

## ***Interactive comment on “Geomorphometric analysis of cave ceiling channels mapped with 3D terrestrial laser scanning” by M. Gallay et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 18 March 2016

It seems as the author cannot read remarks in the highlighted text:

"Page 9 line 5: The highlighted text will be rephrased to: decimation of the mesh, or the mesh parameterization." - But it is the original text and the question was about method of decimation used.

"Page 9 line 23: The highlighted text will be rephrased to: Also, the ceiling channels were extracted as polylines by the means of traditional 2-D geomorphometry." - Shortening is OK (really you do not write about bottom channels in the next text) but the question was: what does mens the 'traditional 2-D geomorphometry'? Manual delimitation or any algorithm?

"Page 10 line 10: The highlighted text will be rephrased to: a normalized ceiling height (DEM\_CH\_NORM)" - OK that you want to add the tool for normalization. But the ques-

C1

tion was: 'Why higher altitudes influence least cost path algorithm?' (An explanation should be usefull)

"Page 10 line 13: The highlighted text will be rephrased to: The higher is the constant the smoother the line will be extracted." - It is again only a reformulation but I questioned your statement: If altitude of the cave is 340 m and you use the constant from the interval (0, -340) it is OK (e.g.  $340 - 300 = 40$  what can be equivalent to dune) but if you use constant e.g. -700 then  $340 - 750 = -410$  what is not equivalent to dune. So limitation of constant in relation to cave height is necessary.

"Page 14 line 30: The highlighted text will be rephrased to: the 26 channels" - But Only 25 is mentioned on page 10, line 31! So it is necessary to change the number here or on the page 10!

---

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/hess-2016-74, 2016.

C2