

Dear Editor,

We have now completed the revision of our manuscript and responded to the three reviews provided. Enclosed are the salient points raised by the reviewers and our general answers. A detailed response is provided to each review separately.

1. All reviewers point to the interest of the dataset we acquired and its usefulness.
2. All reviewers agree with the technique we develop in order to compare the geometry of individual threads from braided and meandering rivers.
3. All reviewers agree with our main conclusions.
4. Two reviewers ask for a thorough clarification of the terms used in the article (river, channel, thread). We do this by adding a figure that defines these terms, and strive to provide a consistent use of these terms throughout the revised manuscript.
5. Two reviewers ask us to be more specific in the method sections and to justify the usage of "meandering" and "braided" for the rivers we studied. Concerning the former comment, we now specify the data acquisition procedure in more detail. Concerning the latter comment, we report values for the sinuosities and braiding indexes that legitimize the use of the terms.
6. Two reviewers question the representativeness of the baseline dataset. They wonder why we did not include data from well known studies on meandering and braided rivers. In our answers to the reviewers, we recall the necessity for datasets to be available in order for them to be included. P. Ashmore, upon reading the submitted manuscript, provided us with a supplementary dataset on individual braided threads of the Sunwapta river, Canada. This set is now added to the baseline dataset and strengthens our conclusions. P. Ashmore is now co-author of the revised version of the manuscript.

We hope that you will now find the revised version of our manuscript suitable for publication in *ESurf*.

Respectfully,
The authors