

Interactive comment on “A flume experiment on the effect of constriction shape on the formation of forced pools” by D. M. Thompson and C. R. McCarrick

T. Lisle (Referee)

tlisle@fs.fed.us

Received and published: 29 April 2010

This is a straightforward report of a well-designed, focused experiment on an important problem of pool-riffle formation. I believe that the results are generally applicable to natural channels. The flume results are consistent with observations I have had in the field but couldn't test because of confounding influences of other factors. The only scientific issue that I have is that the scaled pool-riffle distance in the flume seems shorter than those in natural channels and may have been longer in the flume at a higher flow or longer duration of the experiment. According to the engineering scour literature, the maximum scour should occur at the threshold of particle entrainment outside of the

C676

area affected by the obstruction, e.g., bridge pier. What was the degree of achievement of the entrainment threshold in the experiment? My remaining comments are mostly technical (page/line number): 1946/18: rapidly? 1947/8: If the bank opposite the obstruction is alluvial and free to erode, is there necessarily a constriction? 1949/23: they impact... 1951/2: Sediment as well as water was recirculated? Was this a live bed, i.e., bedload was in transport? 1951/18: It would be useful to introduce Figure 2 here or provide another figure showing obstruction shapes and orientation in the flume. 1952/19: I don't understand this sentence. 1954/18: ...than were the characteristics of the riffle. 1958/25: Any evidence that maximum scour at the obstruction created a slip-face upstream that did not depend on near-bed velocity or turbulence to create the positive slope? 1960/1: Suggest scaling the lag in distance from maximum scour depth to the point of upstream maximum constriction.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 7, 1945, 2010.

C677