

Interactive comment on “A process-based approach to estimate point snow instability” by B. Reuter et al.

E.A. Podolskiy (Referee)

evgeniy.podolskiy@gmail.com

Received and published: 18 January 2015

I enjoyed reading this well-written and carefully prepared manuscript proposing an objective instability assessment technique, which is certainly addressing a problem at the core of snow avalanche forecasting.

The authors analyze tens of Snow-Micro-Penetro-meter (SMP) and Propagation Saw Tests (PST) against finite element (FE) predictions supported by previous analytical solutions in order to justify the proposed methodology, which is making an important step out of observer-dependent instability evaluation.

To me, clearly presented rationale, methods and results, supporting the developed approach, seem convincing and valuable for a wide community of snow avalanche

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



professionals and snow scientists.

Below I am listing only several minor remarks and points requiring, in my opinion, some more details or explanation.

Abstract

Since the failure initiation criterion is a function of additional stress due to skier loading, this should be mentioned in the Abstract. E.g., L18: "... method for estimating snow instability {under skier loading}." Doing so in the title is indeed your own decision.

p. 5827, L15

Provide a reference reporting such field observations.

p. 5827-5829

Somewhere in your review I advice you to mention a work by McClung (2009), which is strongly related to the domain of your paper.

p. 5829, L29

"force-distancesignal" - missing space

p. 5833, L1-3

Here you describe derivation of the penetration depth and I could not follow which one do you mean. For example, in Fig. 3 the x-axis shows Depth, so that Force=f(Depth). So, before plotting, you need to cut off air signal from snow signal to get the snow surface? I suggest to specify what are you talking about here. - To indicate better my confusion: you mean that the penetration depth, lets call it D , is obtained from raw force-distance signal:

$$0.0036 = \int_0^D F(z) dz$$

so this D stands for what? Does this penetration depth correspond to air/snow interface, or is it somehow related to the weak layer through w_f ? The lower boundary is

fixed or sliding?

p.5834, L18

What was the skier penetration depth and how was it evaluated?

p.5834, L19-20

I am afraid that without more details it would be hard to reproduce this step of snow compaction in someone's model. You could better explain how it was done. So, the density below the strip of a width a was assigned with a new density 300 kg m^{-3} and thus new modulus 16 MPa until some penetration depth (which was not shown explicitly). However, I am not sure how do you realize it numerically - does it involve some 2D changes in the field of density? Since the penetration of plate into snow with corresponding compaction is by itself a topic for a research paper (e.g. Mohamed and others, 1991) more details would help.

p. 5834, L28

A matter of taste, but nevertheless: would not it be informative (if meaningful) to indicate the range of θ giving you the maximum shear stress? Any skiing reader will be interested to learn these numbers.

p.5834, L21-22 & p. 5839, L1-3 & p. 5840, L13-15

“A fixed value of the Poisson's ratio . . .” - I am wondering if this could also contribute to predicted values of critical cut length (Sect 3.2). Some studies proposed to use the ratio as a function of density (Sigrist and others, 2006; Sigrist and Schweizer, 2007; Mellor, 1975; Teufelsbauer, 2011). Usually, constant value works well and has little influence, however, usage of some analytical solutions (e.g., Heierli and Zaiser, 2006) shows that the critical crack length can vary for several % as a function of the ratio. Same may be said about roots of your expression (Eq.6). Perhaps, this will be of minor importance in improving the agreement, but nevertheless is worth checking with sensitivity tests for dropping away insignificant factors in future work.

p. 5835, L5

“slab larger than the ski{er} width (0.2m).” -> “. . . the ski width. . .”?

p. 5836, L 6

What is gamma and how did you select it (same for Eq.7)? It appears to be even more important than Poisson ratio for high slab thickness if varies between 0-2.

p. 5837, L13

“Eq. (6) is then solved” - with help of what? I recommend to specify your media for this here.

p. 5839, L4

Since the values of the critical cut can vary from 10 to 60 cm it is important to indicate here the relative mean % to highlight how good the agreement actually is.

p. 5841, L14-18

Here, I recommend to direct a reader to a work where some steps in this direction have been previously made (e.g., Mahajan and Joshi, 2008).

p. 5842, L17-19

Even if the approach and its quantitative nature are indeed novel and original contribution, I nevertheless suggest to put some reference here. Because, as far as I know, the necessity of holistic view to snow avalanche release has been in the air for quite some time (e.g. McClung and Schaerer, 2006 or McClung, 2009). So that this sentence reads as something like: “Whereas previous authors noted a need of holistic approach to avalanche initiation [. . . refs], and we anticipated this finding (i.e. that both conditions have to be fulfilled), we are not aware that it has been demonstrated before.”

Also, I think it would be honest to mention in Discussion or Conclusions one of the difficulties which may limit a direct utilization of your approach by snow professionals

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

- a need to rely on FEM in order to evaluate skier-induced stresses at weak layer depth, $\Delta\tau$, for a given snowpack stratification for obtaining the S . Perhaps, you could also share your vision or idea what to do without this $\Delta\tau$; say, make compromise and rely on analytical solution for a uniform slab (Fig. 4) which is, however, not a good approximation for predicting r_c ?

Cited references

Heierli, J. and Zaiser, M. (2006). An analytical model for fracture nucleation in collapsible stratifications. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 33: 06501.

Mahajan P and Joshi SK (2008) Modeling of interfacial crack velocities in snow. *Cold Reg. Sci. Technol.*, 51(2–3), 98–111, doi: 10.1016/j.coldregions.2007.05.008

Mellor M (1975) A review of basic snow mechanics. *IAHS Publ.* 114 (Symposium at Grindelwald 1974 – Snow Mechanics), 251–291

McClung, D. M. and Schaerer, P.: *The Avalanche Handbook*, The Mountaineers Books, Seattle WA, USA, 2006.

McClung, D. M. (2009), Dry snow slab quasi-brittle fracture initiation and verification from field tests, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 114, F01022, doi:10.1029/2007JF000913.

Mohamed AMO, Yong RN and Murcia AJ (1991) Evaluation of the performance of deep snowpack under compression loading using finite element analysis. *J. Terrmech.*, 30(4), 219–257 (doi: 10.1016/0022-4898(93)90013-N)

Teufelsbauer H (2011) A two-dimensional snow creep model for alpine terrain. *Natur. Hazards*, 56(2), 481–497 (doi: 10.1007/s11069-010-9515-8)

Interactive comment on *The Cryosphere Discuss.*, 8, 5825, 2014.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)