Earth Surf. Dynam. Discuss., 1, C308–C309, 2013
www.earth-surf-dynam-discuss.net/1/C308/2013/

Earth Surface Dynamics Discussions

Interactive comment on "Opportunities from low-resolution modelling of river morphology in remote parts of the world" *by* M. Nones et al.

JM Turowski (Editor)

turowski@gfz-potsdam.de

Received and published: 14 November 2013

Dear authors,

we received three reviewer comments, which, as you have seen, have a generally positive view of the manuscript. They raised three major points that need to be addressed in the revised version. The first is the brief description of the model set up (reviewers # 2 & 3). I ask the authors two (a) provide some more detail to this end, (b) make clear in the text which aspects of the model exactly are described in the cited publications. The second is the model reliability (all reviewers). This is an important topic, and although I understand from the authors' replies that reliability studies and sensitivity analyses have been performed previously, I would like to see a short summary of the results and clear pointers to the relevant literature. The third point is the (partly) qualitative

discussion of the results (reviewers # 1 & 3). These could be expanded somewhat and put into a broader context.

I have another comment about the structure, in particular the introduction and the conclusion. The introduction should finish with a brief statement of the aims of the contribution, a point that needs to be picked up in the conclusion. In my view, the main novelty of the paper is the application of the 1D code without the need for detailed field data. This point needs to be better emphasized in the conclusions. Also, I find the the case studies take too much room in the introduction. I suggest to move the lengthy description of the case studies following the paragraph with the aims of the paper from chapter 1 to chapter 2.

Good luck with revisions,

Jens Turowski

Interactive comment on Earth Surf. Dynam. Discuss., 1, 407, 2013.