The manuscript presents a study on tide-influenced bifurcations based on morphodynamic modelling. The modelling is carried out for a schematized bifurcation and aims to understand tides influence the morphological development of bifurcations. This is an important subject and the conclusions are relevant for understanding the morphological development of tide-influenced deltas. I support publication of the manuscript after moderate revision.

I think that the manuscript can be improved by presenting more thorough analysis of the model results. The additional analysis should take away the vagueness in the conclusions, like those formulated in the abstract:

- Line 18-19. "…our results show that bedload tends to divide less asymmetrical compared to suspended load, showing a **possible** stabilizing effect of lateral bed slopes on morphological evolution." The word "possible" suggest that the authors are not sure about this. Better analysis of the model results should clarify this.
- Line 19-20. "In our simulations, the more tide-dominated systems tend to have a larger ratio of bedload and suspended load transport." How should I read this? Is this a general conclusion, or is it just because of some special feature in your simulations? In the last case it is not worthy to mention in the abstract, unless it gives explanation to the other conclusions. Otherwise you need to give the physical mechanisms explaining it.

In the model set-up some of the parameters have been given a fixed value without sufficient motivation: "horizontal eddy viscosity was set to 10 m^{2}s^{-1}", "value of 10 for α_{bn}", "α_{bs} =1" (Line 102-106). Especially α_{bn} is a key parameter influencing the distribution of sediment transport to the two downstream branches. Also the horizontal eddy viscosity may be important for the local flow pattern around the bifurcation. Therefore, I expected some sensitivity analysis on these parameters, or at least some motivation why fixed values for them can be used in the study without influencing the conclusions.

Line 134. "to have Courant Number smaller than 1", why is this needed? I thought that Delft3D uses an implicit scheme.

Line 143 & Section 2.2. How about the morphological boundary conditions? What was prescribed at the e.g. the upstream boundary, sediment transport rate or fixed bed?

Line 153. Note that even for the largest discharge (2800 m^3/s) the velocity at the upstream boundary is only about 0.5 m/s.

Line 178. I do not understand immediately why the first 2 km determines the morphological development of the entire downstream channel.

Line 211. "but the depth of the two downstream channels does not depend on the discharge", this is remarkable. I wonder if this is not because of the short simulation time. Influence of the upstream boundary not yet reached to the downstream branches?

Details:

Line 183. Change "duration of simulations" to "simulated period"?

Line 192. "m^3" should be "m^{-3}".

Line 195. Eq. (4) not needed, state the similar (to Tau) definitions for other parameters.

Line 238. "Length" should be "length".