lin the responses below, the line numbers refer to the revised track changes document

Reviewers' points are in regular text. Our responses are in blue.

RESPONSE TO REVIEWER 1 (SCARDINO)

1. The reviewer pointed out that we should provide more specific information in the Abstract about the kinds of field protocols being suggested.

We have revised the text beginning at line 52 to read: "*Using standardised and comprehensive data reporting with due attention to precision and reproducibility—including site characteristics, boulder dimensions, complete positional data, tide characteristics, and geodetic and local topographic datum information—will help ensure complete data retrieval in the field*."

2. At line 57, we have replaced the phrase "*longitudinal monitoring*" in the abstract with "*long-term monitoring"*, in response to the reviewer's request (in annotated PDF) for greater clarity.

3. The reviewer stated both in the PDF and in discussion comments that we should include information in section 6 about chronologic constraints on landscape reconstruction.

To that end, we have edited made changes to Section 6, as follows:

• The first paragraph in section 6 (lines 753 et seq.), now reads as follows: "*Determining emplacement age(s) of coastal boulder deposits, and (for ancient example) establishing chronological constraints on the landscape at the time of boulder displacement are very desirable goals. Such data permit construction of event chronologies, and by comparison with other archives such as wave climate or earthquake records, can help distinguish between storm and tsunami deposits. Furthermore, landscape paleoreconstruction permits estimation of sea level and coastline position at the time of displacement, which is important for calculation of forces required for transport*."

• The fourth paragraph (lines 1005-1007) has been amended, and now reads:

"*Whereas it may not be possible to date deposits, we encourage workers to investigate possible geochronology options, and where possible to use more than one, to provide internal validation and error checking. This field is constantly evolving, and we anticipate that the ability to date deposits and/or paleosurfaces will improve rapidly.* "

4. The annotated PDF contained some in-line suggestions for word choice and phrasing, We have addressed these as follows:

- Fig 1 caption: request to remove the word "persons" (line 106)

We have changed the language from "*Each photo includes a person or persons for scale*" to "*Each photo includes a person for scale*"

- Request to delete parenthetical phrase "(which will be described below)" (line 133)

We have left this in place, because it directs the reader to understand that more detailed analysis of the challenges will be addressed later in the paper, otherwise they might think we are ignoring the challenges. The relevant language reads: '*... coastal boulder deposits present many challenges in field measurement and documentation (which will be described below).*"

- Request to replace "onto shores" with "onshore" (line 265)

We have adjusted the language slightly so that the sense is clearer, and it now reads "*some boulders may be transported onto the shores of adjacent islands*".

- Fix typo (line 403)

"...near he coast..." has been corrected to "near the coast"

- request to edit awkward sentences (lines 439-443)

The original text has been edited and clarified. It now reads: "*For rounded or tapered boulders, workers should take care to ensure that tapes are held taut so that they measure the straight line between end points. If they are draped across the boulder surface they will measure a partial circumference, which will be a longer distance than the desired axis. This can be prevented by projecting the boulder end points outward (using a clipboard or other straight rigid object), providing a measurement target for the tape. In many cases, especially with large boulders, this is a two-person operation*."

- Fix typo (line 458)

"*sites and evets*" has been corrected to "*sites and events*"

- Request to delete phrase "This is not too surprising, because.." (line 490)

We have left it this place, because it improves readability and ease of comprehension of the point we are trying to make. And in fact deleting the phrase would break the flow between the two sentences. (We note that the reviewer simply marked the text for deletion but did not give a reason for their preference). The relevant section reads:

"*Only a few of the studies in ISROC-DB used 3D models to obtain boulder volumes; and of those most used it only for a few boulders, providing simple axis data for the bulk of the clast population. This is not too surprising, because although photogrammetry is a*

reliable (and increasingly accessible) way to determine dimensions and derived properties of complex three-dimensional objects"

RESPONSE TO REVIEWER 2 (ANONYMOUS)

This reviewer made no specific edit recommendations. They wrote that "The rationale and objectives are well-explained, and the emphasis on standardising field methodologies is timely and important. The popularization of the ISROC-DB and the proposed protocols will be valuable for improving data comparability, reproducibility, and applicability across research groups and disciplines."

• The reviewer requested "Minor copyediting for grammar and punctuation is suggested throughout the text to ensure the manuscript reads smoothly and professionally"

To that end we have made numerous edits to punctuation, some word choice changes, and in a few places we have reorganised paragraphs slightly to improve flow, clarity and readability. All are indicated with track changes

Comments on the PDF have been addressed as follows:

- Fix typo (line 56)

  "…*this is fosters*…" has been edited to read "…*this fosters*…"

- Fix typo (line 106)

  Figure 1 caption: accidental colon has been deleted

- Comment on Figure 1: "Change the color of the letter "C" to yellow."

  The letters on the figure panels are coloured for contrast. Changing the letter C to yellow would decrease visibility, against the pale sky, so we have left it black.

- Replace "situations" with a different word (line 164)

  We have changed the phrase "*geomorphic situations*" to "*geomorphic settings*"

- Comment on language at line 194: "The definition here is presented as applicable regardless of emplacement mechanism, yet earlier it is specified the exclusion of boulders not emplaced by waves. This could be perceived as inconsistent and may require clarification."

  We have deleted the phrase "*and can therefore be applied to any coastal boulder accumulation regardless of emplacement mechanism*", The edited section now reads:
  "*The advantage of this term is that it is general and non-genetic. This is important, as*

the origin of a majority of coastal boulder deposits remains in question, with relative roles of storm and/or tsunami still under debate."

- Comment on item in Table 1 (Page 11, after line 340): "This seems somewhat repetitive, as it is referenced in the descriptions of both horizontal distance and elevation. I acknowledge that the separate Local datum row has practical value in a field context, as it allows users to explicitly record the geodetic reference or local marker, facilitating reproducibility and avoiding ambiguities. However, I recommend simplifying the property name to Local datum by removing the phrase "for horizontal distance and elevation," in order to reduce potential confusion without diminishing the utility of the row."

  Establishment of a local datum, and then making measurements that rely on that datum, are two different things; and this is why we gave them separate listings in the table. The reviewer makes a good point, however, about the need for greater clarity. So therefore we have reorganised the table to place both the Geodetic reference system and the Local datum line items above the measurements that depend on them. We have also deleted the phrase "for horizontal distance and elevation", as requested.

- Fix typo (line 464)

  We have removed the extra comma