The following specific points were raised in the review:

p.71: “The major unconformities apparent in the acoustic data were interpreted based on correlations with all available ground-truth data and converted into thickness on a 20 m grid (66 ft) grid using the

p.74: “Attempts at grab sampling of the bed in the past in the upper river have been compromised by the coarse bottom material that made sampling impossible in most places (e.g., Lakeshore Engineering Services, 2005, 2007).”

p.86: “The morphology of these features matches past work that has described erosion in bedrock and cohesive material (see summary in Richardson and Carling, 2005), with the isolated scours resembling flute marks (Richardson and Carling, 2005). Images of this groove and furrow morphology shows that it is scoured into exposed till (Foster and Denny, 2009) that has been sculpted into these flow-parallel forms.”

Text has been revised.

All figures seemed to be scanned into the report from other documents and have fuzzy lettering thereby making them hard to read.

Final figure quality has been changed to publication standard.