stones to track their movements, *CATENA*, 142, 245–251, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2016.03.030>, 2016.
- Hanisch, J., Ergenzinger, P., and Bonte, M.: Dumpling - an intelligent boulder for studying internal processes of debris flows, in: *Debris-flow hazards mitigation: Mechanics, prediction, and assessment*, edited by Rickenmann, D. and Chen, C. L., vol. 2, pp. 843–850, Millpress, Rotterdam, Netherlands, 2003.
- 710 Hanson, A. J.: *Visualizing quaternions*, Morgan Kaufmann series in interactive 3D technology, Morgan Kaufmann, San Francisco, CA and Amsterdam and Boston, 2006.
- Hofland, B., Arefin, S. S., van der Lem, C., and Van Gent, M. R. A.: Smart Rocking Armour Units, in: *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on the Application of Physical Modelling in Coastal and Port Engineering and Science*, edited by Coastlab18, Santander, 715 2018.
- Jazar, R. N.: *Advanced dynamics: Rigid body, multibody, and aerospace applications*, Wiley, Hoboken, NJ, 2011.
- Koch, W.: *Tracking and sensor data fusion: Methodological framework and selected applications*, Mathematical Engineering, Springer, Berlin and Heidelberg, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-39271-9>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-39271-9>, 2014.

- Madgwick, S. O. H., Harrison, A. J. L., and Vaidyanathan, A.: Estimation of IMU and MARG orientation using a gradient descent algorithm, 720 IEEE International Conference on Rehabilitation Robotics, 2011, 5975-346, <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICORR.2011.5975346>, 2011.
- Manzella, I.: Dry rock avalanche propagation: unconstrained flow experiments with granular materials and blocks at small scale, Ph.D. thesis, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Lausanne, <https://doi.org/10.5075/EPFL-THESIS-4032>, 2008.
- Manzella, I. and Labiouse, V.: Flow experiments with gravel and blocks at small scale to investigate parameters and mechanisms involved in rock avalanches, *Engineering Geology*, 109, 146–158, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enggeo.2008.11.006>, 2009.
- 725 Manzella, I. and Labiouse, V.: Empirical and analytical analyses of laboratory granular flows to investigate rock avalanche propagation, *Landslides*, 10, 23–36, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10346-011-0313-5>, 2013.
- Moriwaki, H., Inokuchi, T., Hattajji, T., Sassa, K., Ochiai, H., and Wang, G.: Failure processes in a full-scale landslide experiment using a rainfall simulator, *Landslides*, 1, 277–288, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10346-004-0034-0>, 2004.
- Ochiai, H., Okada, Y., Furuya, G., Okura, Y., Matsui, T., Sammori, T., Terajima, T., and Sassa, K.: A fluidized landslide on a natural slope 730 by artificial rainfall, *Landslides*, 1, 211–219, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10346-004-0030-4>, 2004.
- Ochiai, H., Sammori, T., and Okada, Y.: *Landslide Experiments on Artificial and Natural Slopes*, in: *Progress in Landslide Science*, edited by Sassa, K., pp. 209–226, Springer, Berlin, 2007.
- Okura, Y., Kitahara, H., Sammori, T., and Kawanami, A.: The effects of rockfall volume on runout distance, *Engineering Geology*, 58, 109–124, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0013-7952\(00\)00049-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0013-7952(00)00049-1), 2000.
- 735 Olinde, L. and Johnson, J. P. L.: Using RFID and accelerometer-embedded tracers to measure probabilities of bed load transport, step lengths, and rest times in a mountain stream, *Water Resources Research*, 51, 7572–7589, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014WR016120>, 2015.
- Ooi, G. L., Wang, Y.-H., Tan, P. S., So, C. F., Leung, M. L., Li, X., and Lok, K. H.: An Instrumented Flume to Characterize the Initiation Features of Flow Landslides, *Geotechnical Testing Journal*, 37, 20130-158, <https://doi.org/10.1520/GTJ20130158>, 2014.
- Ooi, G. L., Tan, P. S., Lin, M.-L., Wang, K.-L., Zhang, Q., and Wang, Y.-H.: Near real-time landslide monitoring with the smart soil particles, 740 in: *The 15th Asian Regional Conference on Soil Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering*, edited by Japanese Geotechnical Society, vol. 2 of *Japanese Geotechnical Society Special Publication*, pp. 1031–1034, <https://doi.org/10.3208/jgssp.HKG-05>, 2016.
- Ried, M. E., Iverson, R. M., Logan, M., LaHusen, R. H. G., Godt, J. W., and Griswold, J. P.: Entrainment of Bed Sediment by Debris Flows: Results from large-scale Experiments, *Italian Journal of Engineering Geology and Environment*, pp. 367–374, 2011.
- Schilirò, L., Esposito, C., de Blasio, F. V., and Scarascia Mugnozza, G.: Sediment texture in rock avalanche deposits: insights from field and 745 experimental observations, *Landslides*, 16, 1629–1643, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10346-019-01210-x>, 2019.
- Spazzapan, M., Petrovčič, J., and Mikoš, M.: New Tracer for Monitoring Dynamics of Sediment Transport in Turbulent Flows, *Acta hydrotechnica*, 22, 135–148, 2004.
- Spreitzer, G., Gibson, J., Tang, M., Tunnicliffe, J., and Friedrich, H.: SmartWood: Laboratory experiments for assessing the effectiveness of smart sensors for monitoring large wood movement behaviour, *CATENA*, 182, 104-145, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2019.104145>, 750 2019.
- Volkwein, A. and Klette, J.: Semi-automatic determination of rockfall trajectories, *Sensors (Basel, Switzerland)*, 14, 18-187–18-210, <https://doi.org/10.3390/s141018187>, 2014.
- Wang, Y.-F., Cheng, Q.-G., Lin, Q.-W., Li, K., and Yang, H.-F.: Insights into the kinematics and dynamics of the Lu-anshibao rock avalanche (Tibetan Plateau, China) based on its complex surface landforms, *Geomorphology*, 317, 170–183, 755 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2018.05.025>, 2018.
- x-io Technologies: Gait tracking with x-IMU, <http://x-io.co.uk/gait-tracking-with-x-imu/>, 2013.

Yang, H., Wei, F., Hu, K., Chernomorets, S., Hong, Y., Li, X., and Xie, T.: Measuring the internal velocity of debris flows using impact pressure detecting in the flume experiment, *Journal of Mountain Science*, 8, 109–116, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11629-011-2083-x>, 2011.




Figure 1. Smartstone v2.0 hardware kit and technical conventions. (a) Hardware components including an USB-gateway with antenna for communication between a computer and the probe. Electronic components within a plastic tube, hosting the triaxial sensors (compare Table 1) and the internal antenna. (b) Axes conventions of the Smartstone probe v2.0. (c) Reference systems as used in the present study.




Figure 2. Experimental Setup. (a) Simplified sketch of the laboratory flume. Green and blue arrows mark axes of the flume reference system in y^f - and z^f -direction, respectively. (b-d) Starting positions of the five equipped embedded (b) and superficial (c) pebbles. (d) Overlay of (b) and (c) showing the initial positions of all equipped pebbles prior to the experiment. Pebble 4, whose data is plotted in Fig. 3 to 5, is highlighted in light yellow in (b) and (d). Note that pebble 5 could not be included into the analyses due to its damage.




Figure 3. Calibrated raw sensor data of pebble 4. Data is plotted versus relative time since the start of motion. Stationary periods are indicated by white bars, motion by a black bar at the top of each plot, respectively. Vertical bars in light yellow, grey and red mark particular phases (A-F) within the motion sequence (for description see text). Numbered diamonds indicate distinct points in time (see also Fig. 4). (a) ACC data, (b) resultant acceleration magnitude, (c) GYR data. Curves in (a) and (c) show recordings for along/around each probe axis, respectively.




Figure 4. Movement characteristics and high-speed captures. (a-c) Time series of the derived movement characteristics for (a) translational acceleration, (b) translational velocity and (c) translational displacement (with detail). The three curves in each plot give calculated time-dependent values for each axis of the relative reference system (as defined in Sect. 2.2). Motion phases and distinct time points are indicated as in Fig. 3. In (c) green and blue dots indicate the true displacement components in y^f - and z^f -directions measured by means of a laser distance meter (for explanation see Sect. 2.2). (d) High-speed captures at time points diamond I and II. The data of (a-c) was recorded with pebble 4, which is highlighted in light yellow and labelled in (d).




Figure 5. Visualisation of the reconstructed trajectory within the relative reference system. Red, green and blue coloured lines indicate probe axes and display its orientation within the relative reference system as defined in Sect. 2.2. Motion phases and distinct time points are indicated as in 3. (a) 2D-side view (y^{rel} - z^{rel} -plane), (b) 2D-top view (x^{rel} - y^{rel} -plane), (c) 3D perspective view. The dashed grey line represents the tilted flume for illustration.




Figure 6. Reconstructed spatiotemporal trajectories and true depositional positions of four pebbles within the local flume reference system. 2D-side view ($y^{\text{rel}}, z^{\text{rel}}$ -plane). In addition, the idealised flume construction and the pebble material body prior to the experiment is drawn in light grey colours. Note that the equipped pebbles are not drawn in scale due to clearness reasons. The trajectories are colour coded, where the colour represents the relative time since the start of the experiment (first motion, pebble 1). Additionally, specific points in time are highlighted by time stamps.

Table 1. Technical specifications of the Smartstone probe v2.0 as provided by Bosch Sensortec GmbH (2014, 2015) and manufacturer information from Smart Solutions Technology GbR.

Component	Sensor	Measuring range	Noise	Sample-rate
Bosch BMI 160	ACC	± 16 g	1 mg	adjustable:
	GYR	± 2000 $^{\circ}$ $^{-1}$	0.04 $^{\circ}$ $^{-1}$	12.5 Hz, 25 Hz, 100 Hz
Bosch BMC 150	MAG	± 1300 μ T (x-,y-axis)	1 - 2 μ T	
		± 2500 μ T (z-axis)	1 - 2 μ T	

Table 2. Motion phases of pebble 4 as displayed in Fig. 3-5 and high-speed video. IDX gives the index of data samples and t_{start} gives time in seconds since the start of motion. Frame indicated the frame number as displayed in Video 1. For other columns see description within the text.

Phase	IDX	t_{start}	Frame	s_y^{rel}	s_z^{rel}	s_y^f	s_y^f
	[-]	[s]	[-]	[m]	[m]	[m]	[m]
A	12	0.000	64	0.000	0.000	-	-
B	51	0.389	259	0.1774	-0.3464	-	-
C	102	0.898	513	0.7823	-0.7955	-	-
D	113	1.008	568	0.8739	-0.8094	-	-
E	116	1.038	583	0.8958	-0.8217	-	-
F	143	1.307	718	1.0957	-0.9326	-	-
end	195	1.826	977	1.2962	-0.9988	1.4240	-1.1090