

Interactive comment on “Lithological and geomorphological indicators of glacial genesis of the upper Quaternary strata in the lower courses of the Nadym River” by Oleg Sizov et al.

Marc Oliva (Referee)

oliva_marc@yahoo.com

Received and published: 26 February 2020

Dear authors, I have gone started going through the paper entitled “LITHOLOGICAL AND GEOMORPHOLOGICAL INDICATORS OF GLACIAL GENESIS OF THE UPPER QUATERNARY STRATA IN THE LOWER COURSES OF THE NADYM RIVER”. However, I have strong personal concerns about the status of the manuscript in its present state and I consider that it should be significantly improved to proceed for publication.

I am not native speaker but I clearly see that the English needs to be properly assessed. There are several sentences that are written in poor English (p. 2, l. 62-65, p. 4, l.151-152. . .) and several others that should be checked before resubmission of the paper

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



(e.g. p. 2, l. 64-65 Problem..iis the most problematic). Words such as “morains” or “easkers” should be properly written.

But my main concerns are about the general structure of the paper: - Highlights. They should be improved. ... Sediments in area of the Nadym River formed during glaciation. Continental glaciation evidently occurred during the Pleistocene. This is already known. What are the main new findings of the paper? - Introduction is too long and with much information that could be deleted. This is a scientific paper, some information about the history of geological surveys can not appear in the form it does (e.g. p. 2, l. 77-89). Please reduce and summarize the most important information. - Results. I see some nice data about some sections but the geomorphological setting is not well-explained. What is the geomorphological context where these sediments were deposited? I see the figures, tables and the text and I am not convinced about the glacial origin of such deposits. Could you provide more details about the glacial setting? Are there erratic boulders? moraines? can you show evidence of the kame terrace? This is not clear in the text and should be improved. In the abstract you reinforce the importance of (post)glaciation in the shaping of the landscape, but you do not show it in the results. - Discussion. Again, the linkage between your results and the impact of glacial processes in the landscape should be improved. It would be also good to split the discussion into different subsections so that the reader can better understand it. Some expressions are not used in scientific literature (e.g. 20 to 12 thousand years), so please use the proper terminology depending on the dating methods). Also, please highlight better the similarities/differences of your results with respect to other areas where similar/different processes have been detected. And be aware that there is life (and science) outside Russia! So use international literature from other areas to compare it with your findings. - Figures and tables are OK, although I would acknowledge some more general pictures showing the glacial origin of the landscape in the area.

Good luck with it. Best wishes

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Marc Oliva

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/se-2019-175>, 2019.

SED

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

