



# ***Interactive comment on “Reduced fine sediment flux in response to the managed diversion of an upland river channel” by M. T. Perks and J. Warburton***

## **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 23 March 2016

This is a nice study and studies of the effectiveness of restoration are rare and this study should be published after relatively moderate revisions.

### General comments

- The paper mixes methods and results throughout and sometimes to the surprise of this reviewer. Things appear on the abstract and results that were never mentioned in the methods section.
- The paper should be in the past tense.
- Wherever possible the paper should consider the implications for the wider journal

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



audience and try not to sound too parochial as a report to the local agencies Specific comments

The abstracts reads as if two different timescales of data were available and so it reads like some data were ignored. A clearer experimental design statement is needed that outlines the stream monitoring was for 2 years within longer geomorphological surveying.

ANCOVA is mentioned in the abstract but I did not spot it elsewhere.

### Introduction

- Fine sediment is not defined
- The term sensitive is used but why is this system more or less sensitive than any other? - How is upland defined?
- I would like a clear statement of the paper's aims.

### Methods

P1186 – sentence about NIMROD seems out of place.

- Needs an experimental design statement that gives the dates of monitoring and makes clear the time progress of the study, i.e. from stream monitoring to surveying.
- Abstract mentions ANCOVA?

### Results

It seems that each section of the results start with statement of methods, these are either repeats or are new. When they are repeats they should be deleted when new they should be removed but detailed in the methods. For example, remove the first sentence of section 4.3 as it is a repeat of methods. In section 4.3.1 there are references to methods and measures not previously actually mentioned in the methods section.

### Conclusions

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



The conclusions should conclude and not summarise and at present is too long.

---

Interactive comment on Earth Surf. Dynam. Discuss., 3, 1179, 2015.

**ESurfD**

3, C730–C732, 2016

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C732

