

## Author's Response

Prepared by Roberto Fernández on behalf of both authors

We would like to thank the AE Jens Turowski and the two anonymous reviewers for their feedback on the manuscript.

The 'track changes' version of the manuscript shows a lot of changes but in reality the text did not change that much. Based on feedback from the AE we moved text from Results to Discussion and this created lots of changes in the manuscript.

Specific changes made, worth mentioning are:

1. We modified the four aspects pointed by the AE in terms of language.

In response to Reviewer 1:

2. We added the following text (now p6 L1-4)

*The knickpoint height ( $\Delta h$ ) in Figures 9c and 9e is approximately 1cm and the meander bend length before the cutoff ( $L_b$ ) in Figure 8d is approximately 14cm long. These two variables are related via the channel slope as  $\Delta h = SL_b$ . The slope for this run is not available but the knickpoint height divided by the meander bend length is equal to  $S = 0.077$ , within the range of average slopes obtained in the cm-scale experiments (Table 2).*

3. We modified the order of the sentence regarding the laminar channel slopes to make sure that the reader first sees that 'a wide range of slope values are possible', hopefully no longer being a misleading statement.

*In the laminar regime, a wide range of slope values are possible. For example, laminar river analogs have been observed to have 1.5-2.5 higher slopes than their natural counterparts (Malverti et al., 2008) and others have also reported values such as 0.1 (Delorme et al., 2018) and  $5 \times 10^{-3}$  (Abramian et al., 2020).*