

## ***Interactive comment on “The influence of a vegetated bar on channel-bend flow dynamics” by Sharon Bywater-Reyes et al.***

**Sharon Bywater-Reyes et al.**

sharon.bywaterreyes@unco.edu

Received and published: 9 December 2017

Interactive comment on “The influence of a vegetated bar on channel-bend flow dynamics” by Sharon Bywater-Reyes et al.

JM Turowski (Editor) turowski@gfz-potsdam.de

Received and published: 14 November 2017

EC: Dear authors,

we have received two reviews for your paper, both of which are detailed and comprehensive. From these reviews and my own reading of the manuscript, I think that currently the major short-coming lies in the statement of the research gap. Although

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



you have given the objectives, it is currently unclear which open research question you are trying to answer and how this fits into the existing literature. Both reviewers mention that you have overlooked relevant published papers. I suggest that you identify a research gap through a detailed literature review in the introduction and state it clearly together with the research question in the final paragraph of the introduction. The specific objectives should follow out of this research question. In the discussion and conclusion, you can pick up the question and objectives and place your new insights into the body of the existing literature. The reviewers make a large number of other points, and there are open questions on methods, results and discussion. Please take all of these points seriously when revising the paper.

All the best and looking forward to your revised manuscript, Jens Turowski

AC: Dr. Turowski, We believe we have taken most of the reviewers' suggestions into consideration in our revised manuscript. In a few instances, we have responded to the reviewers that we believe suggestions were outside the scope of our work, but we addressed the majority of the comments. Major revisions to the paper include A) re-framing the introduction and motivation of the research by synthesizing what we know about vegetation and channel bends from the literature; B) clarifying details concerning methodology by adding this information to the main text or referring to the Supplement, where much of the details were already housed; C) more explicitly stating assumptions of modeling approach; and D) revising the discussion by deleting portions that bordered speculative (fine-sediment deposition and channel geometry in vegetated channels) and adding in additional insights related to ecogeomorphic feedbacks and chute channels on vegetated point bars.

We have included a revised manuscript, but have not updated figures at this time. Our understanding is we would still have additional time (4 weeks) to make these additional changes. We believe the manuscript is clearer and more focused. Thanks for your consideration.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.earth-surf-dynam-discuss.net/esurf-2017-56/esurf-2017-56-AC3-supplement.zip>

---

Interactive comment on Earth Surf. Dynam. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-2017-56>, 2017.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

