

## ***Interactive comment on “Online modelling of water distribution systems: a UK case study” by J. Machell et al.***

**J. Machell et al.**

s.r.mounce@sheffield.ac.uk

Received and published: 10 February 2010

Thank you to the reviewer for their thoughts and queries.

> However, it is believed that it can serve as a good practice paper that may be of a  
> particular interest to water companies and practitioners. > Specific comments > The  
literature review presented in the first section is found rather generic and lacks > any  
methods of WDS state estimation that are typically used in online hydraulic > modeling.  
> The authors might consider including following publications: > Sterling, M. J. H., and  
Bargiela, A. (1984). "Minimum norm state estimation for computer > control of water  
distribution systems." Control Theory and Applications, IEE Proceedings > D, 131(2),  
57-63. > Andersen, J. H., and Powell, R. S. (2000). "Implicit state-estimation technique  
for water > network monitoring." Urban Water, 2(2), 123-130.

C130

Thank you for the suggestion. These are indeed valid references however, we felt the  
background was sufficient for a practical paper i.e. one aimed at practitioners and so  
avoided adding too many academic references.

> The validation procedure mentioned on P285, L26 does not seem to be described  
in > sufficient detail. The provided information suggests that the online model was  
capable > of reproducing the same results as the conventional model, however, it is  
unclear > how this can infer that the online model also reflected the actual pressure and  
flow > measurements in the real system under normal conditions.

The main difference we are presenting in this paper is the move from using an offline  
(standard industry built) model to an online model. Doing this has no detrimental effect  
on the existing model, and provides comparable results under normal conditions. Since  
we only have inlet/export flow and pressure which are being used as the boundary  
conditions a comparison to measured data is not relevant/appropriate.

> As discussed by the authors Figures 4-6 describe the effects of an open hydrant in  
a > downstream DMA on the studied DMA in Fig. 2. The authors should comment on  
the > sudden pressure drop at 11 a.m. (more than 20m) shown in Fig. 3 and how it is  
related > to the open hydrant given the fact that there was no corresponding increase  
in flow to > explain the drop in pressure (e.g., similar to the flow increase and pressure  
drop at 7 > a.m.)

The reviewer makes an interesting observation. This is reflection of using real field  
data and not simulated data in which various events in the live distribution system,  
often unknown to the utility company, will manifest in recorded data.

> It would be interesting if the authors included a table comparing the modeled and  
> observed > pressures at the two pressure monitoring (DG2) points in addition to the  
model > results shown in Fig. 6. The purpose of these pressure monitoring points  
should be > described too and in particular as if and how these were used by the online  
hydraulic > model.

C131

Normally these two DG2 points would be boundary condition i.e. online measurement points. Unfortunately during this event neither of these loggers was recording data hence the comparison requested is not possible.

---

Interactive comment on Drink. Water Eng. Sci. Discuss., 2, 279, 2009.