

Interactive comment on “Evolution of the spherical cavity radius generated around a subsurface drip emitter” by M. Gil et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 4 May 2010

I would also like to congratulate the authors for their work done for this special issue. In my opinion there are some questions to consider and should be included in the discussion.

The pots used had a volume of 15 L, but might the size of the pot be decisive in the development of the spherical cavity?

When K_s was increase, because it was measured with a permeameter in a previous test with the same soil, why was the value of 2.8×10^{-5} m/s chosen? Was the result of an average of several measures? Why does it coincide with the one used to predict the distribution of the water in units SDI?

Is really significant the uniformity difference between looped and conventional SDI

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



units?

Initially, the authors noted that h_s is very sensitive to r_0 . It has been shown that r_0 is strongly influenced by q , then one would expect that in h_s also observed this effect of q , however, in figure 7, although h_s increased with q , from 5 L/h, but no significant differences, although the amounts are doubled (from 0.5 to 1.0 m), how was expected to be the values of h_s ?

Page 1943, line 6, there is an error in the nomenclature: "... and its variability for the variable case CVr_0 (coefficient of variance of the cavity radius). Two..."

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 7, 1935, 2010.

BGD

7, C849–C850, 2010

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

