Erosion Rates in the Smoky Mountains

This paper is clean and very well presented. I thought that there was a nice balance between method and results. I found that in several instances paragraphs were not clearly focused or defined. In most cases a topic sentence would be of help, or separating one paragraph into two.

The figures were very helpful and clear. I think that even though there are tick marks on the margins of the map it would be useful to have a scale bar. The data on figure 4 is interesting but I don't see how such a strong conclusion can be strong by just a few data points. Granted there are fewer large drainage basins, but the lack of data points makes it difficult to believe the trend. I thought that figure 5 was very helpful in explaining the different erosion rates, but part A is not as clear. The vertical bars are confusing in showing the erosion rate.

- 1. I think the first two sentences of this paragraph could be shortened into one. Or maybe the first sentence isn't necessary, or shouldn't be first. "To understand the survival of the abnormally long lasting Appalachian range...."
- 2. Would it be possible to show a table of these differing rates, so we can get an idea of some of the variance.
- 3. The last paragraph on this page has a first sentence, which is very different from the rest of the paragraph. Maybe it should not be first. The first sentence should do a better job of introducing the range.
- 4. To better introduce the first sentence I would shorten the first sentence.
- 5. Here you jump right into listing data. It might help the reader to tell them what you are getting at before you slam them with lots of numbers. Maybe a sentence or two from the end of the paragraph could be first.
- 6. The idea of dynamic equilibrium should be much better explained in the introduction. This quote would be an excellent addition to the start of the paper.
- 7. I could use some explanation of how the antiquity of the mtn explains how dynamic equilibrium might never be achieved.