

Interactive  
Comment

## ***Interactive comment on “Analysis of the drainage density of experimental and modelled tidal networks” by Z. Zhou et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 16 December 2013

I greatly enjoyed reading this manuscript, which contributes significantly to our understanding of tidal channel network dynamics through a unique mixture of field and lab observations and numerical modeling. The Authors show that the model can satisfactorily reproduce statistical characterizations of observed networks and the tool they develop will now allow the possibility for detailed and controlled studies, in space and time, of the phases through which tidal networks develop.

I provide some detailed comments in an annotated pdf, mainly concerning the use of the English language. My only general comment regards the Discussion and Conclusions sections, which I think repeat too much material from the Introduction and from the Results sections. I suggest the Authors revise these sections to streamline them and avoid excessive repetitions.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



As per ESurf review criteria, my analysis is as follows:

1 Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of ESurf? YES  
2 Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? YES 3 Are substantial conclusions reached? YES 4 Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? YES 5 Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions? YES 6 Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? YES 7 Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? YES 8 Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? YES 9 Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary? YES 10 Is the overall presentation well structured and clear? The presentation can be improved as suggested in my review 11 Is the language fluent and precise? The English language could use some “smoothing” in some places 12 Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used? YES 13 Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated? NO 14 Are the number and quality of references appropriate? YES 15 Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate? N/A

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.earth-surf-dynam-discuss.net/1/C429/2013/esurfd-1-C429-2013-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Earth Surf. Dynam. Discuss., 1, 571, 2013.

## ESurfD

1, C429–C430, 2013

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

