

## Reviewer 1

We thank anonymous referee 1 for detailed comments that helped to clarify parts of the manuscript while the general comment in the end pointed to an important omission in our discussion.

The major comment was that the model limitations and potential effects of missing processes could be better explained. We added several sentences to specify the potential effects of missing processes. Salinity and biochemistry have quite some implications for the distribution of species along estuaries. However, it is not yet known whether characteristic salt marsh species along the salinity gradient have different eco-engineering traits with significantly different effect on the long-term morphodynamics. Our model is a new tool that, in further research, may provide valuable insight in such patterns emerging along the estuary. The more important simplification in this first model study is, however, the absence of waves. It is well-known that waves attack the marsh edge, resulting in steep cliffs and salt marsh retreat. As the effects of waves are likely to be limited in the central estuary compared to the outer estuary due to fetch limitation, their absence may lead to an overestimated effect of vegetation on large-scale morphology. On the other hand, the difference between waves in the mouth and further landward would enhance our modelled vegetation distribution along the estuary. Moreover, we expect larger differences between presence and absence of vegetation and mud than between different marsh species that occur along the salinity gradient. We now discuss this in the revised manuscript.

We adopted all other textual and technical comments. Two of the specific comments require a longer answer.

*Referee comment: Page 3 Figure 1. It is not very clear how the authors determine the “tide dominated”, “mixed energy”, and “river dominated” zones? Is there an objective way of doing this?*

There is no exact objective way of classifying a continuum. We used visual interpretation of the patterns we observe in the landscape, including large scale meander bends, the presence of multiple parallel (sub-) tidal bars and the absence of intertidal morphology, notably creek patterns that form only in significant tidal influence in the mixed tidal-fluvial zone. The gradual transition from mixed to tide dominated was mainly based on the transition from fluvial meanders and chute bars towards tidal bars with indications for bidirectional flow in meander shape, landward-facing barb channels and mutually-evasive ebb- and flood-dominated channels. For the Dovey the identified transitions were verified by actual measurements of tidal range and flow velocities. We added one sentence with this explanation in the caption with a reference to Dalrymple et al., 1992, which we used to identify define change in dominant energy types from morphological changes along the estuary.

*Referee comment: Page 10 Table 2. The model considers the marsh species “Spartina Anglica”, while the model parameters are chosen based on “Spartina Alterniflora”. Albeit the exploratory nature of the model, I think it is still good to use common parameters based on Anglica, which would be more convincing.*

We fully agree that it would be good to use root parameters based on *Anglica*. However, we did not manage to find values for *Anglica*'s root length development as a function of time. Therefore, we decided to take the root development of its closest relative. Moreover, we noticed in the modelling that the most important cause of mortality is inundation duration, making our conclusions insensitive to this assumption.

## Reviewer 2

We now thank Eli Lazarus in the acknowledgements for the useful and constructive review.

The first main comment is a suggestion to expand the model-based dataset to compare the effect of vegetation and mud on different initial bathymetries. We agree that additional model simulations with different initial bathymetries would indeed strengthen the research and illuminate the comparison with the natural estuaries, which also started with different bathymetries. However, this requires a lot of additional results description and methods to fully explain what we did, and partly shifts the focus from the effect of introducing vegetation (and mud) towards the effect of vegetation and mud plus initial estuary bathymetry. It would even be better to let the model develop different bathymetries due to different boundary conditions but the referee clearly understands the inhibiting computational costs of this. However, the main reason why we were reluctant to run more simulations is the inhibitive run time. The simulations including vegetation can take up to 2 months for 100 years of simulation. As we run with a low morphological acceleration, even simulations without the vegetation model last more than 1 month. Following the referee suggestion involves 3-6 new initial bathymetries which would have to be run at least with the vegetation model, but preferentially with all 4 scenarios' (reference, mud, vegetation, mud and vegetation). Moreover, results of our earlier modelling with mud (Braat et al. 2017) strongly suggest that the general large-scale development would be fairly similar in pattern. We therefore focus on the present new insights and continue to develop model code and performance for future work.

The second main comment was to plot an envelope around the width-fraction of vegetation for the natural systems to obtain a sense for the variability in the data. We added this envelope to figure 13, which now shows that our findings are fairly consistent between natural estuaries. We used the 20th and 80th percentile and plotted this around the modelled data which shows there is definitely some variability, also due to a spreading in where the BLCZ occurs, but the main trend remains clearly visible.

A related question, also with respect to Figure 13, was about the range of mixed energy zones. We would like to stress that the energy along the estuary is a continuum and there is no clearly defined mixed energy zone. However, we agree that it would improve the readability and strengthen the message when we point out the rough location of this zone. We made estimates of the location of the bedload convergence zone by taking the approximate location where the effect of the river on the energy in the estuary diminishes. These locations were plotted as a line (range) within the figure to indicate the rough location of the centre of the mixed energy zone for the 9 natural estuaries. On top of that we plotted the 9 locations we determined to get a feeling for how the mixed energy zones of these estuaries are distributed on this line. These normalized locations are also added to table 4.

There are eight detailed comments we would like to address specifically:

*Referee comment: Title (and related uses) – I suggest flipping the transition to read "tidal–fluvial transition", since your physical "position zero" reference throughout the paper is the mouth of the estuary. (This switch in the terminology would propagate through the manuscript.)*

These two terms occur equally often in literature, and we agree with your suggestion that "tidal–fluvial" makes more sense with respect to our "position zero". We adjusted this terminology through the manuscript.

*Referee comment: Abstract – the first line is a bit misleading. I don't think the question is "whether similar...feedbacks exist" (they do, as the authors demonstrate) but how they*

*manifest in full-scale estuarine settings that is poorly understood.*

You were right that the question is not whether these feedbacks exist, but how they affect the morphological development of the estuary. We adjusted the sentence to read: "Vegetation enhances bank stability and sedimentation to such extent that it can modify river patterns, but how these processes manifest in full-scale estuarine settings is poorly understood."

*Referee comment: Abstract, L5 – the mention of mud in a "sandy" estuary model is confusing here. Suggest deleting "sandy" for clarity. (More detail comes later in the manuscript, anyway.)*

We agree that the word sandy is confusing in this part of the abstract. We added the word to emphasize that we are investigating the introduction of mud instead of starting out with a muddy (consolidated) estuary, which might result in significantly different morphological evolution. However, you are right that more detail comes later in the manuscript and therefore we removed it here.

*Referee comment: Abstract, L10–15 – These sentences are confusing because the "results show" delivery bounces between the coupled/isolated/coupled results. This full bottom third of the Abstract could be revised for clarity.*

The structure of the bottom part of the abstract was indeed somewhat confusing. Therefore, we restructured it to follow the same order we use elsewhere in the manuscript (reference, vegetation, mud, mud/vegetation). Also, we further emphasized whether we are talking about model results or analysis of natural estuaries.

*Referee comment: P2, L27 – This section doesn't really constitute a review. I suggest merging it into the Introduction without making it stand apart as its own section, and make it do more work for you. In fact, the paragraph beginning at L27 is stronger than similar material that comes before it – and might easily substitute (more or less) into the very first paragraph of the manuscript.*

We agree that section 1.2 did not really constitute a review and therefore we merged it into the introduction (former 1.1) after the first paragraph. We did a little rewriting, but we considered the first paragraph of the introduction to give a concise overview of the topic after which former section 1.2 goes more in depth. Therefore, we did not substitute much of section 1.1, but we did use 1.2 to strengthen it.

*Referee comment: P11, L7 – This morphometry/normalisation step is an interesting one, and I encourage the authors to push it a bit further (e.g., to delineate the "mixed energy" transition, as discussed in the main comment, above).*

We added information here about how we used this normalization and stress that the zones are convenient labels on a continuum (also see response to referee 1). We show the general trend in energy along the estuary, along with variability (as you suggested) and normalized vegetation distribution along the estuary which together indicate the mixed energy zone.

*Referee comment: P24, L6–8 – Sentence beginning "Regardless..." is great. But I agree with Reviewer #1 that there is an opportunity here (probably ahead of this sentence) for the authors*

*to briefly summarise what potential (albeit secondary) effects waves and these other environmental factors might have. (Push the mixed energy node up or down the estuary? Widen/narrow the vegetation fringes?)*

We agree with your suggestion as well as with reviewer #1 to summarise the effect of other environmental factors. We wrote an additional paragraph with model limitations and simplifications where we discuss the processes we ignore and how these potentially affect the results. An extensive explanation is given in the response to reviewer #1.

*P24 – Manuscript ends abruptly with a set of very fine-scale conclusions. Suggest the authors attempt to zoom out to a wider scope of consideration here and frame the implications of these findings, as they do at the end of the Abstract.*

We followed your suggestion here and added a small paragraph at the end of the conclusions with a wider scope of consideration and implications. We emphasized the potential infilling of estuaries on centennial timescale due to infill of the central estuary and the resulting reduction of tidal prism.

We adopted all other specific comments in the revised manuscript. The restructuring of parts of the introduction and parts of the methods helped to increase readability.

### Reviewer 3

We thank anonymous referee 3 for helpful and useful discussion. Five main comments were made that we discuss below. Minor comments were all adopted.

The first comment is that we use various terms for marshes including tidal marsh and saltmarsh, of which the relation with the tide-dominated and mixed-energy reaches is unclear. We agree that this needs better clarification. We mean marsh in general. The model has a generic marsh species and while future modelling will include waves and salinity, we cannot strictly separate salt marsh from freshwater marsh and tidal marsh from other marsh (also see response to Referee 1). We now use the general term tidal marsh because tides are the main driver for marsh settling and mortality. We now also explain that the zonation in the estuary is useful terminology for what really constitutes a continuum, and define that here we mean the seaward, middle and landward part of the model domain spanning the tidal river to the estuary inlet. We now clarify our choice for a generic marsh species at the end of the first paragraph in the introduction and the differences between the zones at the end of 1.2, which will move up based on suggestions of reviewer #2.

The second comment was about whether it is possible to represent saltmarsh vegetation with a riparian vegetation model. The point of that riparian vegetation model is that it includes the basic vegetation life stages and the basic eco-engineering properties shared by many plant taxa. We use the similarity between riparian and salt marsh vegetation to modify the model for our specific needs, particularly the properties of life stages of settlement, growth and mortality due to currents, uprooting and flooding. These variables were parametrized with appropriate thresholds for marsh vegetation. The main hydromorphological effect of vegetation in the model is flow retardation as a function of stem height, diameter and stem density, which is independent of the type of vegetation. The key modification in the riparian model is the recording of tidal inundation and an appropriate choice of ecological timestep related to the tidal period. As we maintain the essentials of the riparian model this approach also means that we will be able to model the entire river continuum in the future with a number of different species. We added several sentences with explanation at the beginning of the methods section to explain this.

The third comment is a request for clarification of which model components were incorporated in the Delft3D code in section 2.1. We thank the reviewer for pointing this out and added several sentences at the beginning of section 2.1 that state that the equations in section 2.1 are all implemented in Delft3D, and were either default or activated by us. The entire vegetation administration, however, was done in Matlab.

The fourth comment asked the basis for the 2 week ecological timestep we applied. As in our riparian vegetation modelling, the ecological timestep is a compromise between the computational cost of the vegetation model and the change in eco-engineering properties in that period. We know from the growth functions that the marsh species has no appreciable change in size over the two week period. The problem is analogous to that of modelling morphological change which is also much slower than the flow, allowing the use of the morphological acceleration factor. While plants have the fastest shoot growth after settlement, it takes much more time for the cover to grow denser and it is the mortality that determines where the vegetation can settle over times long enough to modify the flow pattern and the resulting morphology. In the manuscript itself we added 1 sentence to clarify that changes in species size over 2 weeks are small and that this balances with the increasing computational demand for smaller timesteps.

The fifth comment is a request for plots showing mud and vegetation cover in the central zone of the estuary for different simulations and we agree that a cross-sectional representation provides a much clearer illustration of the increased vegetation and mud cover in general, and specifically on the tidal bars. We will add two plots with cross-sections at 2 locations in the estuary to visualize the increased vegetation and mud cover.

%% Copernicus Publications Manuscript Preparation Template for LaTeX Submissions%%

S

%% -----

%% This template should be used for copernicus.cls

%% The class file and some style files are bundled in the Copernicus Latex Package, which can be downloaded from the different journal webpages.

%% For further assistance please contact Copernicus Publications at: production@copernicus.org

%% [https://publications.copernicus.org/for\\_authors/manuscript\\_preparation.html](https://publications.copernicus.org/for_authors/manuscript_preparation.html)

%% Please use the following documentclass and journal abbreviations for discussion papers and final revised papers.

%% 2-column papers and discussion papers

\documentclass[esurf, manuscript]{copernicus}

%% \usepackage commands included in the copernicus.cls:

%\usepackage[english]{babel}

\usepackage{tabularx}

%\usepackage{cancel}

%\usepackage{multirow}

%\usepackage{supertabular}

%\usepackage{algorithmic}

%\usepackage{algorithm}

\usepackage{amsthm}

%\usepackage{float}

%\usepackage{subfig}

\usepackage{rotating}

%\graphicspath{R:/ESTUARIES-

ERC/ExperimentationModellingIvarLokhorst/model\_paper/esurf\_manuscript/figures}

%\graphicspath{D:/Wordfiles/Ivar/model\_paper/esurf\_manuscript/figures}

\begin{document}

\title{Morphological effects of vegetation on the [tidal](#)-fluvial-~~tidal~~ transition in Holocene estuaries}

% \Author[affil]{given\_name}{surname}

\Author[1]{Ivar}{Lokhorst}

\Author[1]{Lisanne}{Braat}

\Author[1]{Jasper R. F. W.}{Leuven}

\Author[1]{Anne W.}{Baar}

\Author[2]{Mijke}{van Oorschot}

\Author[1]{Sanja}{Selakovi}\c

\Author[1]{Maarten G.}{Kleinhans}

\affil[1]{Faculty of Geosciences, Utrecht University, PO-box 80115, 3508 TC Utrecht, The Netherlands}

\affil[2]{Department of Freshwater Ecology \& Water Quality, Deltares, PO-box 177, 2600 MH Delft, The Netherlands}

%% The [] brackets identify the author with the corresponding affiliation. 1, 2, 3, etc. should be inserted.

\runningtitle{effects of vegetation on the [tidal](#)-fluvial-~~tidal~~ transition}

\runningauthor{I.R. Lokhorst}

\correspondence{M.G. Kleinans (m.g.kleinans@uu.nl)}

%reviewers:

% Giovanni Coco, Auckland University, NZ, expert on coastal morphodynamics, email: g.coco@auckland.ac.nz

% Bob Dalrymple, Queen's University, expert on estuarine geology, email: dalrymple@geol.queensu.ca

% Andrea D'Alpaos, University of Padova Italy, expert on salt marsh, email: andrea.dalpaos@unipd.it

% Ian Townend, University of Southampton UK, estuarine modelling and engineering, I.Townend@soton.ac.uk

%novelty, originality and importance: This is the first paper on the combination of morphodynamic modelling with vegetation modelling in estuaries. It couples our model for vegetation in rivers, here applied to [saltmarsh](#) [tidal marsh](#) vegetation, to Delft3D for sand and mud. This results in the first model explanation for the Bed Load Convergence zone postulated by Dalrymple, showing that interaction of suspended sediment and vegetation in a tidal environment are already sufficient conditions for the BLC.

\received{}

\pubdiscuss{} %% only important for two-stage journals

\revised{}

\accepted{}

\published{}

%% These dates will be inserted by Copernicus Publications during the typesetting process.

\firstpage{1}

\maketitle

\begin{abstract}

Vegetation enhances bank stability and sedimentation to such extent that it can modify river patterns, but ~~whether similar strong biogeomorphological feedbacks exist~~ [how these processes manifest](#) in [full-scale](#) estuarine [environments](#) [settings](#) is poorly understood. On the one hand, tidal flats accrete faster in the presence of vegetation, reducing the flood storage and ebb-dominance over time, ~~while~~ [On the other hand](#) flow-focusing effects of tidal floodplain elevated by mud and vegetation could lead to channel concentration and incision. Here we study isolated and combined effects of mud and [saltmarsh](#) [tidal marsh](#) vegetation on estuary dimensions. A 2D hydromorphodynamic ~~sandy~~ estuary model was developed, which was coupled to a vegetation model and used to simulate 100 years of morphological development. Vegetation settlement, growth and mortality were determined by the hydromorphodynamics. Eco-engineering effects of vegetation on the physical system are ~~here limited~~ [here limited](#) to hydraulic resistance, which affects erosion and sedimentation pattern through the flow field. We investigated how vegetation, combined with mud, affects the average elevation of tidal flats and controls the system-scale planform. ~~Results show that the~~ [Modelling with](#) vegetation ~~reaches its only results in a pattern with the~~ largest [vegetation](#) extent in the mixed energy zone of the estuary [which is generally shallower](#). Here vegetation can cover more than 50% of the estuary width while it remains below 10-20% in the outer, tide dominated zone. ~~Aerial image analysis~~ [This modelled distribution of vegetation along the estuary](#) shows general agreement with trends in natural estuaries. ~~The~~ [observed by aerial image analysis. Without mud, the modelled vegetation has a limited effect on morphology, again peaking in the mixed energy zone.](#) [Numerical modelling with mud only shows that](#) presence of mud leads to stabilization and accretion of the



intertidal area and a slight infill of the mixed energy zone, ~~which acts as a bed load convergence zone at the fluvial tidal transition. Without mud, the modelled vegetation has a limited effect, again peaking in the mixed energy zone.~~ Combined modelling of mud and vegetation leads to mutual enhancement with mud causing new colonization areas and vegetation stabilizing the mud. This occurs in particular in a zone previously described as the Bedload Convergence Zone. While vegetation focusses the flow into the channels such that mud sedimentation in intertidal side channels is prevented on a timescale of decades, the filling of intertidal area and resulting reduction of tidal prism may cause infilling of estuaries over centuries.

\end{abstract}

%\copyrightstatement{TEXT}

\introduction

\subsection{Problem definition}

Estuaries are flanked by tidal marshes, which are unique ecosystems with a very high biomass that modify the local hydromorphodynamic conditions \citep{davidson1991nature,meire2005scheldt,friedrichs2010barotropic}. ~~It is well known that vegetation~~ Vegetation affects hydromorphodynamics in rivers \citep{corenblit2009plants, oorschot2015distinct}, and this effect on hydromorphodynamics has also been shown on the scale of individual tidal marshes \citep{bouma2005flow, d2006modeling, temmerman2007vegetation}. The effect of vegetation on hydromorphodynamics in tidal marshes is therefore relatively well known on ~~the patch or~~ individual plant or patch scale \citep{jarvela2002flow, siniscalchi2012plant}, while its effect on estuary scale morphodynamics has barely been studied. Incorporating vegetation in estuarine morphodynamic models is considered one of the three biggest challenges to overcome in modelling long term evolution of tidal networks \citep{coco2013morphodynamics}. A comprehensive but qualitative model suggests that tidal marshes reach their largest extent in the mixed energy zone of the estuary \citep{dalrymple1992estuarine}. Here we investigate whether plant species collectively can have eco-engineering effects that are significant enough to modify entire estuarine landscapes.

~~Our hypothesis results from a combination of three independent and complementary analyses. First, a reconstruction of the Holocene development of estuaries and tidal basins suggests that vegetation combined with mud can cause a positive feedback on estuary size. As we do not differentiate between different types of marshes we will use a generic marsh species which will be referred to as either tidal marsh or marsh.~~

~~Through reduction of intertidal water storage at the system margins, due to vegetation enhanced sedimentation, the tidal prism reduces and tends towards flood dominant transport \citep{speer1985study,friedrichs2001tidal,friedrichs2010barotropic}. Second, \cite{leuven2017topographic} showed on the basis of imagery of a large number of estuaries that all space wider than that covered by an ideal convergent estuary is filled with tidal bars. This analysis excluded tidal marshes but clearly a number of estuaries were larger in the past and have at least partly been filled by mud flats, saltmarsh or mangroves. A model study by \cite{braat2017Effects} on effects of mud on system-scale development of estuaries over millennia showed that mud decreases morphodynamics and decreases total system width depending on mud concentration. All three approaches, geological, remote sensing and numerical, point at system-scale effects of mud and vegetation in estuaries. Our aims are to determine the combined effects of mud and vegetation on estuarine planform and morphodynamics, specifically in the setting of a sandy estuary with mud input from the river. To this end we will use a numerical model for century-scale simulation of flow, sediment transport, morphology and vegetation. We ignore binding of sediment by roots because of the relatively shallow rooting and only explore cohesive effects of mud, floodplain filling effects of mud and flow resistance effects of vegetation. This allows us to pragmatically apply an existing model for riparian vegetation to the tidal environment. Two questions of specific interest are what explains the zonation of vegetation as found by~~

\cite{dalrymple1992estuarine}, and what are the morphological and hypsometric changes as a result of presence of vegetation. First we will review known effects of vegetation and mud, which results in specific hypotheses for vegetation zonation and morphodynamic effects that are subsequently tested with a 2DH numerical model.

```
\begin{figure*}\includegraphics[width=0.85\textwidth]{overview_estuary3.png}\caption[Active and vegetated parts of estuaries, showing proportionally more vegetated area in the upstream transition from single thread river to multi thread estuary. The estuaries are the Dovey (UK), Columbia (USA) and Gannel (UK).]\label{schematic_estuary}\end{figure*}\subsection{Review and hypothesis development}
```

In rivers, riparian vegetation stabilizes channels by reducing floodplain flow and adding bank strength to the floodplains \cite{corenblit2009plants,gurnell2012changing}. These eco-engineering effects can be strong enough to cause the transition from braiding towards meandering or even sinuous rivers \cite{ferguson1987hydraulic,tal2007dynamic,dijk2013effects,oorschot2015distinct}. However, presence of vegetation can also cause bifurcation of channels by stabilizing bar tips, causing flow resistance on pointbars and diverging the flow from the channel onto the floodplain \cite{burge2005wandering,dijk2013effects}. Furthermore this increased flow resistance drives an increase in causes flow to decelerate and water height levels to rise, which may induce flooding events \cite{darby1999effect,kleinhans2017Effects}. The presence of mud has a partly similar effect as vegetation because it can lead to stabilization of systems as well, and mud has shown to preferentially accumulate at vegetated areas \cite{kleinhans2017Effects}. Based on these insights and general similarities between rivers and the tidal-fluvial-tidal transition, it is well-conceivable that similar biogeomorphological interactions shape upstream parts of estuaries. While salinity is an important variable determining which species prevail, here we focus on a single and often dominant saltmarsh tidal marsh vegetation species.

Saltmarsh Tidal marsh vegetation flanks estuaries from the brackish zone to the mouth. Saltmarsh Tidal marsh enhances sedimentation both through reduced flow velocities and through particle capture, somewhat comparable to what happens on river floodplains, but saltmarsh tidal marsh is not considered a particularly effective channel and bank stabilizer \cite{lee1983rates,french1993numerical,allen1994continuity,d2006modeling,bouma2007spatial,mudd2010does}. If the hydroperiod, the time that tidal marshes are submerged every day, gets longer the sediment supply to the marsh increases and therefore so does the sediment accretion. Several authors therefore found that tidal marshes are most productive at a certain rate of sea level rise (SLR), because this keeps the hydroperiod more or less constant as SLR balances with accretion rates balance with SLR \cite{redfield1972development,orson1985response}. However, tidal marshes may drown when sea level rise rate is too large relative to the sediment supply, which leads to vegetation loss and therefore marsh drowning at an enhanced rate \cite{kirwan2009coastal}. In general, tidal marshes are thought to approach an equilibrium level relative to the sea level whether rising or not \cite{friedrichs2001tidal,marani2013vegetation}.

For saltmarsh tidal marsh to accrete, the supply of mud is essential as the source of inorganic accumulation. This mud may have a coastal or fluvial source, pointing at and the importance main source might have significant effects on the evolution of the boundary conditions estuary \cite{de2017holocene}. Although mud is transported in suspension and thus reaches higher, low-energetic elevations and areas more distal from the main channel, it is not unlimited. The suspended Suspended sediment rapidly settles in tidal marshes and therefore the concentration in the water quickly decreases with distance from the channels into the marsh \cite{townend2011review}. Nevertheless, cohesive mud is more difficult to erode than sand when it consolidates, so that on the estuary scale mud leads to narrower systems with reduced bar dynamics through mudflat accumulation \cite{braat2017Effects}. The logical hypothesis is that the added effect of vegetation leads to even more accretion at the flanks of the estuary \cite{brew2010predicting}.

The availability of mud is partly determined by the changing hydrodynamic energy along the river continuum, especially in shallow, well-mixed estuaries that we focus on (Fig.~\ref{schematic\_estuary}) \cite{dalrymple1992estuarine}. The tidal-fluvial transition appears to be a zone of sand and mud convergence, both of which are therefore conducive to tidal marsh establishment (Fig.~\ref{schematic\_estuary}). Alternatively, it could be the mixed-energy setting that is conducive to tidal marsh establishment, which, in turn, enhances sedimentation. A central zone of lower energy where the average grain size decreases has been observed where bedload converges \cite{Johnson1982bcz}. Bedload convergence means that both the river and the sea transport more sediment towards this central zone in the estuary than they export, resulting in net accumulation. \cite{dalrymple1992estuarine} suggested that this area of bedload convergence often coincides with the relative largest tidal marsh extent (Fig.~\ref{schematic\_estuary}). Furthermore, in many estuaries a turbidity maximum zone (TMZ) occurs in the same mixed energy zone of the estuary, which is characterized by elevated suspended sediment concentrations \cite[e.g.]{{brenon1999modelling}}. ~~In other words, the fluvial-tidal transition appears to be a zone of sand and mud convergence, both of which are therefore conducive to saltmarsh.~~ It is important to realize that the relative contribution of the tides, river and waves to the total hydrodynamic energy is gradually changing along the estuary \cite{dalrymple1992estuarine}. We will use a rough classification of the estuary into an outer, central and river part, which is characterized by a dominance of tides, mixed importance of tides and river and dominance of the river on hydrodynamics respectively.

Our hypothesis derives from a combination of three independent and complementary analyses. First, a reconstruction of the Holocene development of estuaries and tidal basins suggests that vegetation combined with mud tends to infilling of estuaries. ~~establishment (Fig.~\ref{schematic\_estuary}). In turn, saltmarsh may enhance the accretion as described above.~~

Through reduction of intertidal water storage at the system margins, due to vegetation-enhanced sedimentation, the tidal prism reduces and tends towards flood-dominant transport \cite{speer1985study,friedrichs2001tidal,friedrichs2010barotropic}. Second, a large number of estuaries fill all space wider than that covered by an idealised convergent estuary with tidal bars \cite{leuven2017topographic}. This analysis excluded tidal marshes but clearly a number of estuaries were larger in the past and have at least partly been filled by mud flats, tidal marsh or mangroves. A model study by \cite{braat2017Effects} on effects of mud on system-scale development of estuaries over millennia showed that mud decreases the morphodynamics and decreases the total system width depending on mud concentration. All three approaches, geological, remote sensing and numerical, point at system-scale effects of mud and vegetation in estuaries.

Our aims are to determine the combined effects of mud and vegetation on estuarine planform and morphodynamics, specifically in the setting of a sandy estuary with mud input from the river. To this end we will use a numerical model for century-scale simulation of flow, sediment transport, morphology and vegetation. We ignore binding of sediment by roots because of the relatively shallow rooting and only explore cohesive effects of mud, floodplain-filling effects of mud and flow resistance effects of vegetation. This allows us to apply an existing model for riparian vegetation to the tidal environment. Two questions of specific interest are how the zonation of vegetation, as found by \cite{dalrymple1992estuarine}, can be explained, and what the morphological and hypsometric changes are as a result of presence of vegetation.

\begin{figure\*}

\includegraphics[width=0.85\textwidth]{overview\_estuary3.png}

\caption{Active and vegetated parts of estuaries, showing proportionally more vegetated area in the upstream transition from single-thread river to multi-thread estuary. The estuaries are the Dovey (UK), Columbia (USA) and Gannel (UK). The green areas are the vegetated parts of the estuary while the red lines project the morphologically active areas. Distinctions between dominant energy types are based on characteristic morphological features like tidal creeks, intertidal area, irregular shaped tidal bars, and large meanders \cite{dalrymple1992estuarine}}

\label{schematic\_estuary}

\end{figure\*}

## \section{Methods}

To investigate whether the transition of dominantly fluvial energy to dominantly tidal energy is indeed the hotspot of sedimentation and tidal marsh formation, we combine a vegetation model with the morphological estuary model built in Delft3D by \cite{braat2017Effects} that includes cohesive sediment. [SaltmarshTidal marsh](#) modelling ~~will be~~ based on the recently developed riparian vegetation model by \cite{oorschot2015distinct}. This model takes the vegetation cycle into account, which includes colonization, growth, and mortality due to flooding, uprooting, scour, and high flow velocity. [The processes of settlement, growth, and mortality are similar for riparian and tidal marsh vegetation and the process of flow retardation due to flow obstruction remains a function of stem height, width, and density. So, with a different parametrization for plant growth, dimensions, and mortality we were able to realistically represent marsh vegetation with this model.](#) We modelled the combined effects of mud and vegetation to investigate feedback mechanisms between these two and compare the model results with measurements in nine ~~natural systems.~~

### [real estuaries.](#)

The model consists of two interacting codes: the hydromorphological modelling package Delft3D version 4.01.00 and our Matlab-based vegetation module. [The coupling is fast and the vegetation module slows down the model marginally, mainly due to file input and output. However, the need to compute at a very high temporal resolution leads to model runtimes for up to two months to simulate 100 years development.](#) To investigate the combined effects of mud and vegetation, an existing model schematisation was used that is loosely based on the Dyfi estuary in Wales \cite{braat2017Effects}. The large computation times of the interacting codes necessitated our model start from their well-developed morphology after 1000 years. To isolate the effect of vegetation in the simplest possible settings, we ignore salinity, waves, and tidal components other than M2. The [tidal](#) marsh vegetation is represented by the settling, growth and mortality traits of \textit{Spartina anglica} and the hydraulic resistance as a function of stem dimensions and density as detailed later. ~~It could be argued that~~ [Although \textit{Spartina anglica} is not the pioneers arriving first are other only pioneer species such as in these systems \(e.g. \textit{Salicornia}, but\),](#) the vegetation modelling here is simplified, given the large spatiotemporal scales and first application of a vegetation model. In our runs, the vegetation traits based on the commonly occurring \textit{Spartina anglica} are to be seen as a generic [saltmarshtidal marsh](#) plant species.

### \subsection{Hydromorphodynamic model}

Delft3D is a widely tested, open source, model that can calculate both sand and mud transport. The 2DH (depth-averaged) version was used -with a parameterisation for bend flow-effects on the direction of sediment transport.

[We used a rectangular grid, which affects the form of the equations given below. Here we will state the main equations used in Delft3D which are either default or activated by choice. The only equations incorporated in our matlab model are related to the settling, growth, mortality and bookkeeping of the vegetation.](#)

The model is mainly based on two hydrodynamic equations, the first being the conservation of mass equation:

$$\begin{equation} \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial hu}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial hv}{\partial y} = 0 \end{equation}$$

\label{conservation\_mass}

where \textit{h} is the [waterdepthwater depth](#), \textit{t} is time, \textit{u} is the flow velocity in the x-direction and \textit{v} is the flow velocity in the y-direction.

Equation \ref{conservation\_mass} states that any change in water depth follows from a [discharge](#) gradient in ~~\\$q\_x\\$ in~~ the x-direction (~~\\$q\_x\\$~~) or a [discharge](#) gradient in ~~\\$q\_y\\$ in~~ the y-direction, (~~\\$q\_y\\$~~), for a 2-D model. Momentum conservation is calculated as:

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} + g \frac{\partial z_w}{\partial x} + \frac{g \sqrt{u^2 + v^2}}{C^2 h} - V \left( \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial y^2} \right) + F_x = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} + g \frac{\partial z_w}{\partial y} + \frac{g \sqrt{u^2 + v^2}}{C^2 h} - V \left( \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial y^2} \right) + F_y = 0$$

where  $z_w$  is the water surface height,  $C$  is the Chezy roughness ( $\sqrt{m/s}$ ), which will be calculated by the vegetation model described below,  $V$  is the horizontal eddy viscosity and  $F_{x,y}$  is the streamline curvature-driven acceleration term (citep{schoorman2013physics}). These two equations describe the velocity variations in the x-y plane in one grid cell over time under influence of advection, eddy diffusivity, friction, changing water depth and streamline curvature. ~~Our grid was rectangular.~~

Sediment transport is calculated by separate equations for the different sediment constituents. Sand transport in case of a non-cohesive bed is calculated with the Engelund-Hansen sediment transport predictor:

$$S = \frac{0.05 \sqrt{u^2 + v^2}^5}{\sqrt{g} C^3 \frac{\rho_s - \rho_w}{\rho_w} D_{50}}$$

where  $\rho_s$  the sediment density,  $\rho_w$  the water density and  $D_{50}$  the median grain size. The sediment transport of the mud fraction of the model is calculated by Partheniades-Krone equations (citep{partheniades1965erosion}) for erosion flux  $E_m$ :

$$E_m = M_m \left( \frac{\tau_{cw}}{\tau_{cr,e}} - 1 \right)$$

and for deposition flux  $D_m$ :

$$D_m = w_{sc,b} \left( 1 - \frac{\tau_{cw}}{\tau_{cr,d}} \right)$$

for  $\tau_{cw} > \tau_{cr,e}$ , where  $\tau_{cw}$  is the maximum bed shear stress due to currents,  $\tau_{cr,e}$  is the critical erosion shear stress,  $M_m$  is an erosion parameter,  $w_{sc}$  is the mud settling velocity and  $c_b$  the average sediment concentration in the near bottom layer. Above a critical mud content threshold ( $p_m > p_{m,cr}$ ) the sand and mud flux are proportional to their respective fractions in the sediment bed. Mud erosion is the same in the cohesive and non-cohesive regime, but the sand erosion becomes dependent on the mud entrainment in the cohesive regime, when the mud content in the bed exceeds 40%. The transport of sand becomes fully dependent on the mud flux, as bedload transport is assumed to be zero in the cohesive regime. Once sediment is suspended following the Partheniades-Krone equation it is transported by the advection-diffusion equations. A constant mud settling velocity of  $2.5 \cdot 10^{-4} \text{ m/s}$  was assumed.

based on (citep{braat2017Effects}).

A parameterization is needed for helical flow due to streamline curvature in a depth-averaged simulation to create point bars in river bends and estuarine bars, and is included as follows. The bedload transport direction  $\phi_\tau$  is given by the following equation:

$$\tan(\phi_\tau) = \frac{v - \alpha_l \frac{u}{U} I_s}{u - \alpha_l \frac{v}{U} I_s}$$

where  $U$  is the depth averaged flow velocity,  $I_s$  is the spiral flow intensity factor, here taken at unity, and  $\alpha_l$  is given by the following equation:

$$\alpha_I = \frac{2}{\kappa^2} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sqrt{g}}{\kappa C} \right)$$

where  $\kappa$  is the Von Karman constant, taken as 0.41. Lastly, bed slope effects are included in the model to simulate a deviation in sediment transport direction from the shear stress direction due to grains moving downslope. The sediment transport in the x and y direction under influence of the bed slope effect is given by:

$$q_x = q_s \left( \cos(\phi) - \frac{\tau}{\tau_c} \right) \frac{1}{f(\theta)} \frac{\partial z_b}{\partial x}$$

$$q_y = q_s \left( \sin(\phi) - \frac{\tau}{\tau_c} \right) \frac{1}{f(\theta)} \frac{\partial z_b}{\partial y}$$

where  $q_s$  is sediment transport,  $z_b$  is the bed height, and  $f(\theta)$  is given by the following equation:

$$f(\theta) = \alpha \theta^\beta$$

In this equation  $\theta$  is the shields parameter and  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are calibration parameters specified later.

#### Vegetation model

A model programmed in Matlab was used to simulate the vegetation in the estuary (Oorschot 2015). This model simulates vegetation colonization, growth and mortality and translates this to hydraulic roughness used in Delft3D as based on the (Baptist 2007) equation:

$$C = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{C_b^2} + \frac{C_{dnv}}{2g}}} + \frac{\sqrt{g}}{\kappa} n \frac{h}{h_v}$$

where  $C$  is the Chezy roughness value due to the bed and vegetation roughness ( $\sqrt{m/s}$ ),  $C_b$  is the Chezy value for the bed without vegetation,  $C_{dnv}$  is the drag coefficient,  $n$  is the number of stems per square meter times the stem diameter,  $h_v$  the vegetation height and  $\kappa=0.41$  is the Von Karman constant. Vegetation of different ages and therefore with different characteristics can occur simultaneously in one grid cell up to a total fraction of 1. The Chezy value is calculated for each age class and afterwards a total Chezy coefficient is calculated based on the fraction coverage of each age class.

The vegetation model divides the morphological year in 24 ecological timesteps, which correspond with half a month of morphological development (Table~\ref{results\_table}). Following each ecological timestep the hydromorphodynamic calculations are stopped and the bed level changes, water levels and flow velocities are exported from Delft3D to the vegetation model. A two week interval, during which vegetation properties are assumed constant, was chosen to capture the dominant vegetation development processes.

Over a 2 weeks growth period the species have no appreciable changes in size, and this timestep balances with the computational cost that increases with a decreasing timestep. The vegetation has both general and life-stage specific characteristics (Table~\ref{general\_characteristics} and \ref{ls\_characteristics}). General characteristics are the seedling dimensions, i.e. shoot length and diameter and root length, maximum age, growth factors for logarithmic shoot, root and diameter development, and seed dispersal timing (Oorschot 2015). Life-stage specific characteristics are rules for mortality due to flooding and uprooting, number of stems per area, drag coefficient and fraction of the grid cell surface covered with vegetation. All the variables in the (Baptist 2007) equation are thus accounted for. The new vegetation characteristics are then used to update the Chezy roughness field in Delft3D.

Colonization takes place during the month of seed dispersal on every location where water has been present. (Table~\ref{general\_characteristics}). This means that all cells in the intertidal zone are colonized with *Spartina anglica* by the predefined colonization density. Given that the tides in the model are simplified to M2, the supratidal zone where vegetation settles in nature can be seen as included as high

intertidal. There is no seed dispersal module other than that we assume the seeds to spread through the water (hydrochorously) and neither do seeds end up above the water surface. This means that seedlings colonize lower intertidal areas after which mortality determines which plants survive such that the lower intertidal zone is not occupied by plants during the flow modelling. We do not model rhizomal growth since this is a process occurring at a much smaller spatial scale than the grid cell size.

The vegetation follows a logarithmic growth function dependent on age, which limits their growth once they mature:

$$\begin{equation}$$

$$G = F_v \log(a)$$

$$\end{equation}$$

in which  $G$  is the length or diameter of the shoot or root,  $F_v$  is a characteristic growth factor for the root or shoot, and  $a$  is the vegetation age in years. The initial dimensions of the seedlings are defined in the general characteristics, after which plant growth is calculated yearly following the equation.

Mortality is calculated yearly as a function of burial, uprooting, maximum flow velocities, flooding and ageing. Burial and uprooting are determined by comparison of the plant dimensions and bed level change. If the erosion in an ecological timestep exceeds the length of the root, the plant is uprooted, and if the sedimentation exceeds the shoot length it is considered buried, both leading to mortality

~~[\citep{oorschot2015distinct}. The calculation of](#) To calculate mortality due to flooding and flow velocity is slightly more complex: every timestep contains twelve hours of hydrology, which is approximately the M2 tide. A morphological scale factor of 30 is used, which implies that the morphological development is 30 times faster than expected based on the hydrodynamics. Therefore, one M2 tide is used for two weeks of morphodynamics. For each cell, the maximum, minimum and average water depth at each cell are determined during the tidal cycle. Because tidal marsh vegetation starts to occur above mean tide, and usually quickly accretes to the high tide mark, the subsequent days that the cells are flooded during mean tide are recorded. For flow velocity the maximum value during the tidal cycle in each cell is stored. Lastly, vegetation dies when its maximum age is reached.~~

A dose-effect relation ~~[\citep{oorschot2015distinct}](#)~~ is applied to model gradual plant demise as the fraction of plants that do not survive the hydrodynamic pressure. Until a threshold is exceeded no mortality occurs, while above this threshold an increasing portion of the plants start dying with increasing stress. The threshold value and the slope of the stress-mortality relation are user-defined and can vary between the life-stages of the plants. ~~[\(Table \ref{ls\\_characteristics}\)](#)~~. Mortality was applied to each age class in all grid cells ~~[\citep{oorschot2015distinct}](#)~~.

~~\subsection{Model setup}~~

We set up four model scenarios based on our earlier work and about 30 preliminary test runs, where we balanced time efficiency and the processes that could be realistically represented.

~~[\citep{braat2017Effects,oorschot2015distinct}](#)~~.

The initial bathymetry is the final outcome of a model run that started from an idealised convergent shape ~~[\citep{braat2017Effects}](#)~~. This avoids long computational time to develop sufficient bars and mud flats where vegetation can settle. The rectangular cell size varies from 50~m by 80~m in the estuary to 125~m by 230~m offshore. This is done to balance computational time and sufficient spatial resolution. A 0.2 minute timestep was used based on the Courant criterion. We applied a 1.5~m tidal amplitude defined by two harmonic water levels at the north and south coastal boundaries and a constant 100~m<sup>3</sup>/s discharge at the upstream river boundary. The bed is initially entirely composed of sand and has a sand supply equal to the transport capacity at the river boundary, which avoids sedimentation or erosion at the upstream boundary. Mud, on the other hand, is supplied as a constant concentration at the upstream boundary of 20~mg/l, the same as in the run by ~~[\citep{braat2017Effects}](#)~~ that led to large-scale equilibrium of the estuary planform. This model was run for 1000~years without vegetation in ~~[\citep{braat2017Effects}](#)~~ and the final bathymetry was used as the initial condition for further simulations including vegetation (Figure

\ref{model\_overview}~B). Note that this bathymetry was the result of calculations including mud, ~~while~~. ~~However,~~ we ~~initially apply it~~ only use the initial bathymetry and not the bed composition as a pure sand bed our initial condition in order to isolate the effect of the addition of vegetation and mud through the upstream supply.

```
\begin{figure}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{initial}
\centering
\caption{(a) The original initial bathymetry in \cite{braat2017Effects}. (b) the bathymetry after 1000~years of simulation \cite{braat2017Effects}, which is the initial bathymetry for the present model runs. Bold lines indicate division between the outer, middle and river part of the estuary based on the decrease of flood velocity along the estuary.}
\label{model_overview}
\end{figure}
```

### \subsection{Parameters and scenarios}

Several parameters for hydromorphodynamic processes, numerical processes and vegetation development were varied (Table \ref{results\_table}) to study their effect on estuary developments. Model scenarios were run for ~~a~~ 100 years, which is about the minimum time required for morphological changes at the system scale to occur due to vegetation and the practical maximum time given computational and ~~i/o~~ input/output costs of about two months on a single node in a fast desktop computer (Table \ref{results\_table}). A small morphological scale factor of 30 was used, since preliminary testing showed that this allowed vegetation settlement, growth and mortality over a number of tidal cycles without significant morphological change. In contrast, for sandy estuaries without vegetation values up to 1000 have been used \cite{van2008long}. In the vegetation model a balance is required between morphological and hydrological timescales, since these both affect the development of the plants. If the morphology changes significantly faster than the hydrodynamics, plants are subject to large scale burial and uprooting. A default Chezy value of 50 for bare sediment was chosen as in \cite{braat2017Effects}. Vegetation traits of \textit{Spartina anglica} were based on \cite{nehring2006nobanis} and \cite{deng2009habitat} (Table \ref{general\_characteristics}, \ref{ls\_characteristics}).

```
\begin{table}[t]
\caption{The main hydromorphological parameter settings.}
\resizebox{\linewidth}{!}{%
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline
```

Parameter	value	unit	motivation
Timespan model run	100	year	& sufficient time to have changes on estuary scale
Hydrodynamic timestep	0.2	minutes	& to fulfill courant number criteria
Morphological spin up time	24	hours	& two tidal cycles
Drying flooding depth	0.08	m	& balance between capturing morphodynamics and time efficiency
Morphological acceleration factor	30	-	& low value to allow vegetation processes
Active bed layer thickness	0.1	m	& \cite{braat2017Effects}
Transverse bedslope parameter $\alpha$	0.2	-	& \cite{braat2017Effects}
Transverse bedslope parameter $\beta$	0.5	-	& \cite{braat2017Effects}
Vegetation timestep	21900	min	& to capture settling, growth and mortality

```
\hline
\end{tabular}}
\centering
\label{results_table}
\end{table}
```



```

\begin{table}
\caption{Parametrization of general characteristics of \textit{Spartina anglica}.}
\resizebox{\linewidth}{!}{%
\begin{tabular}{|llll}
\hline
Parameter & Unit & Value & Reference \\ \hline
Vegetation type & & - & \textit{Spartina anglica} \\
& & & & Common European tidal marsh species \\
Maximum age & & & yr & 20 & & \\
& & & & & & \\
Initial root length & & m & & 0.02 & & \\
& & & & & & & Based on \textit{S. alterniflora} \\
\cite{deng2009habitat} \\
Initial shoot length & & m & & 0.07 & & \\
& & & & & & \\
Initial stem diameter & & m & & 0.001 & & \\
& & & & & & \\
Logarithmic growth factor root & - & & 0.19 & & & \\
& & & & & & & Based on \textit{S. alterniflora} \\
\cite{deng2009habitat} \\
Logarithmic grow factor shoot & - & & 1 & & & \\
& & & & & & & \cite{nehring2006nobanis} \\
Logarithmic growth factor stem diameter & - & & 0.005 & & & \\
& & & & & & \\
Timing of seed dispersal & Month & & April & & & \\
& & & & & & & \cite{nehring2006nobanis} \\
\end{tabular}
}
\centering
\label{general_characteristics}
\end{table}

```

```

\begin{table}
\caption{Parametrization of life stage specific characteristics of \textit{Spartina anglica}}
\resizebox{\linewidth}{!}{%
\begin{tabular}{|llllll}
\hline
Parameter & & \multicolumn{3}{c}{\textit{Spartina anglica}} & \\
& & Unit & Ls 1 & Ls 2 & \\
& Ls 3 & Reference \\ \hline
Numbers of years in life stage & yr & 1 & 10 & 9 & \\
& ... \\
Number of stems & & $stems/m^2$ & 13.000 & 1500 & 600 & \\
\cite{nehring2006nobanis} \\
Area fraction (0-1) & & - & 0.05 & 0.5 & 0.8 & \\
& \\
Drag coefficient & & - & 1 & 1 & & \\
& 1 & & cylindrical stems \\
Desiccation threshold & & days & 360 & 360 & 360 & No \\
desiccation assumed \\
Desiccation slope & & - & 1 & & 1 & \\
& 1 & & No desiccation assumed \\
Flooding threshold & & days & 20 & 40 & 40 & \\
& \\
Flooding slope & & - & 0.75 & 0.75 & 0.75 & \\

```

Flow velocity threshold	& m/s	& 0.5	& 1	& 1
Flow velocity slope	& -		& 0.75	& 0.75 & 0.75

**Data collection of natural systems real estuaries**

For a first quantitative comparison of model results with natural systems real estuaries, we mapped along-channel variability of unvegetated channel width and width of the vegetated zone in nine natural estuaries. The natural systems real estuaries were selected from the dataset of leuven2017topographic based on the presence of saltmarsh tidal marsh vegetation, and include one system with mangrove species (Table~\ref{estuary\_data}).

The area of each estuary was visually classified as either unvegetated or vegetated in Google Earth. Here polygons were drawn around the The unvegetated part of the estuary \citep[as described in]{}polygons come from the dataset by \citep{leuven2017topographic}, and the dataset was extended with this analysis adds polygons of the vegetated area (Fig.~\ref{schematic\_estuary}). The vegetated area comprises the area that borders the active estuary and is covered with pioneering or fully-grown saltmarsh tidal marsh vegetation. The presence of sinuous tidal creeks and vegetation other than, for instance, forest, were used as an indicator for present-day or recent tidal influence and exclude older riparian vegetation. Tidal vegetation was distinguished by its different color compared to surrounding forests and grass fields and by its clumpy and patchy structure. The elevation data in Google Earth were used as further evidence for the outer boundary of the tidal vegetation area to avoid steep gradients and cliffs at the transition from supratidal elevation level to higher elevated areas bordering the estuary.

Subsequently, centerlines of the polygons were constructed along the channel, which allowed width measurements perpendicular to this centerline \citep[following the approach of]{}leuven2017topographic. This resulted in along-channel profiles of the active channel width, summed width of vegetation and estuary width, in which the estuary width is defined as the active channel width including bars plus the summed width of vegetation. The along-channel distance from the mouth was normalized with the length of the estuary. Estuary length is defined as the length from the mouth up to the point where the estuary width is equal within a few percent to the active channel width, in our case the upstream river. By this normalization a direct comparison is possible between estuaries with different lengths and our modelled simulations.

Through this normalization it becomes possible to compare estuaries with different tidal-fluvial dominance. Estuaries with a small river might have a smaller, more upstream, mixed-energy zone than estuaries with a larger river. As the mixed-energy zone is somewhat objective, because it is a label on a continuum, we investigate vegetation cover as a function of the normalized position in the estuary and as a function of total energy. By doing this we do not delimit the mixed energy zone but compare vegetation cover development with the development of the total energy along the estuary.

Estimates of local tidal prism and total energy were made for each of the natural systems real estuaries based on \citep{leuven2017topographic}. Local tidal prism was estimated by multiplying the along-channel width profile with the tidal range profile and integrating over the distance upstream of a given point. The volume added by the river was characterised by river discharge multiplied by tidal period. We then calculated a characteristic velocity by dividing the local prism  $TP$  by the local active width  $W_a$  and half the tidal M2 period  $T_{M2}/2$ . As a proxy for the total flow energy this velocity was taken to the power of three as this is also a common indicator of sediment movement \citep{aubrey1985study}, so that flow energy is here calculated as  $2TP (W_a T_{M2})^{-3}$ .

```
\begin{table}
\center
\caption{ Channel area, vegetation area and estuary length derived from polygons digitised in Google Earth,
accessed October 2017.}
```

[. The mixed energy zone gives the approximate location of the mixed energy zone relative to the mouth of the estuary.](#)

```
\begin{tabular}{lc|rrrr}
```

```
rrrrr }
```

```
\hline
```

```
Name & Location & Date aerial photography & Channel area (km$^{2}$) & Vegetation area (km$^{2}$) &
Estuary length (km) \H
```

```
& Mixed energy zone\\
```

```
\hline
```

```
Columbia River & USA & 31/12/2006 & 397.6 & 196.6 & 84.7
```

```
& 0.74 \H
```

```
Dovey estuary & UK & 6/1/2009 & 11.9 & 6.7 & 11.9
```

```
& 0.63 \H
```

```
Glaslyn estuary & UK & 1/12/2006 & 9.9 & 4.2 & 11.3
```

```
& 0.56 \H
```

```
Conwy estuary & UK & 6/1/2009 & 5.3 & 3.1 & 16.0
```

```
& 0.78 \H
```

```
Teign estuary & UK & 1/12/2011 & 3.1 & 0.5 & 7.6
```

```
& 0.79 \H
```

```
Gannel estuary & UK & 12/31/2001 & 0.3 & 0.3 & 3.5
```

```
& 0.58 \H
```

```
Clwyd estuary & UK & 31/12/2006 & 0.3 & 0.6 & 4.7
```

```
& 0.74 \H
```

```
Rodds Bay, Queensland & Australia & 1/12/2006 & 10.1 & 6.5
```

```
& 10.2 \H
```

```
Whitehaven beach & Australia & 1/12/2011 & 2.3 & 3.4
```

```
& 6.8 \H
```

```
& 0.80 \H
```

```
\end{tabular}
```

```
\label{estuary_data}
```

```
\end{table}
```

```
\section{Results}
```

```
\begin{sidewaysfigure}
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{overview_images}
```

\caption{Results of the four scenarios after 100 years of simulation. (a) Morphology. Colors representing larger depths than  $-5\text{~m}$  were saturated to enhance contrast. (b) Tidal range. (c) Mean of absolute flow velocity during the tidal cycle. (d) Mud thickness in cm. (e) Vegetation cover at the surface, ranging from 0--1. }

\label{overview}  
\end{sidewaysfigure}

\begin{figure}  
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{TMZ}  
\centering  
\caption{Tidal range, maximum flood flow velocity , vegetation cover and mud cover as a fraction of the estuary width plotted against landward distance from the coastline. ~~Left~~In all four figures the left axis is used for three variables: width averaged flood velocity, mud cover, and vegetation cover. ~~Right~~The right axis: is used for the maximum tidal range of the estuary cross-section.  
in all four subplots.  
\label{TMZ\_overview}  
\end{figure}

~~In the following section we will first discuss the effects of vegetation and mud on the entire estuary in terms of hydrodynamics, vegetation development, mud cover development and biomorphological development. After that we focus analyses on the central, mixed energy, zone of the estuary, which is potentially the bed load convergence zone with the largest effects of the vegetation and mud.~~

\subsection{Effects of mud and vegetation on the entire estuary}

The mouth of the modelled estuary has a  $3\text{~m}$  tidal range, which decreases gradually in landward direction to disappear roughly  $14\text{~km}$  into the estuary (Fig.~\ref{overview}). The flow velocity, on the other hand, increases in the outer part of the estuary because the convergence is ~~more~~ stronger than the friction. Further in the estuary the convergence decreases and the increase in friction begins to dominate, which results in a decreasing flood velocity. Therefore, there is ~~an optimum~~ a peak in the flood flow velocity at roughly  $5\text{~km}$  into the estuary (Fig.~\ref{TMZ\_overview}). The changes in tidal range along the estuary are thus ~~behaves as similar to those in~~ a hyposynchronous system while the changes in the current ~~behaves as are similar to those in~~ a hypersynchronous system (Fig.~\ref{TMZ\_overview}).

In the simulation without mud and vegetation, i.e. the reference scenario, channels and shoals are dynamic, but no system-scale changes occur as the initial system seems to be close to dynamic equilibrium. Only a slight change in hypsometry occurs: the intermediate heights are slightly eroded, while the higher parts accrete slightly (Fig.~\ref{hypsometry\_entire\_estuary}).

The simulation with vegetation only develops fringing marshes at the edges of the estuary. The marshes start from the estuary mouth up to the tidal limit, roughly  $14\text{~km}$  upstream (Fig.~\ref{overview}). The relative width of the tidal marshes is fairly constant at  $\approx 10\%$  of the estuary width in the outer zone. Between roughly  $6\text{~km}$  and  $11\text{~km}$ , however, the relative width of the marshes suddenly increases. The relative width of the tidal marshes can go up to  $60\%$  of the estuary width. This area coincides with the area where the flood velocity and river velocity start to decrease due to friction and estuary shape respectively (Fig.~\ref{TMZ\_overview}). Beyond  $14\text{~km}$  there is no vegetation anymore, this is because this is beyond the tidal limit and therefore there is no drying and flooding area where seeds are distributed, and seedlings survive. The morphology in the simulation with vegetation only shows little differences compared to the reference simulation. This indicates that the vegetation is unable to enhance sedimentation in absence of suspended fine sediment, and that it predominantly colonizes locations that are not prone to erosion, because there is no significant reduction of the erosion of the intertidal area (Fig.~\ref{hypsometry\_entire\_estuary}). ~~and seedlings survive.~~

The simulation with mud only results in a fairly continuous mud cover along the entire estuary (Fig.~\ref{overview}). There are small amounts of mud which deposit on tidal bars, in the order of an accumulated 10~cm admixed in sand over 100~years, but the more pronounced accumulations occur on the edges of the system. Similar to the simulation with vegetation the relative mud abundance starts to increase landward of the maximum flood velocity, which occurs at roughly 6~km. The relatively large mud extent in the central zone of the estuary is due to the low flow velocities in this zone (Fig.~\ref{overview},\ref{TMZ\_overview}). Unlike the vegetation cover, however, the relative mud abundance does not decrease to zero at the tidal limit, but approaches a roughly constant value of approximately 30\% of the system width (Fig.~\ref{TMZ\_overview}). This is because the system estuary is very small in this area, as the river is only several cells wide, and not because there are large extensive mudflats.

In terms of hypsometry the largest effect of mud is on the intermediate bed elevations that increase slightly (Fig.~\ref{hypsometry\_entire\_estuary}). This shows that the higher elevations are nearly filled as much as possible, and that the estuary develops in a feedback of further filling and reduction of tidal prism.

```
\begin{figure}
\includegraphics[width=0.7\textwidth]{entire_estuary_hypsometry}
\centering
\caption{Hypsometry of the entire estuary after 100 years. Dashed lines indicate the tidal range at the seaward boundary. Around 70\% of the estuary area is intertidal in all scenarios, indicating that the model represents a shallow system. The hypsometry is determined over the surface occupied by the estuary of the initial condition, which excludes new areas formed by bank erosion that is modelled rather simplistically in Delft3D.}
\label{hypsometry_entire_estuary}
\end{figure}
```

```
\begin{figure}
\includegraphics[width=0.7\textwidth]{width_development}
\centering
\caption{Estuary width over time for of the entire system and for zones along the estuary. Width is normalised by average initial width. See Fig.~\ref{model_overview} for locations of zones.}
\label{width_change}
\end{figure}
```

```
\begin{figure}
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{mud_vegetated_cells}
\centering
\caption{Interaction of mud and vegetation. (a) The development of the total mud and vegetation cover over time in the simulation where both are present, where the simulation begins in the origin of the plot. Black line indicates equality of mud and vegetation cover. (b) The average mud cover in vegetated cells and in the entire model, showing substantially higher cover in vegetated cells.}
\label{mud_veg_relation}
\end{figure}
```

The distribution of vegetation and mud in the combined simulation shows similar patterns to the simulations with either mud or vegetation only. There are some marshes and mud deposits in the outer estuary, but these become more pronounced towards the central zone (Fig. \ref{overview}).  
~~ThereIn the simulation without mud and vegetation, i.e. the reference scenario, channels and shoals are moving, but no system scale changes occur as the initial system seems to be close to dynamic equilibrium. During this simulation a slight change in hypsometry occurs. The roughly medium heights are slightly~~

eroded, while the higher parts are slightly sedimentated (Fig.~\ref{hypsoetry\_entire\_estuary}). The morphology in the simulation with vegetation but without mud shows little differences compared to the reference simulation. This indicates that the vegetation is unable to enhance sedimentation in absence of suspended sediment, and that it predominantly colonizes locations which are not prone to erosion because there is no significant reduction of the erosion of the intertidal area (Fig.~\ref{hypsoetry\_entire\_estuary}). When mud is supplied to the simulations, intermediate hypsometric heights show a slight aggradation (Fig.~\ref{hypsoetry\_entire\_estuary}). Addition of vegetation to the simulation with mud further enhances the aggradation of the upper hypsometric heights, and thus the intertidal area.

Furthermore, there is a positive feedback between mud and vegetation. Not only do mud and vegetation occur in the same area, their relative abundance also increases compared to simulations where one of them is absent (Fig.~\ref{overview},\ref{TMZ\_overview}). This is emphasized by the total mud and vegetation cover in the estuary, which are almost identical after 100 years (Fig.~\ref{mud\_veg\_relation}a). There is an especially strong feedback in the beginning of the simulation when vegetation cover increases strongly after which mud cover starts to increase faster (Fig.~\ref{mud\_veg\_relation}a).

On top of that the addition of vegetation to the simulation with mud further enhances the aggradation of the upper hypsometric heights, and thus the intertidal area.

\subsection{Effects of mud and vegetation in the mixed energy zone}

```
\begin{figure}
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{hypsoetry_development}
\caption{Development of hypsometry of three zones in the modelled estuaries. The outer estuary has a concave shape while the central and river area have a convex shape. The middle part shows significant deposition compared to the outer estuary in simulations with mud and vegetation. Blue lines indicate initial minimum and maximum water surface elevation .}
\label{hypsoetry_relations}
\end{figure}
```

```
\begin{figure}
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{river_plots}
\caption{The development of the central zone of the estuary. (a) Simulation without mud and vegetation. (b) Simulation with only vegetation. (c) Simulation with only mud. (d) Simulation with both mud and vegetation. The mud maps belong to the simulation above it.}
\label{development_middle}
\end{figure}
```

```
\begin{figure}
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{tidal_distortion}
\caption{The final tidal cycle in the central estuary at 6~km from the mouth, showing the strongest reduction for the scenario with combined mud and vegetation . (a) Tidal water level. (b) Width-averaged flow velocities over the cycle.}
\label{tidal_assymetry}
\end{figure}
```

Vegetation presence affects the location and thickness of mud deposits mainly in the central estuary (Fig.~\ref{mud\_veg\_relation}b) and to a lesser degree in the outer area (Fig.~\ref{hypsoetry\_relations}). The vegetation cover develops faster than the mud cover, but afterwards stimulates the mud sedimentation which reaches a higher final area (Fig.~\ref{mud\_veg\_relation}). A major difference in hypsometry is, however, that the outer estuary has a concave profile while the central and river reach have a convex

profile. This has direct consequences for the available area for vegetation. Because the effect of vegetation is largest in the central part of the estuary, a series of close-up images is provided (Fig.~\ref{development\_middle}). The bathymetry of the reference simulation shows limited changes (Fig.~\ref{development\_middle}~a). Vegetation colonizes the edges of the area in the simulation without mud, but remains distal from the main ebb-channel and the bathymetry develops similar to that of the reference simulation (Fig.~\ref{development\_middle}~c). Larger differences occur in simulations where mud is present. When mud is added to the simulation it first focusses the main ebb-channel, but afterwards the entire area starts to gradually fill and becomes shallower (Fig.~\ref{development\_middle}~b).

~~When The combined effect of vegetation is added and mud in the central estuary is to raise the intertidal areas and deepen the subtidal areas relative to the run with mud alone, but the overall depth compared to the control run and vegetation run is reduced. This means that the vegetation acts to focus flow into the channels, but the dominant effect is the filling of intertidal area that reduces the overall tidal prism over time.~~

In the simulation with mud ~~the infill of and vegetation~~ the deeper parts of the estuary ~~is stopped no longer accrete~~. Instead the vegetation captures mud in the intertidal area and the vegetation expands laterally towards the main channel while focussing the flow (Fig.~\ref{development\_middle}~d). Vegetation traps the mud in the higher intertidal areas and through this redistribution decreases the siltation of the deeper parts of the estuary. Simultaneously the accumulation of mud increases the bed level in the central part of the estuary, which enables the vegetation to laterally expand in the direction of the channel. Because mud enables vegetation to expand laterally and because mud accumulation increases within vegetated areas, the total mud and vegetation cover increases when both are present. Also the vegetation causes the deposition of mud on bars in the middle of the estuary (Fig.~\ref{development\_middle}~d) where mud barely occurs when vegetation is absent (Fig.~\ref{development\_middle}~c). ~~In other words, the combined effect of vegetation and mud in the central estuary is to raise the intertidal areas and deepen the subtidal areas relative to the run with mud alone, but the overall depth compared to the control run and vegetation run is reduced.~~

~~This means that the vegetation acts to focus flow into the channels, but the dominant effect is the filling of intertidal area that reduces the overall tidal prism over time.~~

The water elevation and mean flow velocity in the middle of the estuary were plotted over time to test the hypothesis that the system becomes flood dominant when vegetation (and mud) are present (Fig.~\ref{tidal\_assymetry}). The system is ebb dominant from the start. The peak flow velocities occur roughly one hour before low and high water and thus the tidal velocity is slightly out of phase. The rise of the tide occurs somewhat faster than the fall of the tide. Normally this would result in higher flood velocities, but in the mixed energy zone of the estuary they are compensated by the river discharge. The tidal asymmetry does not change much over time for the four scenarios, but the tidal range decreases for the scenario with mud and vegetation and both simulations with vegetation cause a decreased average flow velocity (Fig.~\ref{tidal\_assymetry}~b). Furthermore, the effect of combined vegetation and mud is disproportionally larger than that of vegetation or mud alone, confirming the idea of interaction. Moreover, the effect of reduction of tidal prism that determines overall flow energy dominates over the effect of reduction of intertidal area that determines the tendency of flood-dominance.

\subsection{Natural systems}

Real estuaries }

\begin{figure}

\includegraphics[width=0.9\textwidth]{vegetation\_profiles\_new3}

\caption{{(a)The total, active and marsh width along three natural estuaries, partitioned by the method of \cite{leuven2017topographic}. (b) The vegetated part as a percentage of the total width. (c) Tidal prism, discharge and energy taken as width-averaged tidal prism \cite[see for method][{}]{leuven2017topographic}.}}

\label{3\_systems}

\end{figure}

~~In the~~The model simulations, ~~we found~~ showed that the relative vegetation abundance increases especially in the mixed energy zone of the estuary. This is in close agreement with observations in nine ~~natural systems~~real estuaries (Table \ref{estuary\_data}). In ~~natural systems~~real estuaries, vegetation increases in abundance from the estuary mouth towards a short distance before the tidal limit, while landward of the tidal limit the vegetation cover decreases quickly towards zero (Fig.~\ref{3\_systems}). Similar to the modelled scenarios, the landward vegetation cover increase coincides with the decrease of the flow energy. The upper limit of the vegetation is slightly beyond the tidal limit, but this is probably because we included old marshes, which are rarely flooded.

\section{Discussion}

~~In the discussion first the location of tidal marshes is assessed, second their effect on morphology is investigated, thirdly we look into their effect on the tidal wave, then we compare our model outcome with natural systems and last, the implications for further research are given.~~

\begin{figure}

\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{concept\_4}

\caption{Comparison of mud flats and tidal marsh vegetation in a modelled (left) and natural (right) system. Here, velocity magnitude to the power 3 is plotted as an indication for hydrodynamic energy.→

. a,b) show the estuary bathymetry and vegetation, c,d) show the total energy along the estuary, e shows the mud covered area along the estuary and g,h) show the relative vegetated width of the estuary.

\label{concept}

\end{figure}

\subsection{Marsh distribution}

Modelled marshes reach their largest extent in the central ~~part of the~~ estuary, where the tidal energy is the lowest in agreement with the qualitative model of \cite{dalrymple1992estuarine}. The tidal marsh expands mostly landward from the maximum flood current velocity. This is also where the bedload convergence zone begins, and in natural estuaries where ~~a~~ the turbidity maximum zone may occur (Fig.~\ref{concept}).

The main reason for the increase in tidal marsh extent is the combination of flow velocities being low enough, with the presence of suitable bed elevations. The establishment of tidal marshes requires a window of opportunity with long enough mild hydrodynamic stress \cite{bouma2014identifying}. However, the modelled marshes develop primarily landward and not seaward of the maximum flood velocity, which shows that the hydrodynamics are not the only limiting factor. In reality, however, the hydrodynamic stresses will be larger in the outer part as well as wave magnitude is more significant there \cite{dalrymple1992estuarine} and waves are a major limiting factor for seedling establishment in tidal marsh and mangrove landscapes \cite{balke2013seedling}. Waves would result in a further reduction in tidal marsh extent in the outer estuary but will have limited effect on the central part of the estuary and therefore strengthen the trends in our model.

\subsection{Mixed energy zone}

The importance of sediment accumulation in the central part for tidal marsh development is shown in the scenario with mud and vegetation. This simulation shows a further extent of the marshes because mud preferably accumulates in the central part of the estuary, regardless of the fact that no preferential establishment of vegetation on a muddy substrate is included in the model. While it is known that suspended sediment is a requirement for tidal marshes to keep up with sea level rise \cite{d2006modeling, d2007landscape, murray2008biomorphodynamics, fagherazzi2012numerical}, the present model results show that suspended sediment is also a requirement for significant lateral marsh progradation into the estuary. We show that the presence of vegetation increases the mud deposition in the upper intertidal area in agreement with observations \cite{larsen2007delicate, zong2011spatial, follett2012sediment}, but also that this reduces accumulation in the lower



intertidal area. Once the vegetation starts to expand and approaches the main channel (Fig.~\ref{development\_middle}) it starts to focus and concentrate the flow (Fig.~\ref{overview}). After vegetation settlement and stabilization, vegetation causes flow focussing, similar to the fluvial environment \citep{tal2007dynamic,dijk2013effects}.

Despite the reduction of intertidal flood storage, the central zone barely becomes more flood dominant and the tidal limit shifts seaward. This is in contrast to expected tidal dynamics \citep{friedrichs2010barotropic}, probably because the river in this part of the estuary already dominates over the tidal influence. The seaward shift of the tidal limit implies that the inundation time, and therefore stress, of the marshes decreases, explaining why vegetation density increases in the central estuary. Regardless, the river flow, if large enough to move sediment, will keep a channel open even if the floodplains fill up, such that an equilibrium tidal river may develop. This amounts to progradational filling of the estuary as observed in the Holocene \citep{de2017holocene}.

```
\begin{figure}
```

```
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{vegetation_all_profiles_single_19}
```

```
\caption{Relative vegetated width along the estuary averaged for nine natural estuaries compared to the simulation with mud and vegetation. Distance along the estuary is normalised by the approximate distance between coastline and tidal limit.}
```

```
. The approximate location of the bedload convergence zone is determined by the diminishment of the river energy. The uncertainty margin consists of the 20th and 80th percentile.
```

```
\label{natural_systems}
```

```
\end{figure}
```

### Real estuaries

The general agreement between trends in ~~the natural systems~~real estuaries and the numerical model indicates that the overall pattern of tidal marsh and mud flats along the estuary is determined mainly by the tidal hydromorphodynamics and the interaction with mud and vegetation. Figure~\ref{natural\_systems} shows the mean relative vegetation abundance for nine alluvial systems along the ~~tidal-fluvial-tidal~~ transition with pronounced marshes. The relative extent of the vegetation can be higher in ~~natural systems~~real estuaries, which has three main causes. First, the modelled system started as a narrow convergent estuary while many ~~natural systems start from unfilled basins~~. Second, natural systems real estuaries start from unfilled basins. This leads to the question whether the pattern of vegetation abundance and the tendency to accumulate sediment in the central estuary would have occurred for other initial conditions. The model results of \citep{braat2017Effects} show that mud generally settles in similar patterns over most of the modelled period and for most mud concentrations, suggesting that vegetation likewise would have formed similar patterns and central estuary sedimentation. Differences in patterns arise in conditions with much different boundary conditions as discussed below. Second, real estuaries are to a much larger degree infilling than our ebb-dominant system with little sediment import from the sea and they had a much longer time to fill gradually. Third, many natural estuaries develop pronounced turbidity maximum zones (TMZ) under ~~effect~~influence of density-driven currents, tidal currents and river ~~currents~~discharge. Such a TMZ would develop roughly at the mixed energy zone, and a pronounced TMZ can be hypothesized to enhance accretion and tidal marsh expansion ~~and accretion~~ of the central part of the estuary that already occurs without a turbidity maximum zone \citep{braat2017Effects}.

Present limitations of our Our model study ~~leave open the question what the effects would be of~~ simplifying real estuaries in several aspects. First, sediment supply coming from the sea ~~on~~ could enhance tidal marsh establishment in the outer estuary. ~~Further refinement could also include a longer duration of~~ On the other hand, the presence of waves would reduce vegetation survival mainly in the simulation and outer estuary where waves are most powerful. Third, the ~~inclusion~~ absence of multiple tidal components may reduce the ebb dominance and also limit vegetation development further upstream due to the absence of wetting and drying. Ebb dominance may arise due to the interaction of multiple tidal components, which ~~may reduce the ebb dominance~~ interact and result in a skewed velocity and thus ebb or flood dominance. In our model there is only velocity asymmetry due to friction-induced lags as a function of

[tidal stage similar to the process described by \cite{friedrichs2010barotropic}](#). The strongest driver of tidal asymmetry in the central zone is, however, the river discharge. River discharge is known to affect velocity skewness and the timing of slack water and appears to be dominant in the central zone of the estuary [\cite{nidziako2012tidal}](#). Fourth, the salinity gradient is ignored, the vegetation along the entire estuary is the same and there are no changes in how vegetation affects hydromorphodynamics along the estuary. While it is not yet known whether typical marsh species along the salinity gradient have different eco-engineering traits with significantly differently affect the long-term morphodynamics, our model is a new tool that, in further research, may lead to new insights in such patterns emerging along the estuary. Regardless, ~~the~~ enhanced sedimentation would not change the conclusions, which is that fundamental feedback mechanism between mud and vegetation ~~would still~~ affect the larger scale estuary development as: mud facilitates the expansion and survival of marshes while vegetation facilitates the capture of mud-

[, especially in the mixed fluvial-tidal zone.](#)

\conclusions

Numerical modelling of estuaries shows that vegetation follows mud accumulation patterns and simultaneously enhances mud accumulation rates. A positive feedback mechanism emerged in the model between the mud sedimentation and vegetation settlement. Mud sedimentation leads to higher elevated intertidal areas suitable for vegetation settling and development. The vegetation then increases local flow resistance which enhances sedimentation of mud that would otherwise be resuspended again.

Through this biomorphological feedback loop vegetation has a strong effect on morphodynamics in the middle estuary while its effect in the outer estuary is marginal due to larger flow energy. The relative extent of [tidal](#) marsh vegetation increases from the outer estuary towards the inner estuary and can increase from  $\sim 10\%$  to  $50\%$  of the estuary width or probably even more, which is in agreement with observations in [natural systems-real estuaries](#). In particular, the feedback enhances the sedimentary trend in what has been recognised in the literature as the Bedload Convergence Zone in the mixed-energy [tidal-fluvial-tidal](#) transition. The main effect of the overall intertidal space filling is to reduce the tidal prism and progressively fill the estuary in agreement with observations of Holocene systems. The focussing of flow between flanking marsh vegetation has only a limited effect on channel depth, in contrast to observed effects in saltmarsh channels and rivers. The reduction of flood storage has a negligible effect on the flood dominance of the estuary, in contrast to idealised modelling results in the literature-, [also because the river inflow more than balances the tidal velocity skewness](#). These results are, ~~however~~, mainly valid for shallow sandy estuaries.

The effect of vegetation alone on the hypsometry of the entire estuary is limited. This is mainly because its effect on the outer estuary is marginal, where it occupies only a small portion of the estuary surface. In the central part of the estuary vegetation occupies a much larger fraction of the width so that its effects are most pronounced here. When mud is present and forms new intertidal area, the vegetation expands towards the channel, which drives further accretion and forces the system into a single main channel. When mud is absent vegetation lacks an accreting effect because the sand does not reach the vegetated areas for lack of energy in the shallowest flows.

[This means that the greatest morphological effects of vegetation and mud emerge when they occur simultaneously as they have mutual positive feedbacks. The combined presence of mud and vegetation leads to the focusing of flow and channel incision on a decadal timescale but may lead to infilling of the estuary on a centennial timescale due to accumulation of the intertidal area and the consequent reduction of the tidal prism.](#)

%% The following commands are for the statements about the availability of data sets and/or software code corresponding to the manuscript.

%% It is strongly recommended to make use of these sections in case data sets and/or software code have been part of your research the article is based on.

%\codeavailability{TEXT} %% use this section when having only software code available

%\dataavailability{TEXT} %% use this section when having only data sets available

%\codedataavailability{TEXT} %% use this section when having data sets and software code available

%\appendix

%\section{} %% Appendix A

%subsection{} %% Appendix A1, A2, etc.

%\noappendix %% use this to mark the end of the appendix section

%% Regarding figures and tables in appendices, the following two options are possible depending on your general handling of figures and tables in the manuscript environment:

%% Option 1: If you sorted all figures and tables into the sections of the text, please also sort the appendix figures and appendix tables into the respective appendix sections.  
%% They will be correctly named automatically.

%% Option 2: If you put all figures after the reference list, please insert appendix tables and figures after the normal tables and figures.

%% To rename them correctly to A1, A2, etc., please add the following commands in front of them:

\appendixfigures %% needs to be added in front of appendix figures

\appendixtables %% needs to be added in front of appendix tables

%% Please add \clearpage between each table and/or figure. Further guidelines on figures and tables can be found below.

\authorcontribution{The authors contributed in the following proportions to conception and design, data collection, modelling, analysis and conclusions, and manuscript preparation: IRL(40,50,70,60,70\%), LB(10,0,10,0,0\%), JRFWL(0,50,0,0,0\%), AWB(0,0,0,0,10\%), MvO(0,0,10,0,0\%), SS(20,0,10,20,0\%), MGK(30,0,0,20,10\%).} %% optional section

\competinginterests{The authors declare that they have no competing financial interests.} %% this section is mandatory even if you declare that no competing interests are present

%\disclaimer{TEXT} %% optional section

\begin{acknowledgements}

~~We will acknowledge reviewers.~~ IRL, SS and MGK were supported by the European Research Council (ERC Consolidator agreement 647570) to PI Kleinhaus. LB, JRFWL, AWB and MGK were supported by the Dutch Technology Foundation STW (part of the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research, grant Vici 016.140.316/13710) to PI Kleinhaus. MvO was supported by REFORM (FP7 Grant Agreement \*). [We would like to thank Eli Lazarus and the anonymous reviewers for their contributions to improving the paper.](#) Model support by Deltares is gratefully acknowledged. The modelling was part of the MSc-thesis of IRL supervised by SS and MGK.

\end{acknowledgements}

%% REFERENCES

%% The reference list is compiled as follows:

```

%\begin{thebibliography}{}
%
%
%\bibitem[AUTHOR(YEAR)]{LABEL1}
%REFERENCE 1
%
%
%\bibitem[AUTHOR(YEAR)]{LABEL2}
%REFERENCE 2
%
%
%\end{thebibliography}

```

%% Since the Copernicus LaTeX package includes the BibTeX style file copernicus.bst, authors experienced with BibTeX only have to include the following two lines:

```

%%
%%
\bibliographystyle{copernicus}
\bibliography{bibliography2}

```

%% URLs and DOIs can be entered in your BibTeX file as:

```

%%
%%
%% URL = {http://www.xyz.org/~jones/idx_g.htm}
%% DOI = {10.5194/xyz}

```

%% LITERATURE CITATIONS

```

%%
%%
%% command          & example result
%% \citet{jones90}|   & Jones et al. (1990)
%% \citep{jones90}|   & (Jones et al., 1990)
%% \citep{jones90,jones93}| & (Jones et al., 1990, 1993)
%% \citep[p.~32]{jones90}| & (Jones et al., 1990, p.~32)
%% \citep[e.g.,][jones90]| & (e.g., Jones et al., 1990)
%% \citep[e.g.,][p.~32]{jones90}| & (e.g., Jones et al., 1990, p.~32)

```

```
%% \citeauthor{jones90}| & Jones et al.  
%% \citeyear{jones90}| & 1990
```

```
%% FIGURES
```

```
%% When figures and tables are placed at the end of the MS (article in one-column style), please add  
\clearpage  
%% between bibliography and first table and/or figure as well as between each table and/or figure.
```

```
%% ONE-COLUMN FIGURES
```

```
%%f  
\begin{figure}[t]  
\includegraphics[width=8.3cm]{FILE NAME}  
\caption{TEXT}  
\end{figure}
```

```
%
```

```
%
```

```
%%% TWO-COLUMN FIGURES
```

```
%
```

```
%
```

```
%%f  
\begin{figure*}[t]  
\includegraphics[width=12cm]{FILE NAME}  
\caption{TEXT}  
\end{figure*}
```

```
%
```

```
%
```

```
%
```

```
%
```

```
%%% TABLES
```

```
%%%
```

```
%%%
```

```
%%% The different columns must be separated with a & command and should  
%%% end with \\ to identify the column brake.
```

```
%
```

```
%
```

```
%%% ONE-COLUMN TABLE
```

```
%
```

```
%
```

```
%%t  
\begin{table}[t]  
\caption{TEXT}  
\begin{tabular}{column = lcr}  
\topline
```

```
%
```

```
%
```

```
%\middleline
```

```
%
```

```
%
```

```
%\bottomhline
```

```
%\end{tabular}
%\belowtable{} % Table Footnotes
%\end{table}
```

```
%
```

```
%
```

```
%%% TWO-COLUMN TABLE
```

```
%
```

```
%
```

```
%%t
```

```
%\begin{table*}[t]
```

```
%\caption{TEXT}
```

```
%\begin{tabular}{column = lcr}
```

```
%\topline
```

```
%
```

```
%
```

```
%\middleline
```

```
%
```

```
%
```

```
%\bottomhline
```

```
%\end{tabular}
```

```
%\belowtable{} % Table Footnotes
```

```
%\end{table*}
```

```
%
```

```
%
```

```
%
```

```
%
```

```
%%% MATHEMATICAL EXPRESSIONS
```

```
%
```

```
%
```

```
%%% All papers typeset by Copernicus Publications follow the math typesetting regulations
%%% given by the IUPAC Green Book (IUPAC: Quantities, Units and Symbols in Physical Chemistry,
%%% 2nd Edn., Blackwell Science, available at:
http://old.iupac.org/publications/books/gbook/green\_book\_2ed.pdf, 1993).
```

```
%%%
```

```
%%%
```

```
%%% Physical quantities/variables are typeset in italic font (t for time, T for Temperature)
```

```
%%% Indices which are not defined are typeset in italic font (x, y, z, a, b, c)
```

```
%%% Items/objects which are defined are typeset in roman font (Car A, Car B)
```

```
%%% Descriptions/specifications which are defined by itself are typeset in roman font (abs, rel, ref, tot, net, ice)
```

```
%%% Abbreviations from 2 letters are typeset in roman font (RH, LAI)
```

```
%%% Vectors are identified in bold italic font using  $\vec{x}$ 
```

```
%%% Matrices are identified in bold roman font
```

```
%%% Multiplication signs are typeset using the LaTeX commands  $\times$  (for vector products, grids, and exponential notations) or  $\cdot$ 
```

```
%%% The character * should not be applied as multiplication sign
```

```
%
```

```
%
```

```
%
```

```
%
```

```
%%% EQUATIONS
```

```
%
```

```
%
```

```
%%% Single-row equation
```

```
%  
%  
%\begin{equation}  
%  
%  
%\end{equation}  
%  
%  
%%% Multiline equation
```

```
%  
%  
%\begin{align}  
%& 3 + 5 = 8\\  
%& 3 + 5 = 8\\  
%& 3 + 5 = 8  
%\end{align}
```

```
%  
%  
%  
%  
%%% MATRICES
```

```
%  
%  
%\begin{matrix}  
%x & y & z\\  
%\\%x & y & z\\  
%x & y & z\\  
%\end{matrix}
```

```
%  
%  
%  
%  
%%% ALGORITHM
```

```
%  
%  
%\begin{algorithm}  
%\caption{...}  
%\label{a1}  
%\begin{algorithmic}  
%...  
%...  
%\end{algorithmic}  
%\end{algorithm}
```

```
%  
%  
%  
%  
%%% CHEMICAL FORMULAS AND REACTIONS
```

```
%  
%  
%%% For formulas embedded in the text, please use \chem{}
```

```
%  
%  
%%% The reaction environment creates labels including the letter R, i.e. (R1), (R2), etc.
```

| %

| %

| %\begin{reaction}

%%% \rightarrow should be used for normal (one-way) chemical reactions

%%% \rightleftharpoons should be used for equilibria

%%% \leftrightharpoons should be used for resonance structures

| %\end{reaction}

| %

| %

| %

| %

%%% PHYSICAL UNITS

%%%

%%%

%%% Please use \unit{} and apply the exponential notation

\end{document}