

Interactive comment on “River restoration: morphological, hydrological, biogeochemical and ecological changes and challenges” by M. Schirmer et al.

Anonymous Referee #4

Received and published: 15 October 2013

This manuscript is, I believe, supposed to be synthetic in nature - pulling together the different and (to date) individual lessons learned across the RECORD project/experience. This is a laudable goal and this paper is greatly needed to pull all of this information together. However, as the manuscript is presented, it does not really reach this goal very well. I am left with several unanswered questions related to whether the restoration was really successful, and, more importantly, what lessons are transferable to other projects and sites. The paper really does not answer the 4 questions posed in the introduction all that well. I would like to have seen a longer set of replies to each question detailing the instances/examples where the project has really

C5648

answered the questions well, where opportunities exist to still answer these questions, and how well the answers as found at this particular site are transferable to other sites, settings and projects. Much of the required revision may be re-ordering of information already in the manuscript, but the real message of the paper should be a unified communication of the lessons learned of both success and failure. These are the elements that will make this a solid contribution to the literature and a popular paper among practitioners globally.

Minor point: 'LeRoy Poff et al.' should just be 'Poff et al.' (LeRoy is Poff's first name).

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 10, 10913, 2013.

C5649