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Nature has not made it a priority to make it easy for us to discover its laws

Albert Einstein (1901)

In the first of two companion papers, Grayson et al. [1992a] described the application of a relatively detailed “terrain-based” model to two quite different catchments. One is in Australia, characterized by both surface and subsurface runoff generation mechanisms, and the other is a catchment in southern Arizona with exclusively surface runoff processes. The second paper [Grayson et al., 1992b], which is the subject of this comment, is an extensive and critical discussion of results of the first paper. It includes a rather pessimistic assessment of the results of this model exercise, but consists primarily of opinions concerning the use of “physically based” models “intended for use as hydrologic components of sediment and nutrient transport models” (p. 2659). Hereafter we refer to these two papers as paper 1 and paper 2.

It is our view that the authors’ assessment of their results is overly pessimistic, and many of their rather sweeping generalizations therefrom are unwarranted. While some good points were made by the authors (they have mostly been made before), it is hard not to conclude after reading their philosophizing that the authors came to their exercise of detailed “physically based” modeling with unrealistic expectations.

Much similar philosophy has appeared recently on physically based model applicability [Beven, 1989; Dunne, 1982; Klemes, 1988; Loague and Freeze, 1985], and most of that is referenced in the subject manuscript. The work by Loague and Freeze [1985] is a classic example of apples versus oranges, in which calibrated empirical models were indicated to be apparently better than uncalibrated physically based models, and has often been cited to cast doubt on physically based models. In reading all the philosophical criticisms of the “failures” and limitations of “physically based” models, it seems clear that some have indeed expected such models to be exact mimics of nature. But one also wonders whether such expectations have resided more in model developers or in model users, and one wonders how many model users have shared such unrealistic expectations?

1Retired to Fort Collins, Colorado.

Grayson et al. feel such models have been oversold, but it should be emphasized in that regard that more conceptual or even empirical models have been similarly abused at least as much, if not more. In the United States, in our experience, it is indeed the conceptual and parametric models which represent by far the more egregious examples of overselling. In that light it makes little sense to devote the large part of a manuscript to the perceived overselling of physically based models. Furthermore, the authors have not presented a direct example of the type of overselling or false claims for physically based models against which they appear to argue.

There is evidence in paper 2 of presumptions on the part of the authors which are subjective and color their interpretation of results: “the theoretical rigor of some models is impressive... and implies a degree of accuracy that may not exist” (p. 2662). We feel this is a mistaken implication of the authors; theoretical rigor itself makes no promise of accuracy in arbitrary application. It is the responsibility of those applying any theory to ascertain the appropriateness of the assumptions of the theory to the natural condition at hand. Further, they stated, “Process-based models are not the panacea they were once thought to be...” (p. 2663). Who thinks of any model as a panacea? Or they stated, “There is a certain arrogance associated with ‘physically based’ models regarding their superiority over lumped-parameter or empirical models...” (p. 2661). These statements may indicate that either the authors’ own expectations of such models were inflated, or else they made such characterizations in the form of a straw man, as it were, for their arguments against the use of physically based models for prediction or management purposes and their pessimistic assessment of their results in paper 1.

Some Important Definitions

Before a discussion of hydrologic models it is appropriate to try to define terms. We feel there is a confusion in use of the term “model” by Grayson et al. One needs to distinguish between a fundamental hydrodynamic model/concept (such as the kinematic or diffusive wave equation) based on physical principles, such as momentum and mass conservation, and a computer model such as THALES, in which such physically based concepts are incorporated, but many other assumptions and approximations are also introduced. Both are “models.” The first, hereafter denoted type 1 model, is a mathematical abstraction of observed natural behavior, admittedly including simplifications, but verifiable and re-
mathematics of the hydrological processes and their boundary conditions are poorly defined and/or poorly used, so the solutions are not unique' (p. 2660). (What do they mean by “unique”?) It appears to us that the mathematics of the type 1 models are on the contrary quite well defined and their boundary conditions quite clear. Perhaps they were referring to statistical uniqueness, insofar as a comparison of model to data could give a similar statistical measure of fit with more than one set of parameters. Perhaps they were discussing type 2 models, and they were perhaps referring to heterogeneity. We discuss this topic below. Much of the disappointment evidenced in their discussion should be traced to the level of a priori expectations. The recognition of the limited conclusions to be drawn from their experience, as well as a clear distinction between type 1 models and type 2 models, was, unfortunately, not made in their discussion. The jump to generalizations is quite reminiscent of that of Beven [1989], whose criticisms were apparently instigated by disagreement with several applications of the SHE model by its developers. Applying a model at either an invalid scale or to an invalid physical situation does not invalidate either a type 2 model or the type 1 models therein, and this misuse does not invalidate such models in general.

Tackling Heterogeneity in Nature

Possibly the most significant distinction that needs to be made in response to the Grayson et al. problem is between type 1 model failure and natural heterogeneity. The THALES model application to Wagga Wagga assumed that soil hydraulic properties are stepwise uniform, based on soil surveys, which is traditionally considered quite reasonable. They did not attempt to deal with small-scale heterogeneity in subsurface soils or of surface soil depths or deal with spatial heterogeneity of rainfall input [Goodrich and Woolhiser, this issue]. It is well established that small-scale, more or less random heterogeneity characterizes soils wherever statistically large samples have been measured. Grayson et al. [1992a] repeatedly pointed to assumptions made in their modeling strategy and also often acknowledged the fact of heterogeneity. It is not appropriate to conclude that the type 1 model has failed because its parameters exhibit natural spatial heterogeneity. Neither is it appropriate to conclude that a parameter has lost its physical significance when a single value has been unsuccessfully assumed for a heterogeneous region. By contrast, one does not see manuscripts by groundwater hydrologists suggesting that Darcy’s law is invalid for larger scales, simply because it has been found that saturated hydraulic conductivity varies considerably in
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They go on to assert that models incorrectly assume "broad sheet flow" for surface runoff. This is another mistaken assumption. One can show, as in KINEROS [Wu et al., 1982; Woolhiser et al., 1990], that the depth term in such flow equations can be quite properly taken as the mean or effective flow depth, even though the point depth may be quite variable across the flow path, without loss of value of the equations. Thus uniform, sheet-type flow is not necessarily assumed (see also Goodrich [1992]).

Moreover, we disagree that the above statement is the "most important conclusion to be drawn" from this exercise. What should be concluded from the work of Grayson et al. is that one cannot in advance presume what is the most important source of heterogeneities. Their model uses a relatively detailed representation of the surface topography. This may have been the reason for their unrealistic expectations from simulation. But their model does not represent the rainfall, infiltration, soil, or subsoil variability in sufficient detail, and this seems to have been shown to be significant. Indeed the difficulty they had in representing the "base flow" component illustrates this. Yet they tended to criticize the surface component in their conclusion. They pointed to their ability to roughly simulate the Wagga Wagga outflow hydrograph with a Horton-type mechanism as an example of the untrustworthiness of physically based models. This is an unwarranted conclusion, insofar as the runoff in either case is from surface flow, the difference being the physical cause of the surface flow (saturation or Horton mechanisms). Their spatial segregation of hydraulic conductivities in the Wagga Wagga case leads to the possibility that for either mechanism the area in the swale would be the area of runoff generation. It is not difficult to show that for certain topographies and conditions, saturation excess flow and infiltration excess (Horton) flow mechanisms can produce similar surface runoff patterns, but in general the soil properties would differ between the two types of response. For a case with lower saturated conductivity on more upland areas, the possibility of such similarity is exceedingly more remote.

On one point made by Grayson et al. we can heartily agree: "In the present scientific climate, the collection and analysis of field data is undervalued," (p. 2663). We would add to that, the data should be comprehensive and accurate. Their expressed doubts concerning their base flow data provide a good example of data accuracy problems. Getting data from only one rain gage and one runoff gage is not enough, as they also demonstrated, to evaluate a model at the catchment scale. We need to have enough data on enough types of runoff events so that when a type 2 model simulation is considerably different from a measurement, we can answer the question, Why? Very few if any of our present data sets allow this analysis.

Apparently, Grayson et al. expect (or require) hydrologists to provide or discover a set of equations, equivalent to our current set (kinematic surface flow/Darcy's law/Richard's equation/etc.), that are equally parsimonious, with parameters of a physical nature (rather than conceptual) that can somehow be measured, and where a representive elementary area can be quite large. Certainly, their complaints concerning existing type 2 models may be interpreted as frustration that such a large-scale type 1 model or set of equations is not available. However, is there reason to expect that such equations will ever exist? If not, we need to
get on with developing approaches to dealing with heterogeneity using the physical laws we know, and not throw out or abuse the only baby we have because she/he requires the effort of a (heterogeneous) bath.
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