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Multiple regression equations and GEP were used by the author to predict non-dimensional values of $C_f/C_0$. A total of 108 experimental data of Tullis from nine physical models of ogee spillways were used to predict $C_f/C_0$-values. These data relate to different values for $P$, $P_d$ and $Q$. For training phase, 75% of these data points and for testing phase 25% of the total data points are used. Functional relation of $C_f/C_0$ is expressed as

$$C_f/C_0 = f(S, H_o, P, H_o/P_d)$$

Performance of the regression and MEP models were determined in terms of RMSE, $R^2$ and MAE. Performance of MEP model was found to be the best. In all the cases, the design head and the operating head of the spillway were the same. The equation derived by GEP is given by equation (9) in the paper:

$$C_f/C_0 = \frac{S^2 + 10^{-7}}{[0.046 - 2S]} + \frac{S^2 - 3 - H_o/P_d}{[S - 6.332](H_o/P + H_o/P_d)} + 1.008$$

Submergence, $S$ of crest is the major parameter affecting $C_f$. As illustrated in Figures 2 and 3 in the paper, the author has defined submergence in terms of $h_d/h$- both of them measured above the crest of the spillway. USBR (1968), however, defined $h_d$ as the difference between $u/s$ energy level and downstream tail water level. Author’s definition of $h_d$ implies that submergence of spillway crest occurs only when the tail water level is above the crest level which may not be always correct.

Discusser (Mazumder 1966, 1981) defined submergence of flow meters in terms of critical submergence limit ($S_{cr}$) or often called modular limit. If submergence ($S$) is greater than $S_{cr}$, the meter is submersed and it is free when $S < S_{cr}$. Author has mentioned in the paper the threshold value (same as $S_{cr}$) of submergence as 0.8 (Figure 9 in the paper). It may be alright for the given spillway profile where design head is the same as operating head. However, a spillway operates for heads other than design head also depending upon incoming flow. $S_d$ may not be same at all the operating heads. From dimensional analysis, discusser (Mazumder and Joshi 1981) derived $S_{cr} = C_0 C_r r$ and $R$ where, $C_0$ and $C_r$ are the inlet and outlet head loss coefficient, respectively; $r$ is the horizontal fluming ratio ($r = B_o/B_1$) and $R$ is the vertical constriction ratio ($R = \Delta y_1 = P/(P + h)$; Here $B_1$ and $B_o$ are the widths of original channel section and control section respectively; $\Delta$ ($= P$) and $y_1$ are the height of crest and depth of the flow above upstream bed. Figure 1 illustrates the variation of $S_{cr}$ with $C_0$, $C_r$ and $r$ for a given value of $R = 0.8$.

As regards $C_f$-value given by equation (10), it is valid only for the given spillway where operating and design head are the same and the $u/s$ face is vertical. USBR (1968) results show that $C_f$ is a function not only of $P/H_o$ but also of $H_i/H_o$ and a slope of upstream face. Thus, the author’s expression is not a universal one but valid for the given spillway alone. USBR (1968) also gives the limiting values of $P/H_o = 3$ above which $C_f$-value remains the same. Here, $H_o$ is the design head for finding spillway profile. It has also given the flow regime diagram by plotting $h_d/H_o$ against $(h_d + d)/H_o$ indicating the tail water effect and floor effect, respectively. The curve indicates that for $h_d/H_o$ greater than 0.7 there is no tail water effect on $C_f$. Similarly, for $H_i/(h_d + d) > 1.7$, $C_f/C_0 = 1.0$, i.e., there is no floor effect. In the case $h_d/H_o < 0.7$ and $H_i/(h_d + d) < 1.7$ there is both floor and tail water effect on $C_f/C_0$. Here, $d$ is tail water depth.

Flow measurement in open channel and canals is extremely important for water management. Apart from spillways in dams, hydraulic structures like weirs and barrages, drops, venture meters, etc., are devices by which the flow is measured. For free flow conditions, discharge can be measured by using single gauge upstream of these structures since there is no tail water effect. The Coefficient of discharge $C_f$ under free flow condition, depending on the geometry of the device used, remains more or less constant. In submerged flow conditions; however, flow depths both upstream and downstream of the structure are to be measured for finding discharge. $C_f$ under submerged flow is highly sensitive to submergence ($S$) as apparent from Figure 4 in the paper. Any small error in determining $S$ will cause substantial error in discharge. Under submerged flow, the downstream flow surface is wavy resulting in difficulty in finding $S$ very accurately. Thus, flow metering device should be so designed that it works under free flow conditions for the given range of discharges to be measured. For free flow, a control section must exist. Control can be achieved by constricting the channel either vertically or by fluming the channel laterally or by both. In vertical constriction (introducing a smooth hump like ogee weir), critical height of the hump (at its summit) is determined by the maximum discharge ($Q_{max}$). In that case, control will exist for all flows smaller than $Q_{max}$. In the case of lateral fluming (bed remaining horizontal) on the other hand, critical width of flume at the control section ($B_0$) has to be determined by the minimum flow ($Q_{min}$) so that control exists for all flows greater than $Q_{min}$. Using specific energy principles, discusser
developed a unique kind of proportional flow meter by simultaneously raising the bed and fluming laterally. The critical height ($\Delta$) of the hump at the flumed section of width $B_0$ is given by the equations (3) and (4) below:

$$\Delta = E_{1\text{max}} - 3/2 \left[ (Q_{\text{max}}/B_0)^2 / g \right]^{1/3}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

$$B_0 = \left[ 0.7 \left( Q_{\text{max}}^{2/3} - Q_{\text{min}}^{2/3} \right) / (E_{1\text{max}} - E_{1\text{min}}) \right]^{3/2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where $E_{1\text{max}}$ and $E_{1\text{min}}$ are the specific energy heads upstream corresponding to $Q_{\text{max}}$ and $Q_{\text{min}}$, respectively. Further details about the flow meter with experimental results are available in the paper by Mazumder and Deb Roy (1999). It may be mentioned that $C_f$ was almost the same in the flow range $Q_{\text{max}}$ and $Q_{\text{min}}$ for which the flow meter was designed. It is superior to the Parshall (1950) type flow meter used for measuring flow in irrigation canals.
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