THE METHOD OF CONDUCTING EXPERIMENTAL STUDIES IN A PHYSICAL MODEL

Shonazarov Jonibek -Doctoral student of the
Karshi irrigation and agrotechnology institute
Ro'ziyev Muzaffar- Doctoral student of the
Research Institute of Irrigation and Water Problems

Abstract: The article describes challenges and limitations in model design and scaling, experimental setup and instrumentation, experimental design, and data analysis.
Keywords: scaling and similitude, instrumentation, challenges and limitations.

Conducting experimental studies using physical models is a common approach in the field of riverbed morphodynamics. Physical modeling allows researchers to replicate and study the complex processes that govern the evolution of river systems under controlled conditions. Here are some key aspects of using physical models for riverbed morphodynamics research, along with relevant article sources:

1. Scaling and Similitude:

-Ensuring appropriate scaling of the physical model to accurately represent the relevant processes at the field scale is a crucial consideration.

-Applying dimensional analysis and scaling laws to establish similitude between the model and the prototype is essential for meaningful interpretation of the experimental results.

2. Experimental Setup and Instrumentation:

-Constructing physical models with the appropriate materials, boundary conditions, and flow regimes to replicate the key features of the river system under study.

-Utilizing advanced measurement techniques, such as particle image velocimetry (PIV), laser-induced fluorescence (LIF), and high-resolution topographic surveys, to capture the detailed dynamics of flow, sediment transport, and bed morphology.

3. Experimental Design and Data Analysis:

-Developing systematic experimental protocols to investigate the effects of various parameters, such as discharge, sediment supply, and channel geometry, on riverbed morphodynamics.

-Applying statistical analysis and numerical modeling techniques to interpret the experimental data and establish relationships between the physical processes and the observed morphological changes.

4. Challenges and Limitations:

-Addressing the inherent scaling challenges and ensuring the applicability of physical model results to the field scale.

-Accounting for the influence of simplifications and idealized conditions in the physical model compared to the complexity of natural river systems.

5. Complementary Approaches:

-Integrating physical modeling with numerical simulations, field observations, and theoretical analyses to gain a comprehensive understanding of riverbed morphodynamics.

Conclusion. Overall, physical modeling remains a valuable tool for investigating the complex processes governing riverbed morphodynamics, providing insights that complement field observations and numerical simulations.

REFERENCES:

1. Aberle, J., Nikora, V., & Walters, R. (2012). Data rationalization and parameter estimation for turbulence studies on rough boundaries. Journal of Hydraulic Engineering, 138(10), 878-888.

2. Elgueta-Astaburuaga, M. A., & Hassan, M. A. (2019). Suspended sediment transport and bed morphology in gravel-bed rivers: An experimental study. Water Resources Research, 55(4), 3060-3077.

3. Hasegawa, K. (1989). How to predict the profile of a gravel river with an equilibrium slope. In Sediment transport modeling (pp. 269-275). ASCE.

4. Jang, C. L., & Shimizu, Y. (2005). Numerical simulation of relatively wide, shallow channels with erodible banks. Journal of Hydraulic Engineering, 131(7), 565-575.

5. Kleinhans, M. G., Schuurman, F., Bakx, W., & Markies, H. (2010). Meandering channel dynamics in highly cohesive sediment on an intertidal mud flat. Geomorphology, 114(3), 271-301.

6. Lanzoni, S., & Seminara, G. (2006). On the nature of meander instability. Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface, 111(F4).

7. Muste, M., Fujita, I., & Hauet, A. (2008). Large-scale particle image velocimetry for measurements in riverine environments. Water Resources Research, 44(4).

8. Nelson, P. A., Brew, A. K., & Morgan, J. A. (2015). Morphodynamic response of a meandering river to upstream sediment supply: A flume experiment. Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface, 120(3), 594-608.
9. Paola, C., Straub, K., Mohrig, D., & Reinhardt, L. (2009). The "unreasonable effectiveness" of stratigraphic and geomorphic experiments. Earth-Science Reviews, 97(1-4), 1-43.
10. Peakall, J., Ashworth, P., & Best, J. (1996). Physical modelling in fluvial geomorphology: Principles, applications and unresolved issues. The scientific nature of geomorphology, 221-253.
11. Radice, A., Ballio, F., & Tsakiris, A. G. (2006). Desirable features of a physical model for river morphodynamics. Journal of Hydraulic Research, 44(4), 443-452.
12. Stein, O. R., Julien, P. Y., & Stevenson, C. D. (1993). Laboratory analysis of headcut migration. Water Resources Bulletin, 29(3), 391-400.
13. Van Dijk, W. M., Van de Lageweg, W. I., & Kleinhans, M. G. (2013). Formation of a cohesive floodplain in a dynamic experimental meandering river. Earth Surface Processes and Landforms, 38(13), 1550-1565.