

Interactive comment on “Physical pedotransfer functions to compute saturated hydraulic conductivity from bimodal characteristic curves for a range of New Zealand soils” by Joseph Alexander Paul Pollacco et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 27 January 2017

The intent of this paper is not very clear. On closer examination, even the title of the paper is problematic to me. My reasons are given below: 1. It is true that soil moisture release curve, $\theta(h)$, is still being measured in the laboratory despite being time-consuming. The hydraulic conductivity function $K(h)$ is too expensive and time-consuming to measure and is typically reconstructed from the saturated hydraulic conductivity K_s and $\theta(h)$. Therefore what the authors seem to suggest in the paper is to use a bimodal $\theta(h)$ to compute K_s . The error involved will be too huge. In fact, it is common knowledge that an accurate $K(h)$ can be obtained by measuring K_s and $\theta(h)$ rather than by estimating $K(h)$ directly from $\theta(h)$. In fact, this is one

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



of the recommendations for future work in the paper. 2. Saturated K_s is not more time-consuming to measure compared to $\theta(h)$. 3. The approach chosen to determine K_s is strange as K_s depends on the voids in the soil. I can understand if one chooses the particle size distribution as providing the key parameters in a pedotransfer function to estimate K_s . Using $\theta(h)$ is an indirect process of getting the pore-size distribution but due to the time-consuming nature of the test, it is less suitable to be used as a proxy for pore-size distribution. 4. Even when using $\theta(h)$, it is expected that the matrix (micro) pores are the ones governing K_s but this is not evident from the paper. 5. The error for K_s shown in Figures 3 and 4, is about +/- one order. The errors in the measurement of K_s should be less despite the problems mentioned in Section 4.1.3. 6. Based on the above assessment, most of the equations presented in the paper have little value. In addition, none of the equations presented is a pedotransfer function in the traditional sense. 7. More relevant literature on estimating of saturated hydraulic conductivities should be cited e.g. Chapuis, R.P. (2004) Predicting the saturated hydraulic conductivity of sand and gravel using effective diameter and void ratio. Canadian Geotechnical Journal, 2004, 41:787-795, 10.1139/t04-022 Mbonimpa, M., Aubertin, M., Chapuis, R.P. (2002) Practical pedotransfer functions for estimating the saturated hydraulic conductivity. Geotechnical and Geological Engineering (2002) 20: 235. doi:10.1023/A:1016046214724

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/hess-2016-636, 2016.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

