



Comment on **essd-2021-48**

Anonymous Referee #3

Referee comment on "Baseline data for monitoring geomorphological effects of glacier lake outburst flood: a very-high-resolution image and GIS datasets of the distal part of the Zackenberg River, northeast Greenland" by Aleksandra M. Tomczyk and Marek W. Ewertowski, Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2021-48-RC3>, 2021

The authors present a set of very high-resolution UAV-based DEMs of the 2.1 km long section along the Zackenberg River, Greenland, acquired before, during and after the 2017 GLOF. Reading through the manuscript, I came to following observations:

- Interest of a broader audience is fairly limited in my opinion; presented data are indeed interesting but potential usage as well as utilization in other than very specialized and geographically narrowly-focused case studies are nebulous to me
- Assessment and quantification of landscape changes (perhaps the most interesting utilization) have already been analyzed and published by the authors (Tomczyk and Ewertowski, 2020; Tomczyk et al., 2020), further reducing potential use of the dataset
- Methodological approach is technically sound but not novel nor innovative – there is an array of studies focusing on application of UAVs for the production of very high resolution DEMs across the globe (tens of studies adopting this approach published every year, according to the WOS)

Moreover, the ESSD editors in their definitions of goals, practices and recommendations (<https://essd.copernicus.org/articles/10/2275/2018/>) state that:

'Authors should know that, to ensure that ESSD products enable substantial advances in future research, editors must apply dual criteria in all cases; does the data as submitted demonstrate sufficient quality and will the data product interest a sufficient number of users? Clearly, a small data set collected over a short time at a single location generally does not qualify ... '

To sum up, I'm not convinced that presented data – though interesting – can be of use for others than a limited number of researchers working in this particular area and - unlike the other two reviewers - I don't find this dataset suitable for ESSD (this should be decided by the editors). I'm also concerned about the previous exploitation of these data in another two publications of the authors.