

**Review of: Controls on the hydraulic geometry of alluvial channels: bank stability to gravitational failure, the critical-flow hypothesis, and conservation of mass and energy by Jon D. Pelletier**

**Roberto Fernández**

**Jan. 29<sup>th</sup>, 2021**

I have read the author's response to all reviewers and the new manuscript and believe the paper is ready to be published. The author has offered answers to issues raised and edited the manuscript accordingly to improve its clarity. I would have liked to see more references with work such as that by Dafalla (2013) to strengthen the basis for the relation between clay content and cohesion beyond the small subset of clay/sand materials used therein. I see this as the weakest element of the analysis but finding more of such data might be something the author could also include as suggestions for future work. I have included some minor things below and hope to see this paper published soon.

Line 43 – unclear sentence. Should it read:

“Such a balance may also extend to coarse-bedded channels, in which the water flow ~~in which~~ is prone to wave drag...”?

Line 58 – requirement or consequence?

The bankfull widths of alluvial channels are set by ~~the requirement that channels convey~~ geomorphically effective water discharges.

Line 102 – Extra ‘of’ in sentence

The primary ~~of~~ objective of this...

Discussion needs some revision.

Line 339-342 mentions two model simplifications: tension cracks and vegetation.

Line 355 onwards mentions four additional assumptions with the first one being tension cracks mentioned as one of the two model simplifications above.

Merge and call them 5 assumptions/simplifications?

Line 392-393 – Li et al. (2015) not 2005.

Line 406-408 – A quick mention of the research needs identified in Section 4 would make the conclusions stronger (and also easier for people who might not have time to read the full paper).

Line 412 – Roberto Fernández not Hernandez (Alt+160 for á). Thanks!