

Interactive comment on “Revisiting Kelvin Helmholtz Instabilities and von Kármán Vortices in Canopy Turbulence” by Tirtha Banerjee et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 29 November 2017

General Comments:

The paper evaluates the performance of a canopy model using a drag formula in the large eddy simulation (LES). Particularly, the existence of two key features –Kelvin Helmholtz (KH) waves and von Karman (VK) vortices – over the three canopy configurations are examined in this work. Several innovative approaches (proper orthogonal decomposition, Shannon entropy, Mutual information and synchronization analysis) are introduced to analyze the LES data. The conclusion confirms the existence of both phenomena in canopy flow simulations. However, overall, the analyses based on new approaches are incomplete and lack physical interpretation.

Specific Comments:

Major (The authors need to well address these comments before the paper can be

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



published):

1. The paper lacks some important information about the description of analysis approach. These include the lack of (i) the physical interpretation of mutual information content (MIC), (ii) the mathematical equation and physical meaning of synchronization analysis, and (iii) the approach to split the large scale and small scale in MIC analysis.
2. The description of LES setup is incomplete. For example, the paper doesn't provide some key parameters of two patched configurations (e.g. the separation between patches) and the reason to select those key parameters. The reasons to choose different locations of virtual towers between two patched configurations are not given – Why the number of virtual towers inside selected canopy patches are different between these two configurations? The detailed description of initial conditions is missing.
3. The use of virtual tower to mimic observations in lab or field experiment is interesting, but weakened by the lack of comparison with data from observations. This makes the conclusions much weaker, especially due to the use of innovative analysis approaches without any validation. The use of those approaches need to answer the following questions before being applied in a such case: can KH waves and VK vortices be interpreted using these approaches in a real case? and if they can, whether these phenomena can be observed in LES results?
4. The KH and VK phenomena can be identified from many traditional approaches including quadrant analysis, skewness analysis, variable-interval time averaging, wavelet transform, two-point space-time correlation tensor, etc. (a good review about these approaches is in Finnigan (2000)). However, these methods are not being used in current analysis. Why? For example, the following questions is critical: can KH and VK be identified using traditional approaches in current simulations? compared to these traditional approaches, what are the advantages of using these innovative methods? If there are no advantages, why bother?
5. The turbulent flow should be more or less symmetric with respect to the central plane of each canopy patch in streamwise direction. Thus, the turbulent flux $\langle uv \rangle$ should be more or less zero at the virtual towers located on these planes. However, in Figure

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



4, the turbulent flux $\langle uv \rangle$ is non-zero in all three cases. This phenomenon is not explained.

6. Some panels of figures are not analyzed in current manuscript and should not appear in the paper. These panels include the length scale of u in Figure 4 and third column of Figure 5.

Minor:

1. The resolution of Figure 3 and Figure 5 are too low in current manuscript which make them difficult to view. Meanwhile, the ranges of coordinates and color bar in both figures are not the same from case to case.
2. The title of section 4.3 is already included in title of section 4.2 and need to be corrected.
3. The index i shouldn't be used repetitively in equation ' $\pi_i = \dots$ ' in page 7 line 7.
4. New variable V in page 11 line 8 need to be defined before being used.
5. Some other text typos and format problem associate with units need to be corrected.

Finnigan, J.: Turbulence in plant canopies, Annual review of fluid mechanics, 32.1, 519-571, 2000.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2017-595>, 2017.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

