

Interactive comment on “Morphology of the Kosi megafan channels” by K. Gaurav et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 9 November 2014

GENERAL COMMENTS

In this paper channel geometry in the Kosi megafan is analyzed. A very interesting topic is addressed, specifically the morphology of channels in the braided network of the present Kosi River and that of single-thread channels found in other sectors of the fan and in the downstream sector of the Kosi River. The work is to the point, but some sections would need significant improvements, for instance it would be useful to separate "Results" from "Discussion". I have some concerns about some key assumptions that may affect the whole dataset and, therefore, results and conclusions.

(1) P. 1026, L. 7-8. “these channels appear in the remnants of the Kosi River past courses”: is it correct to consider these channels as “single-thread” or they are just old branches of a braided network? I think this is a crucial point because the general aim is to “...to compare single-thread channels with braided threads...” (P. 1025, L. 8-9): if

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



all the seepage channels (see Table A2) are branches of an old braided network, are these channels still an appropriate sample for the comparison?

(2) Definition of channel width in the braided network. This is another crucial point for the whole work. The authors recognize that this is "...a somewhat arbitrary procedure" (P. 1028. L. 10). I think that it should be better justified the choice of considering as bar the area where water depth is less than 10% of maximum channel depth. I do not understand if this definition is stage dependent (i.e. maximum channel depth at time of measurements) or not (i.e. considering the top of the bars). In any case, this procedure produces large channels and small bars: I am wondering how channel geometry, specifically aspect ratio, would change using different procedures. Besides justifying better the choice of the procedure adopted, it would be useful to test if other procedures for channel definition would lead to the same results.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

P. 1026, L. 9. When referring to two or more works, it would be better to use a chronological order; this comments applies also to other citations in the manuscript. Tables A1 and A2. It is not clear to what point in the cross-sections latitude and longitude refer to. P. 1027, L. 19-22. It should be justified better why the distance of 7 km or more was selected to estimate channel slope. It seems to me a large distance. I am not sure the in Table A3 "start point" and "end point" are really needed: maybe just one point for grain size sampling could be sufficient.

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

P. 1024. L. 25. "...within the same channel": not clear P. 1026, L. 22. "pulses" instead of "pusles"

Interactive comment on Earth Surf. Dynam. Discuss., 2, 1023, 2014.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)