

Interactive comment on “Technical note: Transit time distributions are not L-shaped” by Earl Bardsley

J Ding

johnding_toronto@yahoo.com

Received and published: 28 September 2017

Re: The zero–time–to–peak characteristic of a probability density function

I'd like to respond, at this late stage of open discussion period, to the clarion call from the author to banish L-shaped probability density functions from transit time modelling (see Abstract, last sentence).

The initial non–zero probability of a tracer transit time distribution is analogous to the zero–time–to–peak characteristic of a synthetic unit hydrograph.

C1

From the latter's perspective, the L shape of a probability density function (PDF) is a logical consequence of a control volume being considered conceptually a spatially lumped catchment.

To confront, overcome or correct this inherent characteristic or shortcoming of a **single** conceptual store (or reservoir, tank, bucket, tub, etc.), I had resorted to the use of a classical concept relating an S-curve hydrograph and its instantaneous unit hydrograph (Ding, 1974, 2011).

Statistically, the former is a cumulative probability function (CPF), $F(t)$, e.g. Ding (2011, Fig. 3); the latter a PDF, $f(t)$, e.g. Ding (1974, Fig. 1); and that the PDF is the derivative of the CPF, $f(t) = dF(t)/dt$.

For a unit hydrograph, this produces an input-dependent or variable characteristic time, i.e. the higher the rainfall–excess intensity, the shorter the time of the peak ordinate (Ding, 1974, Fig. 3).

References

- Ding, J. Y., 1974. Variable unit hydrograph. *Journal of Hydrology*, 22(1-2), pp.53-69.
Ding, J. Y., 2011. A measure of watershed nonlinearity: interpreting a variable instantaneous unit hydrograph model on two vastly different sized watersheds, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 15, 405-423, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-15-405-2011>.