

Discussion: Comparative study of breakwater crown wall – calculation methods

Vicente Negro Valdecantos DCivEng

Associate Professor, Technical University of Madrid, Madrid, Spain

José Santos López Gutiérrez DCivEng

Assistant Professor, Technical University of Madrid, Madrid, Spain

Jose Ignacio Polvorinos Flors PhD

Technical University of Madrid, Madrid, Spain

Jorge Molines MEng

Research Assistant, Department of Transportation, Technical University of Valencia, Valencia, Spain

Contribution by Jorge Molines

This paper (Negro Valdecantos *et al.*, 2013) presents an extensive and useful comparison of existing formulas to estimate wave forces on crown walls. The paper also provides valuable insights into crown wall behaviour, suggesting the use of formulas for prior sizing and recommending, in any case, tests on a physical model in order to confirm the final design. The authors helpfully advise to use more than one method to obtain results closer to reality, always taking into account the test conditions under which each formula was developed.

The authors suggest considering the addition of the methods of Pedersen (1996) and Molines (2011) to the reviewed literature, both based on irregular tests. Pedersen (1996) conducted a deep analysis of crown wall stability and proposed a method to estimate the 0.1% wave forces, which Camus Braña and Flores Guillén (2004) gave as the most reliable one. Molines (2011) compared existing methods and proposed a formula using pruned neural networks to estimate the 0.1% horizontal and vertical force. The peak value of both forces was considered simultaneously, thus being on the safe side.

Focusing on the method of Martín *et al.* (1995), Martín *et al.* (1999) proposed some variations on their formula. Martín *et al.* (1999) detailed the influence of submerged foundations and considered the dynamic response of the structure on the design wave forces (through the parameter α given in this paper by Equation 10). This method was initially developed for regular waves, and was extended to irregular waves through the hypothesis of equivalence in Martín *et al.* (1995, 1999).

When possible, the authors recommend specifying the force percentile that is estimated by each formula: that is, Bradbury and Allsop (1988), Pedersen (1996) and Molines (2011) estimate the percentile 0.1%, whereas Berenguer and Baonza (2006) estimate the maximum force. Formulas based on regular tests are not directly associated to a probability level of exceedance and need a methodology to be statistically characterised (i.e. the

one described in Martín *et al.* (1995, 1999)). This consideration could add practical insights to those given by the authors, in order to compare the same percentile force for all methods in the hope of avoiding misunderstandings.

Authors' reply

The investigations reported in Negro Valdecantos *et al.* (2013) were actually completed and first reported on in 2010, that is before the method of Molines (2011) had been published, so therefore could not have been reviewed at that time. Methodology developed by Pedersen (1996) certainly provides a deep study of the problem.

The addition of both methodologies will enrich current and future research on the crown wall topic.

Certainly, Martín *et al.* revised the parameter α to include the dynamic response of the crown wall, which represents another step in the study of the problem. However, it must also be added and taken into account that the authors point out that further research on this new issue is required.

Regarding the force percentile, as explained in Negro Valdecantos *et al.* (2013), it was decided to maintain the notation used by the authors in their original papers. The probability level of exceedance and force percentile have been included only in those methods in which the authors indicate them; for example, the horizontal force $F_{h,0.1\%}$ in Pedersen and Burcharth (1992) or the ascent of the sheet of water $R_{u2\%}$ in Berenguer and Baonza (2006).

REFERENCES

- Berenguer JM and Baonza A (2006) Rubble mound breakwater crown wall design. *Proceedings of the National Conference of the Port and Coastal Technical Association, Algeciras, Spain* (in Spanish).
- Bradbury AW and Allsop NW (1988) Hydraulic effects of breakwater crown walls. In *Design of Breakwaters –*

Offprint provided courtesy of www.icevirtuallibrary.com
Author copy for personal use, not for distribution

- Proceedings of the Conference Breakwaters '88*. Thomas Telford, London, UK, pp. 385–396.
- Camus Braña P and Flores Guillén J (2004) Wave forces on crown walls. Evaluation of existing empirical formulations. In *Coastal Engineering 2004* (McKee Smith J (ed.)). World Scientific, Singapore, vol. 4, pp. 4087–4099.
- Martín FL, Vidal C, Losada MA and Medina R (1995) Un método para el cálculo de las acciones del oleaje sobre los espaldones de los diques rompeolas. *Ingeniería del Agua* **2(3)**: 37–52 (in Spanish).
- Martín FL, Losada MA and Medina R (1999) Wave loads on rubble mound breakwater crown walls. *Coastal Engineering* **37(2)**: 149–174.
- Molines J (2011) Stability of crown walls of cube and Cubipod armoured mound breakwaters. *PIANC E-Magazine* **144(1)**: pp. 29–44.
- Negro Valdecantos V, López Gutiérrez JS and Polvorinos Flors JI (2013) Comparative study of breakwater crown wall – calculation methods. *Maritime Engineering* **166(MA1)**: 25–41.
- Pedersen J (1996) *Wave Forces and Overtopping on Crown Walls of Rubble Mound Breakwaters*. Series Paper 12/ Hydraulic & Coastal Engineering Laboratory, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Aalborg, Denmark.
- Pedersen J and Burcharth HF (1992) Wave forces on crown walls. In *Coastal Engineering 1992* (Edge BL (ed.)). ASCE, New York, NY, USA, pp. 1489–1502.
- Polvorinos JI (2013) *Cálculo de Espaldones en Diques Rompeolas. Estudio Comparativo de las Formulaciones Actuales y Propuesta de una Nueva Metodología*. PhD Thesis, Madrid Polytechnic University, Spain (in Spanish).

WHAT DO YOU THINK?

To discuss this paper, please email up to 500 words to the editor at journals@ice.org.uk. Your contribution will be forwarded to the author(s) for a reply and, if considered appropriate by the editorial panel, will be published as discussion in a future issue of the journal.

Proceedings journals rely entirely on contributions sent in by civil engineering professionals, academics and students. Papers should be 2000–5000 words long (briefing papers should be 1000–2000 words long), with adequate illustrations and references. You can submit your paper online via www.icevirtuallibrary.com/content/journals, where you will also find detailed author guidelines.