Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2017-435-RC2, 2018

Hydrology and Earth System Sciences
Discussions

Interactive comment on "Long-term river trajectories to enhance restoration efficiency and sustainability on the Upper Rhine: an interdisciplinary study (Rohrschollen Island, France)" *by* David Eschbach et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 10 February 2018

I am disappointed by some of the author's replies, also considering that my comments were not too difficult to address and aiming to improve quality and clarity of the paper. Specifically, I think that the author could pay more attention to the following aspects: (1) Dating by IRSL. The authors replied that there are not reverse ages: is PIT 2 showing a "normal" relation between depth and ages of sediments (figure 7)? I understand that this could be the only option for dating: on the other hand, I think it could be useful to say that there were no other options. (2) Section 4.4. The authors replied that "...effects of the restoration project cannot be developed here...". If so, why in the

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

“Introduction “ they say “. . .and to assess potential benefits and limits of the restoration” (page 3, line 5) and “. . .evaluate efficiency and sustainability of the restoration effects. . .” (page 3, line 13)? I understand that they want to avoid overlapping between this paper and another one submitted to “Geomorphology”: in this case, my suggest would be to make some change in the “Introduction” to make the whole work more consistent. (3) Sinuosity (Figure 9). Yes, I agree that sinuosity can be measured in a braided rivers: the point is that if you are analyzing a multithread river (braided, wandering; see figure 4) other indices would be more useful to be taken into account (e.g. braiding index).

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2017-435, 2017.