

Interactive comment on “Intensity of geodynamic processes in the Lithuanian part of the Curonian Spit” by Algimantas Česnulevičius et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 7 February 2017

This paper is addressed relevant scientific questions within the scope of ESD. The paper presents novel concepts, ideas and data about intensity of geodynamic processes in the Curonian Split of the Baltic Sea, and considers conditions and intensity of aeolian and dune slope transformation processes occurring in the wind-blown sand strips of the dunes. The title clearly reflects with the contents of the paper, and the abstract provide a concise and complete summary. The scientific methods and assumptions clearly outlined. In this paper mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used. The description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists The research results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions.

Several non-essential remarks. My advice would be to shorten and clarify some of the phrases. For example, ("4.Results and discussion“, 202) "According to the data

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



from the Nida meteorological station (wind speed and direction were measured every 3 hours ???), winds were recorded to blow for a total 4119 hours, and winds stronger than 6 m/s were recorded to blow 3966 hours (Table 1) during the warm season (period?). Would be better see in the "3.Method: part, but not in the "3.Climatic factors" part a statement (182) "To measure the local wind regime in the coastal area of the Baltic Sea, a temporary mobile meteorological station was established. It operated only in the summer of 2016."). I would recommend explaining the differentiation according strength of the wind, better. For example, what is the wind force differentiation criteria? How does this affect geomorphological processes?; and so on. It is recommended to compare the same periods, for example, why the analysis of wind period 2006-2015 (200), if the period of investigation covers the year 2016? It is recommended to restructure and clearly reason the fourth conclusion.

[Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Dynam. Discuss., doi:10.5194/esd-2017-3, 2017.](#)

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

