Computation of vertically averaged velocities in irregular sections of straight channels

Reply to review of P. Rameshwaran (reviewer #2)

1. Line 114: Correct "Sjiono" to Shiono

Reply: We corrected the mistake.

2. Add reasons for using ANSYS CFX solver instead of RANS (Reynolds averaged continuity and Navier – Stokes equations with normal wall function approach) or DANS (double averaged continuity and Navier - Stokes equations approach)

Reply: The double-averaging methodology (DANS) is usually performed to model the multiscale property of water flow with complex physical and biological boundary conditions. In our study we decided to use the RANS approach adopted in ANSYS CFX solver with a standard k-epsilon turbulence model, which uses only a single turbulence length scale, because the modelled domain has not such complex boundary conditions.

In the revised paper we expanded the text by adding in line 447:

"... which solves the Reynolds-average Navier Stokes (RANS) equations..."

3. Lines 560 to 563: The anisotropic redistribution of turbulent kinetic energy in straight channels cannot be simulated with the standard k-e turbulence model therefore the secondary flow. I am not sure about Figure 14 (Is it real secondary flow!). Remove Figure 14 and associated text.

Reply: We followed the reviewer indication; We removed Figure 14 and also lines 526-527 and 560-563.

Marked-up manuscript version

1	Computation of vertically averaged velocities in irregular sections of
2	straight channels
3	
4	ELEONORA SPADA, PhDstudent, Dipartimento di Ingegneria Civile,
5	Ambientale, Aerospaziale, dei Materiali (DICAM), Università degli studi di Palermo,
6	Viale delle scienze, 90128, Palermo, Italy.
7	Email: <u>eleonora.spada@unipa.it</u> (author for correspondence)
8	TULLIO TUCCIARELLI , Professor, Dipartimento di Ingegneria Civile,
9	Ambientale, Aerospaziale, dei Materiali (DICAM), Università degli studi di Palermo,
10	Viale delle scienze, 90128, Palermo, Italy.
11	Email: <u>tullio.tucciarelli@unipa.it</u>
12	MARCO SINAGRA , PhD, Dipartimento di Ingegneria Civile,
13	Ambientale, Aerospaziale, dei Materiali (DICAM), Università degli studi di Palermo,
14	Viale delle scienze, 90128, Palermo, Italy.
15	VINCENZO SAMMARTANO, PhD, Dipartimento di Ingegneria Civile,
16	dell'Energia, dell'Ambiente e dei Materiali (DICEAM), Università Mediterranea di
17	Reggio Calabria, Via Graziella, 89122, Reggio Calabria, Italy.
18	GIOVANNI CORATO, Researcher, Centre de Recherche Public 'Gabriel
19	Lippmann',41 rue du Brill, L-4422 Belvaux, Luxembourg.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

25 ABSTRACT

26 Two new methods for vertically averaged velocity computation are presented, 27 validated and compared with other available formulas. The first method derives from 28 the well-known Huthoff algorithm, which is first shown to be dependent on the way 29 the river cross-section is discretized into several sub-sections. The second method 30 assumes the vertically averaged longitudinal velocity to be a function only of the friction factor and of the so-called "local hydraulic radius", computed as the ratio 31 32 between the integral of the elementary areas around a given vertical and the integral of the elementary solid boundaries around the same vertical. Both integrals are 33 34 weighted with a linear shape function, equal to zero at a distance from the integration 35 variable which is proportional to the water depth according to an empirical coefficient 36 β. Both formulas are validated against 1) laboratory experimental data, 2) discharge hydrographs measured in a real site, where the friction factor is estimated from an 37 38 unsteady-state analysis of water levels recorded in two different river cross sections, 39 3) the 3D solution obtained using the commercial ANSYS CFX code, computing the steady state uniform flow in a cross section of the Alzette river. 40

- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47

Keywords: diffusive model,discharge estimation, irregular section, rating curve,
uniform flow.

50 **1 Introduction**

51 Computation of vertically averaged velocities is the first step of two major 52 calculations in 1D shallow water modelling: 1) estimation of the discharge given the 53 energy slope and the water stage and 2) estimation of the bottom shear stress for 54 computing the bed load in a given river section.

55 Many popular software tools, like MIKE11 (MIKE11, 2009), compute the discharge 56 *Q*, in each river section, as the sum of discharges computed in different sub-sections, 57 assuming a single water stage for all of them. Similarly, HEC-RAS (HEC-RAS,2010) 58 calculates the conveyance of the cross-section by the following form of Manning's 59 equation:

$$Q = KS_f^{1/2} \tag{1},$$

61 where S_f is the energy slope and K is the conveyance, computed assuming the same 62 hypothesis and solving each sub-section according to the traditional Manning 63 equation.

The uniform flow formula almost universally applied in each sub-section is still the 64 65 Chezy equation (Herschel, C., 1897). The advantage of using the Chezy equation is that the associated Manning's coefficient has been calibrated worldwide for several 66 types of bed surface and a single value is ready to use for each application. However, 67 68 it is well known that the Chezy equation was derived from laboratory measurements 69 taken in channels with a regular, convex cross-sectional shape. When the section results from the union of different parts, each with a strongly different average water 70 71 depth, one of two options is usually selected. The first option, called Single Channel Method (SCM) is simply to ignore the problem. This leads to strong underestimation 72 73 of the discharge, because the Chezy formula assumes a homogeneous vertically 74 averaged velocity and this homogeneous value provides strong energy dissipation in 75 the parts of the section with lower water depths. The second option, called Divided 76 Channel Method (DCM) is to compute the total discharge as the sum of the discharges 77 flowing in each convex part of the section (called subsection), assuming a single 78 water level for all parts (Chow 1959; Shiono et al. 1999; Myers and Brennan, 1990). 79 In this approach, the wet perimeter of each subsection is restricted to the component 80 of the original one pertaining to the subsection, but the new components shared by 81 each couple of subsections are neglected. This is equivalent to neglecting the shear 82 stresses coming from the vortices with vertical axes (if subsections are divided by

vertical lines) and considering additional resistance for higher velocities, which
results in overestimation of discharge capacity (Lyness et al. 2001).

85 Knight and Hamed (1984) compared the accuracy of several subdivision methods for 86 compound straight channels by including or excluding the vertical division line in the 87 computation of the wetted perimeters of the main channel and the floodplains. However, their results show that conventional calculation methods result in larger 88 89 errors. Wormleaton et al. (1982) and Wormleaton and Hadjipanos(1985) also 90 discussed, in the case of compound sections, the horizontal division through the junction point between the main channel and the floodplains. Their studies show that 91 92 these subdivision methods cannot well assess the discharge in compound channels.

93 The interaction phenomenon in compound channels has also extensively studied by 94 many other researchers (e.g., Sellin 1964; Knight and Demetriou 1983; Stephenson 95 and Kolovopoulos 1990; Rhodes and Knight 1994; Bousmar and Zech 1999; van 96 Prooijen et al. 2005; Moreta and Martin-Vide 2010). These studies demonstrate that 97 there is a large velocity difference between the main channel and the floodplain, 98 especially at low relative depth, leading to a significant lateral momentum transfer. 99 The studies by Knight and Hamed(1984), Wormleaton et al. (1982) indicate that 100 vertical transfer of momentum between the upper and the lower main channels exists, 101 causing significant horizontal shear able to dissipate a large part of the flow energy.

102 Furthermore, many authors have tried to quantify flow interaction among the subsections, at least in the case of compound, but regular channels. To this end 103 104 turbulent stress was modelled through the Reynolds equations and coupled with the 105 continuity equation (Shiono and Knight, 1991). This coupling leads to equations that 106 can be analytically solved only under the assumption of negligible secondary flows. Approximated solutions can also be obtained, although they are based on some 107 108 empirical parameters. Shiono and Knight developed the Shiono-Knight Method 109 (SKM) for prediction of lateral distribution of depth-averaged velocities and boundary 110 shear stress in prismatic compound channels (Shiono and Knight, 1991; Knight and Shiono, 1996). The method can deal with all channel shapes that can be discretized 111 112 into linear elements (Knight and Abril, 1996; Abril and Knight, 2004).

Other studies based on the Shiono and Knight method can be found in Liao and Knight (2007), Rameshwaran and Shiono (2007), Tang and Knight (2008) and Omran and Knight (2010). Apart from *SKM*, some other methods for analysing the conveyance capacity of compound channels have been proposed. For example, 117 Ackers (1993) formulated the so called empirical coherence method. Lambert and Sellin(1996) suggested a mixing length approach at the interface, whereas more 118 119 recently Cao et al. (2006) reformulated flow resistance through lateral integration 120 using a simple and rational function of depth-averaged velocity. Bousmar and Zech 121 (1999) considered the main channel/floodplain momentum transfer proportional to the 122 product of the velocity gradient at the interface times the mass discharge exchanged 123 through this interface due to turbulence. This method, called EDM, also requires a geometrical exchange correction factor and turbulent exchange model coefficient for 124 125 evaluating discharge.

126 A simplified version of the *EDM*, called Interactive Divided Channel Method 127 (*IDCM*), was proposed by Huthoff et al. (2008). In *IDCM* lateral momentum is 128 considered negligible and turbulent stress at the interface is assumed to be 129 proportional to the span wise kinetic energy gradient through a dimensionless 130 empirical parameter α . *IDCM* has the strong advantage of using only two parameters, 131 α and the friction factor, *f*. Nevertheless, as shown in the next section, α depends on 132 the way the original section is divided.

133 An alternative approach could be to simulate the flow structure in its complexity by using a three-dimensional code for computational fluid dynamics (CFD). In these 134 135 codes flow is represented both in terms of transport motion (mean flow) and turbulence by solving the Reynolds Averaged Navier Stokes (RANS) equations 136 (Wilcox, 2006) coupled with turbulence models. These models allow closure of the 137 mathematical problem by adding a certain number of additional partial differential 138 transport equations equal to the order of the model. In the field of the simulation of 139 140 industrial and environmental laws second order models (e.g. k- ε and k- ω models) are widely used. Nonetheless, CFD codes need a mesh fine enough to solve the boundary 141 layer (Wilcox, 2006), resulting in a computational cost that can be prohibitive even 142 for river of few km. 143

In this study two new methods, aimed to represent subsection interactions in a compound channel, are presented. The first method, named "INtegrated Channel Method" (*INCM*), derives from the previous Huthoff formula, which is shown to give results depending on the way the river cross section is discretized in sub-sections. The same dynamic balance adopted by Huthoff is written in differential form, but its diffusive term is weighted according to a ξ coefficient proportional to the local waterdepth.

The second one, named "local hydraulic radius method" (LHRM), derives from the 151 observation that, in the Manning formula, the mean velocity per unit energy gradient 152 is proportional to a power of the hydraulic radius. It should then be possible to get the 153 vertically averaged velocity along each vertical by using the same Manning formula, 154 where the original hydraulic radius is changed with a "local" one. This "local" 155 hydraulic radius should take into account the effect of the surrounding section 156 geometry, up to a maximum distance which is likely to be proportional to the local 157 water depth, according to an empirical β coefficient. The method gives up the idea of 158 solving the Reynolds equations, due to the uncertainty of its parameters, but relies on 159 the solid grounds of the historical experience of the Manning equation. 160

The present paper is organized as follows: Two of the most popular approaches 161 adopted for computation of the vertically averaged velocities are explained in details, 162 along with the proposed *INCM* and *LHRM* methods. The ξ and β parameters of 163 respectively the INCM and LHRM methods are then calibrated from available 164 discharge lab experimental data and a sensitivity analysis is carried out. The INCM 165 166 and *LHRM* methods are finally validated according to three different criteria. The first criterion is comparison with other series of the previous laboratory data, not used for 167 calibration. The second criterion is comparison with discharge data measured in one 168 169 section of the Alzette river Basin (Luxembourg). Because the friction factor is not 170 known a priori, INCM and LHRM formulas are applied in the context of the indirect discharge estimation method, which simultaneously estimates the friction factor and 171 172 the discharge hydrograph from the unsteady state water level analysis of two water level hydrographs measured in two different river sections. The third validation 173 174 criterion is comparison with the vertical velocity profiles obtained by the ANSYS 175 CFX solver, in a cross section of the Alzette river. In the conclusions, it is finally 176 shown that application of bed load formulas, carried out by integration of elementary solid fluxes computed as function of the vertically averaged velocities, can lead to 177 178 results that are strongly different from those obtained by using the simple mean 179 velocity and water depth section values.

180 2 Divided Channel Method (*DCM*) and Interactive Divided Channel 181 Method (*IDCM*)

In the *DCM* method the river section is divided into subsections with uniform velocities and roughness (Chow, 1959). Division is made by vertical lines and no interaction between adjacent subsections is considered. Discharge is obtained by summing the contributions of each subsection, obtained by applying the Manning formula:

187
$$q = \sum_{i} q_{i} = \sum_{i} \frac{R_{i}^{2/3} A_{i}}{n_{i}} \sqrt{S_{f}}$$
(2).

188 where *q* is the total discharge, A_i , R_i and n_i are the area, the hydraulic radius and the 189 Manning's roughness coefficient of each sub section *i* of a compound channel and S_f 190 is the energy slope, assumed constant across the river section. *DCM* is extensively 191 applied in most of the commercial codes, two of them cited in the introduction.

In order to model the interaction between adjacent subsections of a compound section,
the Reynolds and the continuity equations can be coupled (Shiono and Knight, 1991),
to get:

195
$$\rho \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left(H \overline{U}_{v} \overline{V}_{d} \right) = \rho g H S_{0} + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left(H \overline{\tau}_{xy} \right) - \tau_{b} \left(1 + \frac{1}{s^{2}} \right)^{1/2}$$
(3)

196 where ρ is the water density, g is the gravity acceleration, y is the abscissa according 197 to the lateral direction, U and V are respectively the velocity components along the 198 flow x direction and the lateral y direction, H is the water depth, the sub-index d 199 marks the vertically averaged quantities and the bar the time average along the 200 turbulence period, S_0 is the bed slope, s is the section lateral slope, and τ_{β} is the bed 201 shear stress. The $\overline{\tau}_{xy}$ turbulent stress is given by the eddy viscosity equation, that is:

202
$$\overline{\tau}_{xy} = \rho \overline{\varepsilon}_{xy} \frac{\partial U_d}{\partial y}$$
 (4a),

203
$$\bar{\varepsilon}_{xy} = \lambda U_* H$$
 (4b)

204 where the friction velocity U_* is set equal to:

205
$$U_* = \left(\frac{f}{8g}\right)^{1/2} U_d \tag{5},$$

and f is the friction factor, depending on the bed material. The analytical solution of Eqs. (3)-(5) can be found only if the left hand side of Eq. (3) is zero, which is equivalent to neglecting secondary flows. Other solutions can only be found by assuming a known Γ value for the lateral derivative. Moreover, λ is another experimental factor depending on the section geometry. The result is that solution of Eq. (3) strongly depends on the choice of two coefficients, λ and Γ , which are additional unknowns with respect to the friction factor f.

In order to reduce to one the number of empirical parameters (in addition to *f*) Huthoff et al. (2008) proposed the so-called Interactive Divided Channel Method (*IDCM*).

Integration of Eq. (3) over each i^{th} subsection, neglecting the averaged flow lateral momentum, leads to:

217
$$\rho g A_i S_0 = \rho f_i P_i U_i^2 + \tau_{i+1} H_{i+1} + \tau_i H_i$$
(6)

where the left-hand side of Eq.(6) is the gravitational force per unit length, proportional to the density of water ρ , to the gravity acceleration g, to the crosssectional area A_i , and to the stream wise channel slope S_0 . The terms at the right-hand side are the friction forces, proportional to the friction factor f and to the wet solid boundary P_i , as well as the turbulent lateral momentum on the left and right sides, proportional to the turbulent stress τ and to the water depth H.

224 Turbulent stresses are modelled quite simply as:

225
$$\tau_{i+1} = \frac{1}{2} \rho \alpha \left(U_{i+1}^2 - U_i^2 \right)$$
(7).

where α is a dimensionless interface coefficient, U_i^2 is the square of the vertically averaged velocity and τ_i is the turbulent stress along the plane between subsection *i*-1 and *i*. If subsection *i* is the first (or the last) one, velocity U_{i-1} (or U_{i+1}) is set equal to zero.

Following a wall-resistance approach (Chow, 1959), the friction factor f_i is computed as:

232
$$f_i = \frac{g n_i^2}{R_i^{1/3}}$$
(8),

where n_i is the Manning's roughness coefficient and $R_i(=A_i/P_i)$ is the hydraulic radius of subsection *i*. Equations (6) forms a system with an order equal to the number *m* of subsections, which is linear in the U_i^2 unknowns. The results are affected by the choice of the α coefficient, which is recommended by Huthoff et al. (2008), on the basis of lab experiments, equal to 0.02. Computation of the velocities U_i makes it easy to estimate discharge *q*.

IDCM has the main advantage of using only two parameters, the f and α coefficients. On the other hand, it can be easily shown that α , although it is dimensionless, depends on the way the original section is divided. The reason is that the continuous form of Eq. (6) is given by:

244
$$\rho g \left(HS_o - \frac{f U^2}{g \cos \theta} \right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (\tau H)$$
(9),

where θ is the bed slope in the lateral direction. Following the same approach as the *IDCM*, if we assume the turbulent stress τ to be proportional to both the velocity gradient in the lateral direction and to the velocity itself, we can write the right-hand side of Eq. (9) in the form:

249
$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y} (\tau H) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left(\frac{\alpha_H}{2} \rho U \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} H \right)$$
(10),

and Eq. (9) becomes:

251
$$\rho\left(gHS_{o} - \frac{fU^{2}}{g\cos\theta}\right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y}\left(H\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\left(\alpha_{H}\rho U^{2}\right)\right)$$
(11).

In Eq. (10) α_H is no longer dimensionless, but is a length. To get the same Huthoff formula from numerical discretization of Eq. (10), we should set:

$$\alpha_H = 0.02 \,\Delta y \tag{12},$$

where Δy is the subsection width, i.e. the integration step size. This implies that the solution of Eq. (11), according to the Huthoff formula, depends on the way the equation is discretized and the turbulence stress term on the r.h.s. vanishes along with the integration step size.

3 The new methods

260 3.1 Integrated Channel Method (INCM)

INCM derives from the *IDCM* idea of evaluating the turbulent stresses as proportional 261 to the gradient of the squared averaged velocities, leading to Eqs. (7) and (11). 262 Observe that dimensionless coefficient α , in the stress computation given by Eq. (7), 263 can be written as the ratio between α_{H} and the distance between verticals *i* and *i*+1. 264 For this reason, coefficient α_{H} can be thought of as a sort of mixing length, related to 265 the scale of the vortices with horizontal axes. *INCM* assumes the optimal α_{H} to be 266 proportional to the local water depth, because water depth is at least an upper limit for 267 268 this scale, and the following relationship is applied:

$$\alpha_H = \xi H \tag{13},$$

270 where ξ is an empirical coefficient to be further estimated.

271 3.2 Local hydraulic radius method (LHRM)

LHRM derives from the observation that, in the Manning equation, the averagevelocity is set equal to:

274
$$V = \frac{R^{2/3}}{n} \sqrt{S_0}$$
(14),

and has a one-to-one relationship with the hydraulic radius. In this context the 275 hydraulic radius has the meaning of a global parameter, measuring the interactions of 276 the particles along all the section as the ratio between an area and a length. The 277 inconvenience is that, according to Eq. (14), the vertically averaged velocities in 278 279 points very far from each other remain linked anyway, because the infinitesimal area and the infinitesimal length around two verticals are summed to the numerator and to 280 281 the denominator of the hydraulic radius independently from the distance between the 282 two verticals. To avoid this, LHRM computes the discharge as an integral of the vertically averaged velocities, in the following form: 283

$$q = \int_0^L h(y) U(y) dy$$
(15),

where U is set equal to:

286
$$U = \frac{\Re_{l}^{2/3}}{n} \sqrt{S_{0}}$$
(16),

and \mathfrak{R}_l is defined as local hydraulic radius, computed as:

288
$$\Re_{i}(y) = \frac{\int_{a}^{b} h(s) N(y,s) ds}{\int_{a}^{b} N(y,s) \sqrt{ds^{2} + dz^{2}}}$$
(17a)

289

$$a = \max(0, y - \beta h) \tag{17b}$$

290

$$b = \min(L, y + \beta h) \tag{17c},$$

291 where *z* is the topographic elevation (function of *s*), β is an empirical coefficient and *L* 292 is the section top width. Moreover *N*(*y*, *s*) is a shape function where:

293
$$N(y,s) = \begin{cases} -\frac{\left[y - \beta h(y)\right] - s}{\beta h(y)} & \text{if } a < s < y\\ \frac{\left[y - \beta h(y)\right] - s}{\beta h(y)} & \text{if } b > s > y\\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
(18).

Equations (18) show how the influence of the section geometry, far from the abscissa 294 295 y, continuously decreases up to a maximum distance, which is proportional to the water depth according to an empirical positive coefficient β . After numerical 296 discretization, Eqs (15)-(17) can be solved to get the unknown q, as well as the 297 298 vertically averaged velocities in each subsection. If β is close to zero and the size of 299 each subsection is common for both formulas, LHRM is equivalent to DCM; if β is very large LHRM is equivalent to the traditional Manning formula. In the following, 300 β is calibrated using experimental data available in the literature. A sensitivity 301 analysis is also carried out, to show that the estimated discharge is only weakly 302 303 dependent on the choice of the β coefficient, far from its possible extreme values.

304 3.3 Evaluation of the ξ and β parameters by means of lab experimental data

INCM and *LHRM* parameters were calibrated by using data selected from six series of experiments run at the large scale Flood Channel Facility (FCF) of HR Wallingford (UK), (Knight and Sellin, 1987; Shiono and Knight, 1991; Ackers, 1993), as well as 308 from four series of experiments run in the small-scale experimental apparatus of the Civil Engineering Department at the University of Birmingham (Knight and 309 310 Demetriou, 1983). The FCF series were named F1, F2, F3, F6, F8 and F10; the 311 Knight and Demetriou series were named K1, K2, K3 and K4. Series F1, F2, and F3 312 covered different floodplain widths, while series F2, F8, and F10 kept the floodplain 313 widths constant, but covered different main channel side slopes. Series F2 and F6 314 provided a comparison between the symmetric case of two floodplains and the asymmetric case of a single floodplain. All the experiments of Knight and Demetriou 315 (1983) were run with a vertical main channel wall, but with different B/b ratios. The 316 series K1 has B/b = 1 and its section is simply rectangular. The B/b ratio, for Knight's 317 experimental apparatus, was varied by adding an adjustable side wall to each of the 318 319 floodplains either in pairs or singly to obtain a symmetrical or asymmetrical cross section. The geometric and hydraulic parameters are shown in Table 1; all notations 320 of the parameters can be found in Fig. 1 and S_0 is the bed slope. The subscripts "mc" 321 322 and "fp" of the side slope refer to the main channel and floodplain, respectively. 323 Perspex was used for both main flume and floodplains in all tests. The related Manning roughness is $0.01 \text{ m}^{-1/3} \text{s}$. 324

The experiments were run with several channel configurations, differing mainly for floodplain geometry (widths and side slopes) and main channel side slopes (see Table 1). The K series were characterized by vertical main channel walls. More information concerning the experimental setup can be found in Table 1 (Knight and Demetriou, 1983; Knight and Sellin, 1987; Shiono and Knight, 1991).

Four series, named F1, F2, F3 and F6, were selected for calibration of the β coefficient, using the Nash Sutcliffe (NS) index of the measured and the computed flow rates as a measure of the model's performance (Nash and Sutcliffe, 1970).

The remaining three series, named F2, F8 and F10, plus four series from Knight and Demetriou, named K1, K2, K3 and K4, were used for validation (no.) 1, as reported in the next section. NS is given by:

$$NS = \left[1 - \frac{\sum_{j=1,2} \sum_{i=1,N_J} \sum_{K=1,M_{N_J}} (q_{i,j,k}^{obs} - q_{i,j,k}^{sim})^2}{\sum_{j=1,2} \sum_{i=1,N_J} \sum_{K=1,M_{N_J}} (q_{i,j,k}^{obs} - \overline{q}_{i,j,k}^{obs})^2}\right]$$
(19)

337 where N_j is the number of series, M_{Nj} is the number of tests for each series, $q^{sim}_{i,j,k}$ 338 and $q^{obs}_{i,j,k}$ are respectively the computed and the observed discharge (j = 1 for the 339 FCF series and j = 2 for the Knight series; *i* is the series index and *K* is the water 340 depth index). $\overline{q_{i,j,k}^{obs}}$ is the average value of the measured discharges.

Both ξ and β parameters were calibrated by maximizing the Nash Sutcliffe (NS) index, computed using all the data of the four series used for calibration. See the NS versus ξ and β curves in Figs. 2a and 2b.

344 Calibration provides optimal ξ and β coefficients respectively equal to 0.08 and 9.

345 The authors will show in the next sensitivity analysis that even a one-digit 346 approximation of the ξ and β coefficients provides a stable discharge estimation.

347 3.4 Sensitivity analysis

348 We carried out a discharge sensitivity analysis of both new methods using the 349 computed $\xi = 0.08$ and $\beta=9$ optimal values and the data of the F2 and K4 series. 350 Sensitivities were normalized in the following form:

351
$$I_{s} = \frac{1}{q_{INCM}} \frac{\Delta q}{\Delta \xi}$$
(20),

352
$$L_{s} = \frac{1}{q_{LHRM}} \frac{\Delta q}{\Delta \beta}$$
(21),

353

where Δq is the difference between the discharges computed using two different β and ξ values. The assumed perturbations " $\Delta\beta$ " and " $\Delta\xi$ " are respectively $\Delta\beta = 0.001 \beta$, $\Delta\xi$ $= 0.001 \xi$.

The results of this analysis are shown in Table 2a for the F2 series, where H is the water depth and Q_{meas} the corresponding measured discharge.

359 They show very low sensitivity of both the *INCM* and *LHRM* results, such that a one

360 digit approximation of both model parameters (ξ and β) should guarantee a computed

- discharge variability of less than 2%.
- 362 The results of the sensitivity analysis, carried out for series K4 and shown in Table
- 363 2b, are similar to the previous ones computed for F2 series.

364 4 Validation criterion

365 4.1 Validation n.1 - Comparison with laboratory experimental data

366 A first validation of the two methods was carried out by using the calibrated 367 parameter values, the same Nash-Sutcliffe performance measure and all the available 368 experimental series. The results were also compared with results of *DCM* and *IDCM* 369 methods, the latter applied using the suggested $\alpha = 0.02$ value and five subsections, 370 each one corresponding to a different bottom slope in the lateral y direction. The NS 371 index for all data series is shown in Table 3.

The DCM results are always worse and are particularly bad for all the K series. The 372 results of both the IDCM and INCM methods are very good for the two F series not 373 used for calibration, but are both poor for the K series. The LHRM method is always 374 the best and also performs very well in the K series. The reason is probably that the K 375 376 series tests have very low discharges, and the constant $\alpha = 0.02$, the coefficient 377 adopted in the IDCM method, does not fit the size of the subsections and Eq. (13) is not a good approximation of the mixing length α_{H} in Eq. (12) for low values of the 378 379 water depth. In Figs. 3a and 3b the NS curves obtained by using DCM, IDCM, INCM and LHRM, for series F2 and K4, are shown. 380

381 4.2 Validation n.2 - Comparison with field data

Although rating curves are available in different river sites around the world, fieldvalidation of the uniform flow formulas is not easy, for at least two reasons:

1) The average friction factor f and the related Manning's coefficient are not known as in the lab case and the results of all the formulas need to be scaled according to the Manning's coefficient to be compared with the actually measured discharges;

387 2) River bed roughness does change, along with the Manning's coefficient, from one388 water stage to another (it usually increases along with the water level).

A possible way to circumvent the problem is to apply the compared methods in the context of a calibration problem, where both the average Manning's coefficient and the discharge hydrograph are computed from the known level hydrographs measured in two different river cross sections (Perumal et al., 2007; Aricò et al., 2009). The authors solved the diffusive wave simulation problem using one known level hydrograph as the upstream boundary condition and the second one as the benchmarkdownstream hydrograph for the Manning's coefficient calibration.

It is well-known in the parameter estimation theory (Aster et al., 2012) that the uncertainty of the estimated parameters (in our case the roughness coefficient) grows quickly with the number of parameters, even if the matching between the measured and the estimated model variables (in our case the water stages in the downstream section) improves. The use of only one single parameter over all the computational domain is motivated by the need of getting a robust estimation of the Manning's coefficient and of the corresponding discharge hydrograph.

Although the accuracy of the results is restricted by several modeling assumptions, a positive indication about the robustness of the simulation model (and the embedded relationship between the water depth and the uniform flow discharge) is given by: 1) the match between the computed and the measured discharges in the upstream section, 2) the compatibility of the estimated average Manning's coefficient with the site environment.

409 The area of interest is located in the Alzette River basin (Gran-Duchy of 410 Luxembourg) between the gauged sections of Pfaffenthal and Lintgen (Fig. 4). The 411 river reach length is about 19 km, with a mean channel width of \sim 30 m and an 412 average depth of \sim 4 m. The river meanders in a relatively large and flat plain about 413 300 m, with a mean slope of \sim 0.08%.

414 The methodology was applied to a river reach 13 Km long, between two instrumented 415 sections, Pfaffenthal (upstream section) and Hunsdorf (downstream section), in order 416 to have no significant lateral inflow between the two sections.

Events of January 2003, January 2007 and January 2011 were analysed. For these events, stage records and reliable rating curves are available at the two gauging stations of Pfaffenthal and Hunsdorf. The main hydraulic characteristics of these events, that is duration (Δt), peak water depth (H_{peak}) and peak discharge (q_{peak}), are shown in Table 4.

In this area a topographical survey of 125 river cross sections was available. The
hydrometric data were recorded every 15 min. The performances of the discharge
estimation procedures were compared by means of the Nash Suctliffe criterion.

425 The results of the *INCM* and *LHRM* methods were also compared with those of the 426 *DCM* and *IDCM* methods, the latter applied by using $\alpha = 0.02$ and an average

- 427 subsection width equal to 7 m. The computed average Manning's coefficients n_{opt} ,
- 428 reported in Table 5, are all consistent with the site environment, although they attain
- 429 very large values, according to *DCM* an *IDCM*, in the 2011 event.
- 430 The estimated and observed dimensionless water stages in the Hunsdorf gauged site,

431 for 2003, 2007 and 2011 events are shown in Figs. 5-7.

- 432 Only the steepest part of the rising limb, located inside the colored window of each
 433 Figure, was used for calibration. The falling limb is not included, since it has a lower
 434 slope and is less sensitive to the Manning's coefficient value.
- 435 A good match between recorded and simulated discharge hydrographs can be436 observed (Figs. 8-10) in the upstream gauged site for each event.
- 437 For all investigated events the Nash Sutcliffe efficiency NS_q is greater than 0.90, as 438 shown in Table 6.
- The error obtained between measured and computed discharges, with all methods, is of the same order of the discharge measurement error. Moreover, this measurement error is well known to be much larger around the peak flow, where the estimation error has a larger impact on the NS coefficient. The NS coefficients computed with the *LHRM* and *INCM* methods are anyway a little better than the other two.

444 4.3 Validation n.3 - Comparison with results of 3D ANSYS CFX solver

The vertically averaged velocities computed using *DCM*, *IDCM*, *INCM* and *LHRM* were compared with the results of the well known ANSYS 3D code, named CFX, which solves the Reynolds-average Navier Stokes (RANS) equations, applied to a prismatic reach with the irregular cross-section measured at the Hunsdorf gauged section of the Alzette river. The length of the reach is about four times the top width of the section.

In the homogeneous multiphase model adopted by CFX, water and air are assumed to share the same dynamic fields of pressure, velocity and turbulence and water is assumed to be incompressible. CFX solves the conservation of mass and momentum equations, coupled with the air pressure-density relationship and the global continuity equation in each node. Call α_l , ρ_l , μ_l and \mathbf{U}_l respectively the volume fraction, the density, the viscosity and the time averaged value of the velocity vector for phase l (l= w (water), a (air)), that is:

458
$$\rho = \sum_{l=w,a} \alpha_l \rho_l$$
(22a),

459
$$\mu = \sum_{l=w,a} \alpha_l \mu_l \tag{22b}.$$

460 where ρ and μ are the density and the viscosity of the "averaged" phase. The air 461 density is assumed to be a function of the pressure *p*, according to the state equation:

462

$$\rho_a = \rho_{a,0} e^{\gamma(p-p_o)} \tag{22c},$$

463 where the sub-index 0 marks the reference state values and γ is the air compressibility 464 coefficient.

The governing equations are the following: 1) the mass conservation equation, 2) the Reynolds averaged continuity equation of each phase and 3) the Reynolds averaged momentum equations. Mass conservation implies:

$$468 \qquad \sum_{l=w,a} \alpha_l = 1 \tag{23}$$

469 The Reynolds averaged continuity equation of each phase *l* can be written as:

470
$$\frac{\partial \rho_l}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho_l \mathbf{U}) = S_l$$
(24).

471 where S_l is an external source term. The momentum equation instead refers to the 472 "averaged" phase and is written as:

473
$$\frac{\partial(\rho \mathbf{U})}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{U} \otimes \mathbf{U}) - \nabla \cdot \left(\mu_{eff} \left(\nabla \mathbf{U} + (\nabla \mathbf{U})^{T}\right)\right) + \nabla p' = S_{M}$$
(25),

474 where \otimes is the dyadic symbol, S_M is the momentum of the external source term *S*, and 475 μ_{eff} is the effective viscosity accounting for turbulence and defined as:

$$\mu_{eff} = \mu + \mu_t \tag{26}$$

477 where μ_t is the turbulence viscosity and p' is the modified pressure, equal to:

478
$$p' = p + \frac{2}{3}\rho k + \frac{2}{3}\mu_{eff}\nabla \cdot \mathbf{U}$$
 (27),

479 where k is the turbulence kinetic energy, defined as the variance of the velocity 480 fluctuations and p is the pressure. Both phases share the same pressure p and the same 481 velocity **U**. 482 To close the set of six scalar equations (Eq.23, Eq.24 (two) and Eq.25 (three)), we 483 finally apply the k- ε turbulence model implemented in the CFX solver. The 484 implemented turbulence model is a two equation model, including two extra transport 485 equations to represent the turbulent properties of the flow.

Two-equation models account for history effects like convection and diffusion of turbulent energy. The first transported variable is turbulent kinetic energy, k; the second transported variable is the turbulent dissipation, ε . The K-epsilon model has been shown (Jones, 1972; Launder, 1974) to be useful for free-shear layer flows with relatively small pressure gradients. Similarly, for wall-bounded and internal flows, the model gives good results, but only in cases where the mean pressure gradients are small.

The computational domain was divided using both tetrahedral and prismatic elements (Fig. 11). The prismatic elements were used to discretize the computational domain in the near-wall region over the river bottom and the boundary surfaces, where a boundary layer is present, while the tetrahedral elements were used to discretize the remaining domain. The number of elements and nodes, in the mesh used for the specific case are of the order respectively $4*10^6$ and $20*10^6$.

A section of the mesh is shown in Fig.12. The quality of the mesh was verified by
using a pre-processing procedure by ANSYS® ICEM CFDTM (Ansys inc., 2006).

The six unknowns in each node are the pressure, the velocity components, and the 501 volume fractions of the two phases. At each boundary node three of the first four 502 503 unknowns have to be specified. In the inlet section a constant velocity, normal to the 504 section, is applied, and the pressure is left unknown. In the outlet section the hydrostatic distribution is given, the velocity is assumed to be still normal to the 505 section and its norm is left unknown. All boundary conditions are reported in Table 7. 506 The opening condition means that that velocity direction is set normal to the surface, 507 but its norm is left unknown and a negative (entering) flux of both air and water is 508 509 allowed. Along open boundaries the water volume fraction is set equal to zero. The 510 solution of the problem converges towards two extremes: nodes with zero water 511 fraction, above the water level, and nodes with zero air fraction below the water level. On the bottom boundary, between the nodes with zero velocity and the turbulent flow 512 513 a boundary layer exists that would require the modelling of micro scale irregularities. CFX allows the use, inside the boundary layer, of a velocity logarithmic law, 514

according to an equivalent granular size. The relationship between the granular size
and the Manning's coefficient, according to Yen (1994), is given by:

517
$$d_{50} = \left(\frac{n}{0.0474}\right)^6$$
(28),

518 where d_{50} is the average granular size to be given as the input in the CFX code.

Observe that the assumption of known and constant velocity directions in the inlet and 519 outlet section is a simplification of reality. A more appropriate boundary condition at 520 the outlet section, not available in the CFX code, would have been given by zero 521 velocity and turbulence gradients (Rameshwaran et al. 2013). For this reason, a better 522 523 reconstruction of the velocity field can be found in an intermediate section, where 524 secondary currents with velocity components normal to the mean flow direction can 525 be easily detected (Peters and Goldberg, 1989; Richardson and Colin, 1996). See in 526 Fig. 13 how the intermediate section was divided to compute the vertically averaged 527 velocities in each segment section. These 3D numerical simulations confirm that the momentum Γ , proportional to the derivative of the average tangent velocities and 528 equivalent to the left hand side of Eq. 2, cannot be set equal to zero, if a rigorous 529 reconstruction of the velocity field is sought after. 530

To compute the uniform flow discharge, for a given outlet section, CFX code is run iteratively, each time with a different average longitudinal velocity in the inlet section, until the same water depth as in the outlet section is attained in the inlet section for steady state conditions.Using the velocity distribution computed in the middle section along the steady state computation as upstream boundary condition, transient analysis is carried on until pressure and velocity oscillations become periodic.

In order to test the achievement of the fully developed state within the first half of the modeled length the authors plotted the vertical profiles of the streamwise velocity components for ten verticals, equally spaced along the longitudinal axis of the main channel. See in Fig.14 the plot of four of them and their location. The streamwise velocity evolves longitudinally and becomes almost completely self similar starting from the vertical line in the middle section.

543 Stability of the results has been finally checked against the variation of the length of 544 the simulated channel. The dimensionless sensitivity of the discharge with respect to 545 the channel length is equal to 0.2%. 546 See in Table 8 the comparison between the vertically averaged state velocities, 547 computed through the *DCM*, *IDCM*, *INCM*, *LHRM* formulas (u_{DCM} , u_{IDCM} , u_{INCM} , 548 u_{LHRM}) and through the CFX code (u_{CFX}). Table 9 also shows the relative difference, 549 Δu , evaluated as:

550
$$\Delta u = \frac{u - u_{CFX}}{u_{CFX}} \times 100$$
(29).

551 As shown in Table 8, both *INCM* and *LHRM* perform very well in this validation test instead of DCM, which clearly overestimates averaged velocities. In the central area 552 of the section the averaged velocities calculated by the INCM, LHRM and CFX code 553 554 are quite close with a maximum difference ~7%. By contrast, larger differences are evident close to the river bank, in segments 1 and 9, where INCM and LHRM 555 underestimate the CFX values. These larger differences show the limit of using a 1D 556 code. Close to the bank the wall resistance is stronger and the velocity field is more 557 558 sensitive to the turbulent exchange of energy with the central area of the section, 559 where higher kinetic energy occurs.

560 **5 Conclusions**

Two new methods computing the vertically averaged velocities along irregular sections have been presented. The first method, named *INCM*, develops from the original *IDCM* method and it is shown to perform better than the previous one, with the exception of lab tests with very small discharge values. The second one, named *LHRM*, has empirical bases, and gives up the ambition of estimating turbulent stresses, but has the following important advantages:

567 1. It relies on the use of only two parameters: the friction factor f (or the 568 corresponding Manning's coefficient n) and a second parameter β which on the basis 569 of the available laboratory data was estimated to be equal to 9.

570 2. The β coefficient has a simple and clear physical meaning: the correlation distance, 571 measured in water depth units, of the vertically averaged velocities between two 572 different verticals of the river cross-section.

573 3. The sensitivity of the results with respect to the model β parameter was shown to 574 be very low, and a one digit approximation is sufficient to get a discharge variability 575 less than 2%. A fully positive validation of the method was carried out using lab 576 experimental data, as well as field discharge and roughness data obtained by using 577 the unsteady-state level analysis proposed by Aricò et al. (Aricò et al., 2009) and 578 applied to the Alzette river, in the grand Duchy of Luxembourg.

4. Comparison between the results of the CFX 3D turbulence model and the *LHRM* model shows a very good match between the two computed total discharges, although the vertically averaged velocities computed by the two models are quite different near to the banks of the river.

583 Moreover, the estimation of the velocity profiles in each of the considered sub-584 sections could be used in order to evaluate the vertical average velocity and so the 585 shear stresses at the boundary of the whole cross section. In fact, it is well-known that 586 bed load transport is directly related to the bed shear stress and that this is 587 proportional in each point of the section to the second power of the vertically 588 averaged velocity, according to Darcy Weisbach (Ferguson, 2007):

589
$$au_0 = \rho U^2 \frac{f}{8}$$
 (30),

590 Moreover, it is well-known that bed load transport is directly related to the bed shear 591 stress and that this is proportional in each point of the section to the second power of 592 the vertically averaged velocity, according to Darcy Weisbach formula (Ferguson, 593 2007):

594
$$au_0 = \rho U^2 \frac{f}{8}$$
 (30),

All the bed load formulas available in literature compute the solid flux per unit width.For example, the popular Schoklisch formula (Gyr et al., 2006) is:

597
$$q_s = \frac{2.5}{\rho_s / \rho} S^{\frac{3}{2}}(q - q_c)$$
(31),

where q and q_s are respectively the liquid and the solid discharge per unit width. This implies that the information given by the mean velocity and by the cross section geometry is not sufficient for a good estimation of the bed load in irregular sections. If Eq.(31) holds, the error in the bed load estimation is proportional to the error in the volumetric discharge, discussed in the previous sections.

603 Acknowledgements

The authors wish to express their gratitude to the Administration de la gestionde l'eau

605 of Grand-Duché de Luxembourg and the Centre de Recherche Public "Gabriel

606 Lippmann" for providing hydrometric and topographical data on Alzette River.

608	Notation
609	A_i = area of each subsection "i" of a compound channel
610	B = top width of compound channel
611	b = main channel width at bottom
612	f = friction factor
613	g = gravity acceleration
614	H = total depth of a compound channel
615 616	n_{mc} and n_{fp} = Manning's roughness coefficient for the main channel and floodplain, respectively
617	P_i = wetted perimeter of each subsection "i" of a compound channel
618	Q _{meas} = measured discharge
619	R_i = hydraulic radius of each subsection "i" of a compound channel
620	$S_0 =$ longitudinal channel bed slope
 621 622 623 624 625 626 	S_f = energy slope τ = turbulent stress ε = turbulent dissipation ρ = fluid density μ = fluid viscosity α = <i>IDCM</i> interface coefficient
627	$\beta = LHRM$ coefficient
628	$\boldsymbol{\xi} = INCM$ coefficient
629	
630	
632	
004	

633	References
634	
635	Abril, J. B., and Knight, D. W. (2004). Stage-discharge prediction for rivers in flood
636	applying a depth-averaged model. J. Hydraul. Res., 42(6), 616-629.
637	
638	Ansys Inc., Canonsburg. (2006). ANSYS CFX Reference guide.
639	
640	Ackers, P. (1993). Flow formulae for straight two-stage channels. J. Hydraul. Res.,
641	31(4), 509–531.
642	
643	Aricò, C. and Tucciarelli, T. (2007). A Marching in Space and Time (MAST) solver
644	of the shallow water equations. Part I: the 1D model. Advances in Water Resources,
645	30(5), 1236-1252.
646	
647	Aricò, C., Nasello, C. and Tucciarelli, T. (2009). Using unsteady water level data to
648	estimate channel roughness and discharge hydrograph, Advances in Water Resources;
649	32(8), 1223-1240.
650	
651	Aster, C., Borchers, B., Clifford, H. (2012). Parameter Estimation and Inverse
652	Problems. Elsevier, ISBN: 978-0-12-385048-5.
653	
654	Bousmar, D., and Zech, Y. (1999). Momentum transfer for practical flow computation
655	in compound channels. J. Hydraul. Eng.; 696–706.
656	
657	Cao, Z., Meng, J., Pender, G., & Wallis, S. (2006). Flow resistance and momentum
658	flux in compound open channels. J. Hydraul. Eng.; 1272–1282.
659	
660	Chow, V. T. (1959). Open channel hydraulics. New York: McGraw-Hill.
661	
662	Corato, G., Moramarco, T., and Tucciarelli, T. (2011). Discharge estimation
663	combining flow routing and occasional measurements of velocity, Hydrol. Earth Syst.
664	Sci.,15, pp. 2979-2994.
665	

- Dey, M., and Lambert, M. F. (2006). Discharge prediction in compound channels by
 end depth method. *J. Hydraul. Res.*,44(6), 767–776.
- 668
- Ferguson, R. (2007) Flow resistance equations for gravel and boulder-bed streams. *Water resources research*, 43, W05427.
- 671
- 672 Gyr, A, and Hoyer k. (2006), Sediment Transport A geophysical Phenomenon,
 673 Springer, 30-31.
- 674
- Herschel, C. (1897). On the origin of the Chezy formula, J. Assoc. of Engineering
 Soc. 18, 363-368.
- 677
- Hu, C., Ji, Z., and Guo, Q. (2010). Flow movement and sediment transport in
 compound channels. J. Hydraul. Res., 48(1), 23–32.
- 680
- Huthoff, F., Roos, P. C., Augustijn, D. C. M., and Hulscher, S. J. M. H. (2008).
 Interacting divided channel method for compound channel flow. *J. Hydraul. Eng.*,
 1158–1165.
- 684
- Jones, W. P., and Launder, B. E. (1972). The Prediction of Laminarization with a
 Two-Equation Model of Turbulence, *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*; vol. 15, pp. 301-314.
- 688
- Kejun Yang, Xingnian Liu; ShuyouCao and Er Huang. (2013). Stage-Discharge
 Prediction in Compound Channels, *J. Hydraul. Eng.*
- 691
- 692 Knight, D. W., and Abril, B. (1996).Refined calibration of a depth averaged model for
- turbulent flow in a compound channel. *Proc. ICE Water Maritime Energy*; 118(3),151–159.
- 695
- Knight, D.W., and Demetriou, J. D. (1983). Flood plain and main channel flow
 interaction, *J. Hydraul. Eng.*, 1073–1092.
- 698

- Knight, D. W., and Hamed, M. E. (1984).Boundary shear in symmetrical compoundchannels, *J. Hydraul. Eng.*, 1412–1430.
- 701

- Knight, D. W., McGahey, C., Lamb, R., and Samuels, P. G. (2010).Practical channel
 hydraulics: Roughness, conveyance and afflux. CRC Press/Taylor and Francis,
- The Netherlands, 1–354.
- 705
- Knight, D. W., and Sellin, R. H. J. (1987). The SERC flood channel facility. J. Inst.
- 707 *Water Environ*. Manage, 1(2), 198–204.
- 708
- 709 Knight, D. W., and Shiono, K. (1996). River channel and floodplain hydraulics.
- Chapter 5, Floodplain processes, M. G. Anderson, D. E. Walling, and P. D. Bates,
 eds., Wiley, New York, 139–181.
- 712

Knight, D. W., Shiono, K., and Pirt, J. (1989).Prediction of depth mean velocity and
discharge in natural rivers with overbank flow. Proc., Int. Conf. on Hydraulic and
Environmental Modelling of Coastal, Estuarine and River Waters, R. A. Falconer, P.
Goodwin and R. G. S. Matthew, eds., Gower Technical, Univ. of Bradford, U.K.,
419–428.

- 718
- Lambert, M. F., and Sellin, R. H. J. (1996). Discharge prediction in straight
 compound channels using the mixing length concept. *J.Hydraul. Res.*,34(3), 381–394.
- Launder, B. E., and Sharma, B. I. (1974). Application of the Energy Dissipation
 Model of Turbulence to the Calculation of Flow Near a Spinning Disc. Letters in Heat
 and Mass Transfer; vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 131-138.
- 725
- Liao, H., and Knight, D. W. (2007). Analytic stage-discharge formulas for flow in
 straight prismatic channels. *J. Hydraul. Eng.*, 1111–1122.
- 728
- 729 Lyness, J. F., Myers, W. R. C., Cassells, J. B. C., and O'Sullivan, J. J. (2001). The
- influence of planform on flow resistance in mobile bed compound channels *Proc.*,
- 731 *ICE Water Maritime Eng.*; 148(1), 5–14.
- 732

733	McGahey, C. (2006). A practical approach to estimating the flow capacity of rivers.
734	Ph.D. thesis, The Open Univ., Milton Keynes, U.K,. (British Library).
735	
736	McGahey, C., Knight, D. W., and Samuels, P. G. (2009). Advice, methods and tools
737	for estimating channel roughness. Proc. ICE Water Manage, 162(6), 353-362.
738	
739	Moreta, P. J. M., and Martin-Vide, J. P. (2010). Apparent friction coefficient in
740	straight compound channels. J. Hydraul. Res., 48(2), 169-177.
741	
742	Myers, W. R. C., & Brennan, E. K. (1990). Flow resistance in compound channels. J.
743	Hydraul. Res., 28(2), 141–155.
744	
745	Omran, M., and Knight, D. W. (2010). Modelling secondary cells and sediment
746	transport in rectangular channels. J. Hydraul. Res., 48(2), 205-212.
747	
748	Peters J.J. and Goldberg A. (1989). Flow data in large alluvial channels in
749	Maksimovic, C. & Radojkovic, M. (eds) Computational Modeling and Experimental
750	methods in Hydraulics; Elsevier, London, 77-86.
751	
752	Perumal M, Moramarco T, Sahoo B, Barbetta S. (2007). A methodology for discharge
753	estimation and rating curve development at ungauged river sites. Water Resources
754	Res.
755	
756	Rameshwaran, P. and Shiono, K. (2007). Quasi two-dimensional model for straight
757	overbank flows through emergent vegetation on floodplains J. Hydraul. Res. 45(3),
758	302-315.
759	
760	Rameshwaran, Ponnambalam; Naden, Pamela; Wilson, Catherine A.M.E.; Malki,
761	Rami; Shukla, Deepak R.; Shiono, Koji. (2013). Inter-comparison and validation of
762	computational fluid dynamics codes in two-stage meandering channel flows. Applied
763	Mathematical Modelling, 37 (20-21). 8652-8672.
764	

765	Rhodes, D. G., and Knight, D. W. (1994). Velocity and boundary shear in a wide
766	compound duct. J. Hydraul. Res., 32(5), 743-764.
767	
768	Richardson R. W. and Colin R. Thorne. (1998). Secondary Currents around Braid Bar
769	inBrahmaputra River, Bangladesh. J. Hydraul. Eng., 124(3), 325-328.
770	
771	Schlichting, H. (1960). Boundary layer theory, 4th Ed., McGraw-Hill, NewYork.
772	
773	Sellin, R. H. J. (1964). A laboratory investigation into the interaction between the
774	flow in the channel of a river and that over its flood plain. La Houille Blanche, 7,
775	793–801.
776	
777	Shiono, K., Al-Romaih, J. S., and Knight, D. W. (1999). Stage-discharge assessment
778	in compound meandering channels. J. Hydraul. Eng., 66-77.
779	
780	Shiono, K., and Knight, D. W. (1991). Turbulent open-channel flows with variable
781	depth across the channel. J. Fluid Mech., 222, 617-646.
782	
783	Stephenson, D., andKolovopoulos, P. (1990). Effects of momentum transfer in
784	compound channels. J. Hydraul. Eng., 1512–1522.
785	
786	Tang, X., and Knight, D. W. (2008). Lateral depth-averaged velocity distributions
787	and bed shear in rectangular compound channels. J. Hydraul. Eng., 1337-1342.
788	
789	Van Prooijen, B. C., Battjes, J. A., andUijttewaal, W. S. J. (2005). Momentum
790	exchange in straight uniform compound channel flow. J. Hydraul. Eng., 175-183.
791	
792	Wormleaton, P. R., Allen, J., and Hadjipanos, P. (1982). Discharge assessment in
793	compound channel flow. J. Hydraul. Div., 108(9), 975-994.
794	
795	Wormleaton, P. R., & Hadjipanos, P. (1985). Flow distribution in compound channels.
796	J. Hydraul. Eng., 357–361.
797	

- 798 Yen, B.C. (1992). The Manning formula in context. Channel Flow Resistance:
- 799 Centennial of Manning's Formula,. Editor Water Resources Publications, Littleton,
- Colorado, USA, p. 41.
- 801
- MIKE11, A Modelling System for Rivers and Channels, Reference Manual, DHI2009
- 804 HEC-RAS, River Analysis System, Hydraulic Reference Manual, US Army Corps of
- Engineers 2010.
- 806

Series	S_0	h	В	b_4	b_1	b_3	S _{fp}	s _{mc}
Series	$[\%_0]$	[m]	[m]	[m]	[m]	[m]	[-]	[-]
F1					4.1	4.100	0	1
F2		0.15	1.8	1.5	2.25	2.250	1	1
F3	1 027				0.75	0.750	1	1
F6	1.027				2.25	0	1	1
F8					2.25	2.250	1	0
F10					2.25	2.250	1	2
K1					0.229	0.229		
K2	0.966	0.08	0.15	0.152	0.152	0.152	0	0
K3					0.076	0.076	0	0
K4					-	-		

807 Table 1 Geometric and Hydraulic Laboratory Parameters of the experiment series.

Table 2a Sensitivities I_s and L_s computed in the F2 series for the optimal parameter values.

H [m]	$Q_{\text{meas}}[m^3 s^{-1}]$	I_s	L_s
0.156	0.212	0.2209	0.2402
0.169	0.248	0.1817	0.2194
0.178	0.282	0.1651	0.2044
0.187	0.324	0.1506	0.1777
0.198	0.383	0.1441	0.1584
0.214	0.480	0.1305	0.1336
0.249	0.763	0.1267	0.1320

820 Table 2b Sensitivities I_s and L_s computed in the K4 series for the optimal parameter

821 values.

Н	Q _{meas}	I	T
[m]	$[m^3 s^{-1}]$	I_S	L_S
0.085	0.005	0.3248	0.3282
0.096	0.008	0.2052	0.2250
0.102	0.009	0.1600	0.1709
0.114	0.014	0.1354	0.1372
0.127	0.018	0.1174	0.1208
0.154	0.029	0.0851	0.0866

823 Table 3 Nash-Sutcliffe Efficiency for all (calibration and validation) experimental824 series.

	Series	DCM	<i>IDCM</i>	INCM	LHRM
	<i>F1</i>	0.7428	0.9807	0.9847	0.9999
Calibration	F2	0.6182	0.9923	0.9955	0.9965
Set	F3	0.7219	0.9744	0.9261	0.9915
	F6	0.7366	0.9733	0.9888	0.9955
	F8	-0.0786	0.9881	0.9885	0.9964
	F10	-0.0885	0.9965	0.9975	0.9978
Validation	<i>K1</i>	-14.490	-0.7007	-8.2942	0.9968
Set	K2	-0.9801	0.3452	-1.8348	0.9619
	<i>K3</i>	0.1762	0.6479	-0.3944	0.9790
	K4	0.2878	0.888	0.3548	0.9958

833	Table 4 Main characteristics of	the flood events at	the Pfaffenthal and Hunsdorf
834	gauged sites.		

		Pfaffe	nthal	Hunsdor	f
Event	Δt [h]	H _{peak}	q_{peak}	H_{peak}	$Q_{ m peak}$
		[m]	$[m^3s^{-1}]$	[m]	$[m^3 s^{-1}]$
January 2003	380	3.42	70.98	4.52	67.80
January 2007	140	2.90	53.68	4.06	57.17
January 2011	336	3.81	84.85	4.84	75.10

836 Table 5 Optimum roughness coefficient, n_{opt} , for the three flood events.

	DCM	IDCM	INCM	LHRM
Event	<i>n</i> _{opt}	n _{opt}	n _{opt}	n _{opt}
	[sm ^{-1/3}]	$[sm^{-1/3}]$	$[sm^{-1/3}]$	$[sm^{-1/3}]$
January 2003	0.054	0.047	0.045	0.045
January 2007	0.051	0.047	0.046	0.045
January 2011	0.070	0.070	0.057	0.055

838 Table 6 Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency of estimated discharge hydrographs for the analysed

839 flood events.

	DCM	IDCM	INCM	LHRM
Event	NS_q	NS_q	NS_q	NS_q
	[-]	[-]	[-]	[-]
January 2003	0.977	0.987	0.991	0.989
January 2007	0.983	0.988	0.989	0.992
January 2011	0.898	0.899	0.927	0.930

847	Table 7 Boundary	conditions	assigned in	n the	CFX	simulation.
-----	------------------	------------	-------------	-------	-----	-------------

Geometry Face	Boundary Condition				
Inlet	All velocity components				
	Velocity direction and				
Outlet	hydrostatic pressure				
	distribution				
Side-Walls	Opening				
Тор	Opening				
	No-slip wall condition, with				
Bottom	roughness given by				
	equivalent granular size d ₅₀ .				

Table 8 Simulated mean velocities in each segment section using 1D hydraulic
models with *DCM*, *IDCM*, *INCM*, *LHRM* and *CFX*, and corresponding differences.

Subsection	<i>u_{CFX}</i>	u_{DCM}	<i>u_{IDCM}</i>	<i>u_{INCM}</i>	<i>u_{LHRM}</i>	Δu_{DCM}	Δu_{IDCM}	Δu_{INCM}	Δu_{LHRM}
	[ms ⁻¹]	[ms ⁻¹]	[ms ⁻¹]	[ms ⁻¹]	[ms ⁻¹]	[%]	[%]	[%]	[%]
1	1.33	1.58	1.47	1.23	1.12	18.79	10.52	-7.52	-15.78
2	1.37	1.42	1.4	1.36	1.38	3.65	2.19	-0.73	0.73
3	1.38	1.53	1.48	1.38	1.4	10.87	7.25	0	1.45
4	1.47	1.64	1.6	1.56	1.57	11.56	8.84	6.13	6.80
5	1.53	1.94	1.8	1.59	1.61	26.79	17.65	3.92	5.23
6	1.57	2.01	1.81	1.6	1.68	28.02	15.29	1.91	7.00
7	1.46	1.66	1.65	1.49	1.5	13.69	13.01	2.05	2.74
8	1.42	1.48	1.46	1.44	1.43	4.22	2.82	1.40	0.70
9	0.88	0.91	0.90	0.70	0.69	3.40	2.27	-20.43	5 -21.59



854

855 Figure 1 Compound channel geometric parameters.

856











Figure 3 Estimated discharge values against HR Wallingford FCF measures for F2 (a)

and K4 (b) series.



863

864 Figure 4 The Alzette Study Area.

Figure 5 Observed and simulated stage hydrographs at Hunsdorf gauged site in theevent of January 2003.

Figure 6 Observed and simulated stage hydrographs at Hunsdorf gauged site in theevent of January 2007.

Figure 7 Observed and simulated stage hydrographs at Hunsdorf gauged site in theevent of January 2011.

Figure 8 Observed and simulated discharge hydrographs at Pfaffenthal gauged site inthe event of January 2003.

Figure 9 Observed and simulated discharge hydrographs at Pfaffenthal gauged site inthe event of January 2007.

Figure 10 Observed and simulated discharge hydrographs at Pfaffenthal gauged site in

the event of January 2011.

883

885 Figure 11 Computational domain of the reach of the Alzette river.

886

888

Figure 12 A mesh section along the inlet surface.

889

890 Figure 13 Hunsdorf river cross-section: subsections used to compute the vertically

averaged velocities.

892

Figure 14 Streamwise vertical profile along the longitudinal axis of the mean channel.

895