Interactive comment on "Processing and accuracy of topobathymetric LiDAR data in land-water transition zones" *by* M. S. Andersen et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 17 March 2016

The authors presented a method of processing topobathymetric LiDAR data, and the accuracy of the production of DEM data is compared to others. Generally, it is an interesting and meaningful research. But there are some major aspects that should be process. Such as, the development of the method mentions little. I do not know the existing methods, let alone the shortcomings and advantages. At some extents, it looks like a technical report. I strongly suggests the authors improve the sections of "Introduction" and "Discussion". Specifically, Table 1 is not necessary; the numbers of the figures is a little high, and some has low quality. I suggest the authors can reduce some figures that are not necessary.

The answers of the questions for guiding the reviewers are the following:

1) Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of HESS?

Seldom. The relevant literature is scarce, and the analysis should be strengthen.

2) Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? Few. I can not see much in the manuscript.

3) Are substantial conclusions reached? A little. The authors give specific procedures about the method, but the novel and development should be illustrated.

4) Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? Yes, the methods are illustrated clearly.

5) Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions? Almost. The accuracy of the results is OK.

6) Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? I think so. The authors made abundant studies, and I infer that it can be reproduced.

7) Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? Probably not. The relevant literature is not limited, and the comparisons are not enough.

8) Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? Yes.

9) Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary? Yes.

10) Is the overall presentation well structured and clear? Yes.

11) Is the language fluent and precise? Yes.

12) Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used? Yes.

13) Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated? I suggest the figures can be reduced, whose quality improved, and Table 1 eliminated.

14) Are the number and quality of references appropriate? I strongly suggest adding the literatures, and analyze them specifically ad give deep comparison with this paper.

15) Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate? There are not supplementary materials in this manuscript.

C3