Earth **Surface**
Dynamics
Discussions

Open Access

Interactive comment on "Morphological coupling in a double sandbar system" *by* T. D. Price et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 10 February 2014

This manuscript presents a number of findings that have been published previously by the authors and I therefore believe that it has to be evaluated as a review paper instead of a research paper. However, as a review I have a mix of feelings. On one side, the authors are the ideal team to make a review on this topic. On the other, the paper limits itself to presenting the results of the authors themselves. The introduction clearly states: "This paper aims to present our recent findings on...". After reading the paper I can confirm that indeed this is so.

In my view, a review article can not be limited to resubmit part of published works, but it should collect all the existing work on the topic and place them in a broader context. Unfortunately, I cannot recommend the publication of the article in the present state since it focus in presenting results of papers published by the authors. However, I want to encourage the authors to resubmit the paper but including a review of the current state of knowledge about systems double bar. For this review paper I have no doubt

that this authors are the most suitable and that they can also keep many parts of the current text.

Below, I include a number of comments on each section that can help the authors to improve the text.

- Title / abstract: It has to be clearly stated that this is a review article. The fact of including "review" in the title may be an editorial matter.

- Section 1: The introduction, witch like the rest of the text is very well written, is too general. I find it better for a paper of crescentic bars that to one focusing on the coupling in double sandbar systems. It is very significant that, without considering the last paragraph (summary), in all the introduction only two sentences refers to inner and outer bars, "multiple sysytem bar" appears only once and "coupling" or "double bar" can not be found.

- Section 2: Much of the information on this section should appear in an introduction focused on double bar systems.

- Section 3.1: This is for me the best part of the whole text. It focuses on double bar systems and makes stress upon the coupling between the two bars. If I find something missing is the little reference that is made to single bar systems. For example, Is there there any relation (from observations or modeling) between single bar systems and double bar systems?

- Section 3.2: Results of numerical modelling are presented in this section. This basically consists of two parts. In the first, the observed coupling patterns are compared to model results. The second focuses on explaining which conditions are more favourable for development or destruction of rip channels. I miss an explanation of the role of coupling in these phenomena. On this section I also want to highlight the overuse of "we". It gives the feeling that new results are presented when they are not at any time. I think the authors should devote more effort to link the results with existing literature. For ex-

ample, to discuss the differences with the single bar systems and give an explanation.

- Section 4: In this section the authors provide additional information related to double bar systems which should have been in the introduction.

_____

Interactive comment on Earth Surf. Dynam. Discuss., 1, 1209, 2013.