

Interactive comment on “Brief Communication: 2-D numerical modeling of the transformation mechanism of a braided channel” by Y. Xiao et al.

A.C.W. Baas (Referee)

andreas.baas@kcl.ac.uk

Received and published: 5 December 2014

I am writing this closing comment both as referee and as managing editor. The review report by the 1st referee confirms the key problem with this paper that I also had observed. This is the problem that it is nearly impossible to understand and evaluate the model, the parametrisations, and the key assumptions of the study, because all this information is not presented in a comprehensible manner. As such the paper is simply not accessible to neither reviewer, nor reader of NPG. Unfortunately this means that the manuscript must be rejected for further consideration, as it is not possible to understand and evaluate the research that it reflects on. This is a systemic and fundamental problem with the manuscript as a whole that can not be addressed via a revision procedure. Instead, we suggest that the authors develop a new comprehensive paper and

C668

submit this for consideration at a more discipline-specific journal (focussing on river dynamics or fluvial engineering, for example).

Interactive comment on Nonlin. Processes Geophys. Discuss., 1, 953, 2014.