

***Interactive comment on* “Brief communication: Supraglacial debris-cover changes in the Caucasus Mountains” by Levan G. Tielidze et al.**

Etienne Berthier (Editor)

etienne.berthier@legos.obs-mip.fr

Received and published: 5 June 2019

Dear authors

I read your response to the reviewers and the revised manuscript (MS). I do not think they meet yet the requirements to deserve a full re-review.

1/ The rebuttal letter should be more self-consistent. Currently it does not contain scientifically justified-responses to the referee comments and lacks some explanations. For example, reviewer 1 (Sam Herreid) made some detailed comments about the need to examine a consistent and meaningful spatial domain. Your response to this comment is simply to refer to new text and figures without any scientific explanations. Similarly, later in the rebuttal, you justify the use of a method (the buffer method) by citing three

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



references from the co-authors of this study. This is not really convincing and you do not justify neither why you “excluded multiple digitization method in this version of manuscript”. This is not sufficient for a rebuttal letter that needs to convince the editor/reviewers that all concerns have been properly addressed.

2/ The manuscript is not ready neither. During a quick read, I found several typos, results reported with varying number of decimals, issues with section numbering etc. . . At this stage I expect an almost typo-free manuscript so that the reviewers can focus on the scientific content and how their concerns were addressed.

I have a lot of respect for the time spent by referees to evaluate and improve a paper. I will only send them a revised version if the MS and the rebuttal letter meet the quality level expected in TC.

I will carefully checked that you reply to all comments in an adequate way and that you provide an improved version of the paper before sending it to the referees.

Best regards,

Etienne Berthier

Interactive comment on The Cryosphere Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-2018-259>, 2019.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

