

Interactive comment on “Measurement of spatial and temporal fine sediment dynamics in a small river” by Y. Schindler Wildhaber et al.

D. nbsp;H. de Boer (Referee)

dirk.deboer@usask.ca

Received and published: 5 March 2012

1. Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of HESS? Based on the scope of HESS as provided on its homepage I would say yes.
2. Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? The paper presents a study on different techniques for evaluating sediment transport and intrusion into the channel bed. Although not novel, the results are useful for comparing the disparate results obtained in other studies.
3. Are substantial conclusions reached? The conclusions would be very useful for researchers planning a study on fine sediment transport in small streams.

C6254

4. Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? Yes, they are.
5. Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions? Yes, interpretations and conclusion are firmly based on the results.
6. Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? Yes. The experiments are well described in this papers or in its references.
7. Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? Yes, proper credit is given where it is due.
8. Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? The paper concerns both sediment transport in the water column and sediment intrusion into the bed. This latter part is not indicated in the title, but perhaps it should be.
9. Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary? Yes, the abstract is concise and complete.
10. Is the overall presentation well structured and clear? Yes, the paper is well structured.
11. Is the language fluent and precise? No, this paper will require some editing to prepare it for publication in an international journal.
12. Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used? Yes.
13. Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated? No, the paper is fine in terms of its length and in the number of figures and tables.
14. Are the number and quality of references appropriate? Yes, the number and quality of the references are appropriate for the paper's scope and length.

C6255

15. Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate? Yes.

Detailed comments

page line comment

11316 17 “accumulation” should be “net accumulation”

11318 17 “dynamics” should be “dynamics”

11320 17 “commercially available one meter 110×4.2mm PE pipes” is unclear. What are all these different dimensions?

11320 18 “(inner diameter (i.d.)=101.6 mm)” should be “with an inner diameter of 101.6 mm”

11322 11 Is heterogeneity the right term here? Spatial or temporal variability may be better.

11322 24 “copped” should be “capped”

11323 10 11 microns is pretty large. Standard would be 0.45 microns.

11324 23 “In the fall months drifting leaves” should be “In the fall months, drifting leaves”

11324 28 “Regularly water samples” should be “Regular water samples”

11325 3 “grain size composition” should be “grain size distribution”

11325 15 “D50 of the SS” should be “The D50 of the SS”

11326 5 “until” should be “below”

11326 10 “Our results confirm the conclusions of previous field studies that infiltration of fine sediment is maximum during peak discharge” should be “Our results confirm the conclusions of previous field studies of maximum infiltration of fine sediment during peak discharge”

C6256

11326 17 “Spearman rank correlation tests showed that these differences had no influence on the amount of sediment infiltration though” should be “Spearman rank correlation tests, however, showed that these differences had no influence on the amount of sediment infiltration”

11326 23 “for site B” should be “at site B”

11326 28 “most possible explanation” should be “most likely explanation”

11327 1 “due to difference flow velocity” should be “due to the difference in flow velocity”

11327 14 “As such, comparisons of sediment infiltration rates from studies with different sampling intervals have to be done with caution, especially if the results are related to each other quantitatively” should be “As such, quantitative comparisons of sediment infiltration rates from studies with different sampling intervals have to be done with caution”

11328 11 “Thus, the down stream scouring of fine sediment seems to play a more important role on the total sediment accumulation than the sediment infiltration” should be “Thus, downstream scouring of fine sediment seems to have a greater effect on total sediment accumulation than on sediment infiltration” or “Thus, downstream scouring of fine sediment seems to have a greater effect than sediment infiltration on total sediment accumulation.” Note that these two alternatives have different meanings.

11328 24 “This fraction deposits” should be “This fraction is deposited”

11328 27 “higher” should be “greater”

11329 13 “also significant (t.test, $p < 0.05$) higher fraction of silt and clay” should be “also a significantly higher fraction of silt and clay (t.test, $p < 0.05$)”

11330 10 In various places, “water level” is used. “Discharge” would be a better term as it is the flow conditions that are of interest rather the level of the water.

C6257

11330 16 “smaller <2mm” is double.

11330 21 What is meant by SS here? The load or the concentration?

11330 23 “boarder” should be “border”

11331 9 Suspended sediment load or concentration?

11331 26 “probably due to the discussed negligence of the cross channel differences” should be “probably due to the cross channel differences discussed earlier ”

11332 1 “But the fixation of the sensors” should be “But the installation of the sensors”

11334 1 “site A the one with the largest data set” should be “site A, which has the largest data set”

Everywhere: do not use SS, OBS, CV, VHG etc in the text. These terms should be spelled out.

Everywhere: the term “infiltration” is misleading as it is usually used for water infiltrating into the soil. Perhaps a better term to use would be “sediment infiltration” (as used in some of the references).

Everywhere: ‘t.test’ should be ‘t-test’

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 8, 11315, 2011.