



HAL
open science

Numerical modelling of water infiltration into the three components of porosity of a vertisol from Guadeloupe

Stephane Ruy, Liliana Di Pietro, Yves-Marie Cabidoche

► **To cite this version:**

Stephane Ruy, Liliana Di Pietro, Yves-Marie Cabidoche. Numerical modelling of water infiltration into the three components of porosity of a vertisol from Guadeloupe. *Journal of Hydrology*, 1999, 221, pp.1-19. hal-02695457

HAL Id: hal-02695457

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02695457>

Submitted on 8 Sep 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **Numerical modelling of water infiltration into the three components of**
2 **porosity of a Vertisol from Guadeloupe.**

3 S. RUY^{a, *}, L. DI PIETRO^a, and Y.M. CABIDOCHÉ^b

4 ^a INRA, Unité de Science du Sol, Domaine St Paul, Agroparc, 84914 Avignon Cedex 9, France

5 ^b INRA, Unité Agropédologique de la Zone Caraïbe, B.P. 515, 97165 Pointe à Pitre Cedex, Guadeloupe,
6 French West Indies

7 **Abstract**

8 We present a mechanistic model of soil deformation and water infiltration into a Vertisol of
9 Guadeloupe (French West Indies), which accounts for the three components of porosity of this
10 soil (matric, structural and macro-cracks). Time and space scales are respectively of several
11 hours and the prism delimited by macro-cracks. The model accounts for water movements
12 from the structural porosity and from the macro-cracks into the matric porosity. It simulates
13 the non-equidimensional deformations of the prism resulting from water storage in the matric
14 porosity. Inputs of the model, measured in the laboratory, are the shrinkage curve, the
15 retention curve and the hydraulic conductivity of the matric porosity. The anisotropy ratio of
16 the soil deformation was measured *in situ*. Experiments were conducted *in situ* to provide
17 structural parameters and data to fit and test the model. It is possible to find a unique set of
18 parameters for each experiment. However, parameters significantly differ from one
19 experiment to another. The model shows that the structural water flow regulates the partition
20 of water infiltrating within the prism and of water flowing in the macro-cracks. The model
21 does not accurately predict water infiltration because of a poor modelling of water flow in the
22 structural porosity.

23 **Keywords**

24 swelling clay soil, vertisol, crack, macroporosity, Guadeloupe, infiltration, preferential flow.

1 **1- Introduction**

2 Water flow in heavy clay soils is dominated by macropore flow. Darcy's law describes water
3 flow in small pores (micropores), whereas this law does not apply to water movement within
4 macropores in which gravity is the main driving force (Beven & Germann, 1982). Most
5 models predicting water infiltration into macroporous soils are based on the concept of a
6 bimodal porosity (Hoogmoed & Bouma, 1980; Beven & Germann, 1981; Jarvis & Leeds-
7 Harrison, 1987; Chen & Wagenet, 1992; Jarvis 1994). None of these models apply to a
8 Vertisol because the total porosity of Vertisols can not be reduced to a bimodal porosity.
9 Furthermore these models are one-dimensional and the deformation of the soil is not or poorly
10 accounted for. Garnier *et al.* (1997) proposed a numerical model of 3-dimensional anisotropic
11 deformation and water flow in a swelling clay paste without macropores. Bronswijk (1988)
12 proposed a general procedure to incorporate macro-crack opening and closure into simulation
13 models of water infiltration in clay soils by introducing the shrinkage curve and a geometry
14 factor of anisotropy, r_s .

15 A model of infiltration and soil deformation in a Vertisol should account for three porosity
16 compartments (Cabidoche & Ozier-Lafontaine, 1995; Ruy, 1997): macro-cracks delimiting
17 continuous soil prisms, intra-prism structural porosity and matric porosity. The almost vertical
18 macro-cracks, several decimetres apart, open and close as the clay particles reorganise in
19 response to soil moisture changes. Their width ranges from 0 for a saturated soil to several cm
20 at the end of the dry season. Water entering these cracks may infiltrate laterally into the walls
21 of the soil matrix. The matric porosity is formed by the arrangement of clay particles. Matric
22 pores are less than about 5 μm in width (Wilding & Tessier, 1988). They remain saturated
23 during structural and normal shrinkage (as defined by Stirk, 1954) and thus contains the water
24 responsible for soil movement. The limit between structural and normal shrinkage is called

* Corresponding author. Email : ruy@avignon.inra.fr

1 the crack air entry (CAE) point. The intra-prism structural porosity has a relatively stable
2 geometry (Cabidoche & Ozier-Lafontaine, 1995). Structural pores are from about 10 μm to
3 several mm in width (Yule & Ritchie, 1980; Ruy, 1997). Structural water does not induce any
4 deformation of the soil (Yule & Ritchie, 1980). Shrinkage cracks are not included in structural
5 porosity.

6 In order to better understanding the processes of water infiltration in an undisturbed swelling
7 clay soil, we present the physical bases of a 2D numerical model of water infiltration and soil
8 movements in a Vertisol. Calibration and validation results are also discussed.

9 **2- Physical bases and description of the model**

10 The model is 2D, the scale of modelling is a half prism isolated by one macro-crack. The
11 experimental size of a prism can be deduced from the network of macro-cracks. The variation
12 of the macro-crack aperture with depth can be calculated from measurements of the anisotropy
13 ratio and variations of soil layer thicknesses.

14 *(i) water flow in the matric porosity*

15 We assume that water flow is described by Darcy's law because of the small diameter and the
16 homogeneous distribution of the size of the matric pores (Ruy, 1997). 2D Richard's equation
17 is used to calculate water fluxes. A source function S_w accounts for the diffusive water
18 movement from structural porosity to matric porosity, as suggested by Jarvis (1994):

$$S_w = K_{w/s}(\psi_{\text{mat}}) \cdot S_{\text{struc}} \cdot \frac{\psi_{\text{struc}} - \psi_{\text{mat}}}{d^2}, \quad (1)$$

19 where $K_{w/s}$ (cm s^{-1}) is the matric conductivity, ψ_{mat} (cm) the potential of water in matric
20 porosity, ψ_{struc} (cm) the potential of water in structural porosity, S_{struc} the saturation of
21 structural porosity and d (cm) an effective "diffusion" length. We suppose that the potential of
22 water in the structural porosity is a linear function of the saturation of this porosity: ψ_{struc} is
23 equal to 0 cm when the structural porosity is saturated and is equal to ψ_{ae} when it is air filled,

1 where ψ_{ae} is the soil water potential at the CAE point (Ruy, 1997). The overburden
2 component of the total potential of water (Philip, 1969) is not accounted for (Ruy &
3 Cabidoche, 1998).

4 We used the finite element method to discretize the domain with rectangular elements. The
5 boundary condition at the surface is a Neumann's condition according to (iv). A zero flux
6 condition is imposed at the bottom of the profile and along the vertical axis of the soil prism,
7 because of the symmetry of the soil prism. The boundary condition along the macro-crack
8 wall is a function of the depth of ponded water in the crack and is described in subsection (iii).

9 *(ii) water flow in the intra-prism structural porosity*

10 We measured continuously in the field the variations of water content (WC) with depth and
11 time for several weeks in previous experiments that are detailed in Ruy (1997). We observed
12 an increase of the structural WC when the matric WC was constant. Macro-cracks were not
13 sampled. These results showed that water flow inside the prism could not be modelled by
14 Darcy's law with a bimodal hydraulic conductivity and water retention curve, and therefore
15 that water flow inside the structural porosity was of "preferential flow type". Then ,we assume
16 that water flow in the structural porosity is a gravity flow.

17 The soil profile is divided into 7 layers, 20 cm in height (except the surface layer whose height
18 is only 10 cm). Water flow is described in a conceptual way by using a model of reservoirs in
19 cascade (one reservoir per layer). For each layer, the volume of the reservoir is the volume of
20 the structural porosity. The output flux q of each reservoir (Figure 1) is a power function of
21 the saturation of the reservoir:

$$q = c \cdot S_{\text{struc}}^b \quad , \quad (2)$$

22 where c (cm s^{-1}) is the unknown hydraulic conductance, S_{struc} the saturation of the reservoir
23 (*i.e.* the saturation of the structural porosity) and b an empirical exponent. Beven & Germann
24 (1981) and Jarvis & Leeds-Harrison (1987) used a similar power law function for relating

1 water flow in macropores and water content. Theoretical values of b can be calculated from
2 the laminar film flow theory in a single, smooth and vertical macropore. For open channel
3 flow, a power law function similar at eq. (2) relates the flow and the depth of water (e.g.
4 Maheshwari, 1994): the exponent ranges from 3 (laminar flow) to $5/3$ (turbulent flow and
5 Manning-Strickler relation) or $2/3$ (turbulent flow and Chezy relation) (Chen & Wagenet,
6 1992). In our case, no experimental study was available to conclude on the type of flow in the
7 structural porosity. The flow is assumed to be turbulent, and we set the value of b to 1.5.
8 A mass balance is performed at each time step and for every layer between the input flux
9 (which is the output flux of the layer above), the output flux, the volume of water that
10 infiltrates into the matric porosity (the S_w function, see eq. (1)), and the accumulation of water.
11 The bottom of the profile is impervious.

12 *(iii) water flow into the macro-cracks*

13 Ruy (1997) showed that overland flow on a drained parcel of Vertisol was intercepted by
14 macro-cracks and was then rapidly removed by drain pipes before infiltrating horizontally into
15 the prisms. It was however impossible to quantify this process. For a heavy clay soil in the
16 Netherlands (Typic Fluvaquents), Hoogmoed & Bouma (1980) showed that horizontal
17 absorption of water into the prism represents only a small percentage of the volume of water
18 by-passing in the cracks. Moreover, numerical simulations conducted by Di Pietro (1996) on
19 an artificial medium showed that the front velocity of water infiltration within a crack
20 increases with an increasing crack aperture and a decreasing hydraulic conductivity of the
21 matric porosity. This results in a decreasing amount of water horizontally entering into the
22 matric porosity. However, in the absence of drains or when macro-cracks close above drain
23 pipes, free water may accumulate at the bottom of macro-cracks where it can be slowly
24 absorbed into the prisms (Jaillard & Cabidoche, 1984).

25 In the model, water infiltrating into the macro-crack instantaneously reaches the bottom of the

1 crack where it accumulates. Horizontal infiltration into the soil prism during downward
2 unsaturated flow along the macro-crack wall is neglected, whereas it is taken into account for
3 ponded conditions at the bottom of the macro-crack. Hence, the lateral boundary condition for
4 the resolution of the 2D Richard equation is a zero flux condition above the surface of the
5 ponded water, and a Dirichlet condition below this surface (hydrostatic profile). At each time
6 step, the model recalculates the volume of the macro-crack and the depth of the surface of the
7 ponded water according to a mass balance and to the deformation of the soil matrix.

8 *(iv) partitioning of rainfall at the soil surface (Table 1)*

9 First, rainfall, R , enters the matric porosity as long as its intensity does not exceed the
10 infiltrability of the matrix, $I_{\text{mat}}^{\text{max}}$. Then, excess water flows into the structural porosity and then
11 into the macro-cracks if rainfall intensity exceeds the infiltration capacity of both matric and
12 structural porosities, $I_{\text{mat}}^{\text{max}} + I_{\text{struc}}^{\text{max}}$. If the macro-crack is filled with water or closed at the surface,
13 its infiltrability, $I_{\text{crac}}^{\text{max}}$, is nil and any excess water is lost as instantaneous surface runoff.
14 Matric (resp. structural) infiltrability is computed from a mass balance performed on the first
15 layer of finite elements, see subsection (i) (resp. first reservoir, see subsection (ii)).

16 *(v) deformation of the soil matrix*

17 Clay particles reorganise as water infiltrates into matric porosity, and the soil prism is
18 deformed in every directions according to the anisotropy ratio of soil movements. Swelling is
19 supposed to be normal, *i.e.* any entrance of water results in an equal increase of the bulk
20 volume. We used in the model the anisotropy ratio k of Voltz & Cabidoche (1995): k is the
21 elongation rate in any horizontal direction divided by the elongation rate in the vertical
22 direction. It ranges from 0 (1D vertical swelling) to 1 (equidimensional deformation) and
23 $k \rightarrow \infty$ for horizontal movements only. The model deforms each finite element at each time
24 step according to the variation of the mean matric WC of the element.

1 Table 2 presents a synthesis of all the equations used in the numerical model.

2 *(vi) Numerical considerations.*

3 We chose to make the calculations separately with respect to the flow domains. 2D water
4 infiltration in the matric porosity domain is first calculated. Vertical and horizontal boundary
5 conditions are calculated and Richards' equation is then linearised and solved by an implicit
6 method (Euler's method). The initial time step is 30 s and is automatically adjusted between
7 0.5 s and 60 s. Updated values of the saturation of structural reservoirs for each of the seven
8 layers and the depth of ponded water in the macro-crack are calculated according to the
9 volume of water that infiltrates into the matric porosity with respect to the source function S_w
10 or the Dirichlet boundary condition. Excess of water is then added at the surface of the soil
11 prism in structural porosity, and a new profile of saturation of each reservoir is calculated. At
12 least, the new vertical boundary condition for Richards' equation along the crack wall is
13 updated.

14 **3- Material and methods**

15 **3.1- Description of the experiments**

16 The model was tested on a Vertisol at the Experimental Research Station of INRA in Gardel,
17 Guadeloupe (French Antilles). The aim of the experiments was to give data to calibrate and
18 validate the model.

19 *Soil*

20 The soil is a chromic vertisol, with more than 80 % clay ($< 2 \mu\text{m}$). Main soil features are in
21 Appendix A1.1. The plot has been grown with Stargrass (*ynodon nemfluensis*) for more than
22 10 years. Macro-cracks open during the dry season along a large network delimiting prisms of
23 about 70 cm in width. The soil profile is described in Appendix A1.2.

24 *Experimental site (Figure 2)*

25 The network of macro-cracks was plotted at the end of the dry season. Several soil prisms

1 were isolated from the plot by a polyethylene sheet coated with a hull of resin and fibre-glass.
2 A side of the hull was replaced by a rigid inox steel-plate on which the measurement devices
3 were fixed. Then, the soil was excavated at the front of the inox steel-plate. Four windows
4 were cut into the inox sheet and equipped with Plexiglas plates. Water stored in macro-cracks
5 could be removed at different depths through holes made in one of the Plexiglas sheet.

6 *Soil movement measurements*

7 Potentiometric sensors (50 μm precision, Essor Français Electronique, Ivry la Bataille,
8 France) were fitted on the remaining Plexiglas windows to measure the horizontal
9 deformation of a soil prism at different depths: 7, 27, 47, 67, 87 cm, with three replicates per
10 depth. Data were collected on a Campbell CR21X data logger (Campbell Scientific,
11 Shepshed, UK) every 5 minutes. All the displacement sensors were installed on the same soil
12 prism.

13 Thickness variations of prism layers were measured with modified THERESA[®] transducers
14 (Cabidoche & Ozier-Lafontaine, 1995). The soil layers equipped were the 10-30 cm, 30-50
15 cm, 50-70 cm layers depth for the first set of transducers, and the 30-50 cm, 50-70 cm, 70-90
16 cm depth layers for the second set, with three replicates per set. Transducers were fitted with
17 the same potentiometric displacement sensors and data were collected on the CR21X data
18 logger every 5 minutes

19 *Water application*

20 For high rainfall intensities, water was applied at the soil surface with four full cone nozzles
21 (Lechler, Paris, France) fitted at the corners of a 1mx1m square frame. We used a portable
22 sprayer for low intensities. Homogeneity of rainfall was checked using five cans placed
23 randomly at the surface.

24 *Water content measurements*

25 In swelling soils, the water content cannot be measured by usual devices (neutron probe,

1 tensiometers, TDR, capacitance probes) because of soil movement. The matric WC was
2 calculated with the model of Voltz & Cabidoche (1995) from thickness variations of prism
3 layers measured with the modified THERESA[®] transducers. When using these transducers,
4 prism layers are define as layers containing a constant mass of solid particles (material
5 description). Therefore the volume of a prism layer is not constant and is related to the soil
6 matric water content. The model of Voltz & Cabidoche assumes that the shrinkage of a prism
7 layer is a normal shrinkage, i.e. that a decrease of the matric water content results in the same
8 decrease of the apparent prism layer volume. If the anisotropy of soil movements is known,
9 then the thickness variation of a prism layer can be converted into volume variation and then
10 converted into matric water content changes. The structural WC was not measured. A
11 piezometer was fitted into a macro-crack: the level of ponded water was automatically
12 measured by an ultrasonic probe and stored in a data logger (CR2M, France) every minute.

13 **3.2- Measurements of input parameters**

14 Two sets of parameters are required: one set to calculate the profile of the matric WC from
15 vertical thickness measurements, which in turn becomes the initial conditions of the model
16 (matric WC and crack aperture), the other set is directly used by the model. The method of
17 Cabidoche & Voltz (1995) was used to measure the first set of parameters, which are: the
18 specific volume of solids, the specific volume of air and the matric WC at the crack air entry
19 point. The second set of parameters (the water retention curve, the shrinkage curve, and the
20 matric hydraulic conductivity) was measured according to the methods described in Ruy &
21 Cabidoche (1998). The anisotropy ratio k was calculated from *in situ* measurements of vertical
22 and horizontal soil movements (Ruy, 1997).

23 **3.3- Sensitivity analysis**

24 Uncertainty exists at the level of all inputs of the model. We can distinguish between
25 parameters related to the geometry of the domain (anisotropy ratio k , diffusion length d , size

1 of the prism), those related to the water infiltration (matric hydraulic conductivity $K_{w/s}$,
2 anisotropy k , conductance c , exponent b , structural porosity, ...) and those defining the initial
3 and boundary conditions (matric and structural WC, rainfall intensity, ...). As it is almost
4 impossible to perform a multivariate sensitivity on all these parameters, we will focus on the
5 most relevant ones which are either the parameters that can't be measured and then should be
6 fitted (conductance c and diffusion length d) or the parameters that were measured with a high
7 experimental uncertainty (anisotropy k and structural porosity). Outputs of the model are the
8 cumulated flows into the three porosities ("matric flow", "structural flow" and "macro-crack
9 flow") and the cumulated runoff after 10000 sec of simulation. Cumulated matric flow is the
10 sum of the cumulated infiltration from the soil surface, the horizontal infiltration from the
11 macro-crack and the amount of water that flows from structural to matric porosity. Initial
12 values of the parameters used in the sensitivity analysis are 0.85 for k , 0.01 cm s^{-1} for c , 1 cm
13 for d and $0.437 \text{ dm}^3 \text{ kg}^{-1}$ for structural porosity. The range of variations is shown in Table 3.
14 The analysis is first a "one-at-a-time analysis" on the previous parameters that may reveal
15 some discontinuities of the model. Parameters are then gathered to account for correlation
16 between them in a qualitative way. Indeed, soil structure parameters (structural porosity,
17 conductance c , diffusion length d) may not be independent: if structural porosity is important
18 and well connected, then the size of aggregates decreases and c should increase and d should
19 decrease. However, it is not possible to calculate the correlation between them because c and
20 d can not be measured and they are essentially empirical. Three sets of parameters were used:
21 one set with the initial values (set #0), another one (set #1) with a "low" structural porosity,
22 the last one (set #2) with a "high" structural porosity (Table 3).

23 **3.4- Fitting of unknowns parameters**

24 Structural conductance c and diffusion length d must be fitted from experimental data. Both
25 parameters are soil structure parameters: they should vary with depth because the volume and

1 the shape of the structural pores vary with depth (Table 4). In the surface layer (0-50 cm)
2 structural pores are channels, packing pores and planar voids, whereas they are mainly
3 channels in depth. We considered two different values for c : c_{surf} (layers 0-10 cm and 10-30
4 cm) and c_{deep} (30-50 cm to 90-110 cm). c is nil at 130 cm, because of the impervious layer.
5 Three different values were considered for d : d_{surf} (0-10 cm, 10-30 cm, 30-50 cm), d_{mid} (50-70
6 cm, 70-90 cm) and d_{deep} (90-110 cm and 110-130 cm). Therefore 5 parameters must be fitted
7 from experiments. Exp1 to Exp5 provided data to calibrate the model from soil layer
8 thickness measurements. Let us denote \mathbf{U} the vector of these parameters. \mathbf{U} was determined by
9 minimising the least-squares objective function $SSE(\mathbf{U})$ using the Marquardt method (1963):

$$SSE(\mathbf{U}) = \sum_{i=1}^4 \left(\sum_{j=1}^T \left(\bar{s}_i(t_j) - \hat{s}_i(t_j, \mathbf{U}) \right)^2 \right), \quad (3)$$

10 where i is the number of soil layers (from layer 1: 10-30 cm to layer 4: 70-90 cm depth), T the
11 total number of time intervals, t_j the time (sec), $\bar{s}_i(t_j)$ (cm) the mean swelling that is measured
12 on layer i , and $\hat{s}_i(t_j, \mathbf{U})$ (cm) the mean swelling of layer i that is simulated by the model.

13 4- Results

14 4.1- Submodels validation

15 The model can be run in 3 domains, 2 domains (matric porosity + structural porosity or
16 macro-crack) or 1 domain (only matric porosity). When run in 1 domain, the model has been
17 successfully checked against experimental data obtained in two rigid porous media
18 (Haverkamp *et al.*, 1977) and in a 1D swelling bentonite paste (Angulo *et al.*, 1990; Figure 3).
19 We used the model in two domains (matric porosity and macro-cracks). A rainfall of 120 mm
20 h^{-1} for 6 min was simulated (frequency 0.9 year^{-1} in the Grande-Terre island of Guadeloupe).
21 Figure 3 shows that most of the rain flows into the macro-crack where it accumulates and then
22 infiltrates into the soil prism, resulting in both horizontal and vertical swelling of the prism.

1 The pattern of the heterogeneity of water potentials inside the prism (Figure 4) is very similar
2 to the spatial variability of the water content measured in the field (see Figure 7 of Jaillard &
3 Cabidoche, 1984). Therefore, we consider that these quantitative and qualitative results
4 validate the model when run with 1 or 2 domains (matric porosity and macro-cracks).

5 **4.2- Experiments results**

6 Six independent experiments, called Exp1 to Exp6, were performed. Initial matric contents
7 and the application rate of water are shown in Table 5. Macro-crack flow has never been
8 observed, except in the last experiment. The mean vertical swelling of the prism layers for
9 Exp4 are shown in Figure 5. For each experiment, the variation in the swelling measured by
10 transducers is quite large. For example, we plotted data collected in the 30-50 cm layer during
11 Exp5 in Figure 6. Two assumptions can be made to explain this heterogeneity: (i) a
12 preferential flow of water along the axis of the transducer, (ii) a large variability of the
13 structural porosity inside the prism. The first hypothesis has to be rejected because such a flow
14 should be stopped by the first anchor of the transducer into the soil (at a depth of 10 cm or 30
15 cm depending on the set of transducers), and then could not be recorded by the lower
16 transducers. Therefore, only the horizontal heterogeneity of the structural porosity explains
17 this discrepancy between the transducer. This heterogeneity is not incorporated into the
18 model.

19 Variations in the level of water in macro-cracks for Exp6 is plotted in Figure 12, and the mean
20 swelling velocity of the 10-30cm layer is plotted in Figure 7. The swelling velocity increases
21 as the level of water into the macro-crack reaches the 10-30 cm layer. It shows that lateral
22 infiltration into the prism of water running rapidly downwards along cracks has to be
23 neglected and that it must be taken into account under the level of ponded water into the
24 macro-crack.

25 **4.3- Measurements of input parameters**

1 Parameters of the model of Voltz & Cabidoche (1995) are shown in Table 4. The shrinkage
2 curve, the water retention curve and the matric hydraulic conductivity are not shown in this
3 paper but are detailed in Ruy (1997). Two layers were considered: the surface layer (0-50 cm
4 in depth) and the deep layer (50-100 cm in depth). In the range of the *in situ* soil moisture, the
5 shrinkage was normal. Water retention curves for both layers were fitted with the Van-
6 Genuchten model (1980) (Table 4). k is equal to 0.826 m m^{-1} (Ruy, 1997).

7 **4.4- Sensitivity analysis**

8 *(i) one-at-a-time analysis*

9 Cumulated runoff is the most sensitive output of the model, but it is not important (a few
10 mm).

11 Only cumulated macro-crack flow and runoff are sensitive to k : increasing k results in
12 converting vertical swelling into horizontal movement, and therefore in closing the macro-
13 crack more quickly. The volume of the macro-crack decreases and runoff is enhanced.

14 Cumulated matric flow is highly sensitive to d (Figure 8), as the main component of
15 cumulated matric flow is the water diffusion from structural porosity and as the source
16 function S_w is inversely proportional to d^2 (*eq. (1)*). Indeed with the initial values of the
17 parameters, water balance inside the matric porosity shows that only 0.14 mm water infiltrates
18 from the soil surface, 1.1 mm from macro-cracks walls and 6.1 mm from the structural
19 porosity. As a consequence, swelling of the soil prism increases as d decreases and that results
20 in a decreasing volume of the macro-crack and therefore in an increase of runoff. We could
21 expect that increasing (resp. decreasing) d would decrease (resp. increase) the cumulated
22 structural flow as it decreases (resp. increases) the amount of water uptake from structural
23 porosity within matric porosity. However, d has no influence on the cumulated structural flow
24 as it is controlled by the infiltrability of the structural porosity, which is solely a function of
25 the conductance c .

1 All outputs of the model are sensitive to conductance c . As the infiltrability of the structural
2 porosity is a function of c , increasing c increases the velocity of structural water flow and
3 increases the amount of water infiltrating into structural porosity. Therefore, we obtain less
4 cumulated macro-crack flow and runoff (Table 3). However, cumulated matric flow is not
5 very sensitive to c within the range $[0.005 \text{ cm s}^{-1}; 0.01 \text{ cm s}^{-1}]$: inside these limits, water flow
6 from structural to matric porosity is governed by the diffusion length d . If c is lower than
7 0.005 cm s^{-1} , cumulated structural flow is very limited and the amount of water that may enter
8 into the matric porosity according to eq. (1) is decreased. If c is greater than 0.01 cm s^{-1} , water
9 infiltrates more quickly and deeper into the structural porosity: saturation S_{struc} of the upper
10 layers is decreased, and the amount of water that flows from structural to matric porosity
11 according to eq. (1) is also decreased.

12 The model is not very sensitive to the value of the structural porosity.

13 *(ii) sensitivity analysis on set of parameters (Table 3)*

14 For set #1, the variation of the cumulated matric flow is mainly explained by the decrease of
15 d , whereas the variation of c has an influence on cumulated structural and macro-crack flows,
16 and then on runoff. For set #2, the variation of d has little effects and concerns only cumulated
17 matric flow: increase of cumulated structural flow and disappearance of macro-crack flow and
18 runoff is explained by the increase of c and of the structural porosity.

19 As a conclusion, the model is not sensitive to k and to the value of structural porosity which
20 are both measured in the field. It is sensitive to the structural conductance c and to the
21 diffusion length d which are empirical soil structure parameters that must be fitted.

22 **4.5- Calibration**

23 Exp1 to Exp5 were used for calibration. During these experiments, we never observed water
24 flow into the macro-crack. Therefore, only 1D infiltration into the prism occurred. As swelling
25 of layers under the 90 cm depth was not recorded, d_{deep} was set to 4 cm.

1 First we checked the uniqueness of the parameters estimation using the data of Exp3. The
2 time of simulation was 4080 sec (68 min). Parameter estimations were conducted with three
3 different initial parameter sets. A fourth estimation was carried out with a time of simulation
4 of 10000 sec. Results are presented in Table A2.1. For all the parameters and estimations,
5 except for d_{mid} , the standard error of estimation is not high compared to the parameter value.
6 For d_{mid} , the standard error of estimation is at least 100 % of the value, except for estimation
7 #4 where the standard error decreases to 15 % of the value. This is explained by the fact that
8 the swelling of deep layers was delayed and occurred only after about 4000 sec. Final
9 parameter values are not very different from one simulation to another and confidence
10 intervals greatly overlap. This suggests that the fitted parameters are unique. This has been
11 confirmed by other investigations carried out by Ruy (1997). Measured and simulated
12 swelling of 10-30 cm depth and 50-70 cm depth soil layers after calibration (estimation #4) is
13 plotted against time in Figures 9a and 9b respectively, which shows a good agreement
14 between simulation and measurements.

15 Estimations of all parameters for Exp1 to Exp5 are presented in Table A2.2. The measured
16 swelling of all layers for Exp1 and Exp5 is plotted against the simulated swelling in Figures
17 10a and 10b respectively. d_{deep} was fitted only from Exp5, because the swelling of deep layers
18 was not large in the other experiments: its value was 2.62 cm. Values of d_{mid} are different
19 from one experiment to another but 95 % confidence intervals greatly overlap. Therefore, a
20 mean value could be estimated by a weighted average of the values per experiment, with the
21 weight inversely proportional to the estimation variances. The estimated average was 2.45 cm.
22 Fitted values of d_{surf} also differ from Exp1 to Exp5 and 95 % confidence intervals do not
23 overlap. As the size of aggregates is a function of the matric WC, we tried to relate d_{surf} to the
24 initial matric WC of the 10-30 cm layer, but the regression was not significant. Therefore, a
25 mean value was also estimated by a weighted average of the values per experiment, the

1 average value was 0.440 cm. Fitted values of d increase with depth. This result was expected
2 because structural porosity decreases with depth.
3 Fitted values of c_{surf} and c_{deep} differ from one experiment to another. They can be explained
4 neither by the initial matric WC, nor by rainfall intensity R . Germann & Di Pietro (1996)
5 distinguished two kinds of flow in macropores, *i.e.* dispersive and preferential flow. They
6 showed (see Table 3 of Germann & Di Pietro, 1996) that conductance is constant when water
7 infiltration is governed by preferential flow (for large input rates of water), and increases with
8 the rainfall intensity when the flow in macropores is dispersive (for low input rates). In our
9 experiments, low input rates of water in Exp2, Exp3 and at the beginning of Exp4 could be
10 responsible for a dispersive infiltration, whereas the second part of Exp4 and Exp5 could have
11 been governed by preferential flow. However, this result cannot explain the difference
12 between Exp2 and Exp3 where rainfall intensities are the same. In fact, other factors, such as
13 geometry and initial saturation of structural porosity, have an influence upon the value of
14 structural conductance.

15 **4.6- Validation**

16 Finally, we tested the model with the independent data set collected during Exp6. Parameter
17 values used in the simulation are 0.440 cm for d_{surf} , 2.45 cm for d_{mid} , 2.62 cm for d_{deep} , 0.0434
18 cm s^{-1} for c_{surf} and 0.0478 cm s^{-1} for c_{deep} . Values of c_{surf} and c_{deep} are those fitted in Exp5
19 because rainfall intensities of Exp5 and Exp6 are close.

20 Simulation results are presented in Figures 11 and 12. Neither the range of swelling nor its
21 rate are simulated in a satisfactory way. For deep layers, however, simulated swelling is inside
22 the 68 % confidence interval (Figure 11b). The worst simulations are obtained for the layer
23 30-50 cm (Figure 11a). No swelling is simulated by the model at the beginning of the water
24 input. Matric conductivity is very low ($2 \times 10^{-6} \text{ cm day}^{-1}$) because of the low initial matric WC.
25 Therefore, the amount of water that moves from structural to matric porosity is almost nil. The

1 rapid swelling that occurs after about 4000 sec is due to the upraising of the saturation in
2 structural porosity. The model simulates the closure of the macro-crack at the surface after
3 6000 sec: this was not observed in the field and the swelling is recorded for 10000 sec more.
4 Simulated time variations of the level of ponded water in the macro-crack are different from
5 measurements (Figure 12). Water flow in the macro-crack is recorded for 2520 sec (42 min)
6 after the beginning of the rainfall, whereas it is simulated after 6120 sec (102 min). The
7 beginning of water infiltration into the macro-crack is delayed by the model, because of the
8 high infiltrability of the structural porosity (structural conductance of 0.0434 cm s^{-1} at the
9 surface). However, the upraising of the water level is well simulated: measurements (resp.
10 simulation) show that water reaches the level of 120 cm 720 sec (resp. 600 sec) after the
11 beginning of the flow in the macro-crack. After rainfall has stopped, the decrease of the water
12 level in the macro-crack is not well simulated. However, at least two reasons can explain this
13 discrepancy. (i) clogging of the piezometer by deposit of clay particles: therefore, the level
14 recorded inside the piezometer is higher than the water level in the macro-crack; (ii) artefacts
15 of simulation: as the macro-crack closes up, a small variation in the amount of water in the
16 macro-crack results in a large variation in the level of water.

17 **5- Discussion**

18 **5.1 Physical representativeness of the model**

19 Macro-crack flow, matric flow and soil deformation have been validated (**section 4.1**). Two
20 components of the model can be questioned: (i) rainfall partition at the soil surface between
21 matric and structural porosity, and (ii) modelling of water flow in the structural porosity.
22 Besides the modelling of rainfall partition that we used is widely used (e.g. Jarvis & Leeds-
23 Harrison, 1987; Jarvis 1994), it is true only for infiltration saturating pores of increasing size.
24 In our case, (i) matric flow is a saturating infiltration and (ii) the model simulates
25 simultaneous infiltration in both matric and structural porosities as the computed matric

1 infiltrability is very low. Therefore the conditions of validity of the hypothesis about rainfall
2 partition are met and there is no reason to change this module.

3 **5.2 Is water flow in structural pores preferential and turbulent ?**

4 Flow can be laminar or turbulent depending on the value of the dimensionless Reynolds
5 number, Re . $Re=2000$ is the limit between the two kinds of flow for open channel flow or pipe
6 flow. Usually, the limit is between 1 and 10 in porous media (Chen & Wagenet, 1992), which
7 corresponds to a pore diameter of about 100 μm . Moreover, theoretical values of b are related
8 to the flow conditions. b is equal to 2 (resp. 3) for a laminar flow in a smooth and vertical
9 plane pore (resp. a smooth and vertical tubular pore) and is between $2/3$ and $5/3$ for a
10 turbulent flow. Germann & Di Pietro (1996) analysed results obtained on drainage
11 hydrographs. They showed that gravity-dominated flow can be either of the preferential type
12 or of the dispersive type: in their experiments, the value of b was not constant but may be used
13 to assess the degree of preferential flow. b decreased with increasing application rates of
14 water. Its value was about 4 for a preferential flow (application rate of water equal to about
15 360 mm h^{-1}), and increased up to 8 for a more dispersive flow (application rate of about 36
16 mm h^{-1}). According to these authors, the power law relation between the flux and the
17 saturation is the same as the power law relation between the hydraulic conductivity and the
18 saturation for a fully dispersive flow. In this case, the conductance is the hydraulic
19 conductivity at saturation, and b ranges from 11 to 30 (Clapp & Hornberger, 1978).

20 Therefore, there is no reason to set b at a constant value of 1.5 for all our experiments. Indeed,
21 (i) the range of the application rates of water at the soil surface (Table 5) indicates that the
22 type of flow could change from dispersive to preferential, and (ii) the range of structural pore
23 sizes in the soil (10 μm to several mm, Ruy, 1997) indicates that flow conditions could change
24 from turbulent to laminar flow. New calibration could be conducted with b as an unknown
25 parameter. However, the total number of parameters would increase and parameters b and c

1 would probably not be independent.

2 **5.3 Is water flow in structural pores really preferential ?**

3 Hypothesis that structural flow is of preferential type came from the results of Ruy (1997).
4 However, the experimental uncertainty in the calculation of structural and matric WC was
5 quite important. It is possible that Darcy's law may be applied on one part of the structural
6 flow (in the smallest pores) and that a gravity-dominated flow may be used for the other part
7 of the structural flow, as the range of variation of the pore diameters is quite large. We used
8 the Wind's evaporation method (Tamari *et al.*, 1993) to obtain the hydraulic conductivity of
9 the structural porosity ("structural conductivity") on one saturated clod sampled in the 70-80
10 cm layer. Results are only approached as the shrinkage is not accounted for in this method, but
11 we see (Figure 13) a good agreement between the matric conductivity and the structural
12 conductivity, showing that Darcy's law could be used at least in one part of the structural
13 porosity.

14 **6- Conclusion**

15 We presented a mechanistic model of water infiltration in a *in situ* Vertisol of Guadeloupe.
16 that required some calibration. It is possible to find a unique set of parameters for each
17 experiment. However, parameters significantly differ from one experiment to another.
18 Therefore, the model is not fully validated. This is due to a poor modelling of water flow in
19 the structural porosity. Nevertheless, our model already shows that infiltration in this soil is a
20 3D process and that the structural water flow is the main factor of the partition of water
21 between vertical infiltration in the prism and water flow in macro-cracks. Unfortunately, the
22 measurement of this process is impossible in the field. In fact, we don't know if structural flow
23 is preferential or if Darcy's law could be used. More researches are therefore needed to better
24 understand the processes of water infiltration in the structural porosity.

25 **Acknowledgements**

1 We are grateful to MM. J. André, T. Bajazet and A. Mulciba for their technical assistance
2 during the experiments, and to C. Gaudout-Gay from the translation department of INRA for
3 improving the English of the first version of this paper.

4 **References**

- 5 Angulo, R., Gaudet, J.P., Thony, J.L. and Vauclin, M., 1990. Conductivité hydraulique d'un
6 milieu poreux partiellement saturé, déformable. II. Résultats expérimentaux. Comptes
7 Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences de Paris, série II, 310, 341-345.
- 8 Beven, K. and German, P., 1981. Water flow in soil macropores. II. A combined flow model.
9 Journal of Soil Science, 32, 15-29.
- 10 Beven, K. and German, P., 1982. Macropores and water flow in soils. Water Resources
11 Research, 18, 1311-1325.
- 12 Bronswijk, J.J.B., 1988. Modeling of water balance, cracking and subsidence of clay soils.
13 Journal of Hydrology, 97, 199-212.
- 14 Cabidoche, Y.M. and Ozier-Lafontaine, H., 1995. THERESA: I. Matric water content
15 measurements through thickness variations in vertisols. Agricultural Water Management,
16 28, 133-147.
- 17 Cabidoche, Y.M. and Voltz, M., 1995. Non-uniform volume and water content changes in
18 swelling clay soil: II. A field study on a Vertisol. European Journal of Soil Science, 46,
19 345-355.
- 20 Chen, C. and Wagenet, R.J., 1992. Simulation of water and chemicals in macropore soils. Part
21 1. Representation of the equivalent macropore influence and its effect on soil water flow.
22 Journal of Hydrology, 130, 105-126.
- 23 Clapp, R.B. and Hornberger, GM, 1978. Empirical equations for some soil hydraulic
24 properties. Water Resources Research, 14, 601-604.
- 25 Di Pietro, L., 1996. Application of a lattice-gas numerical algorithm to modelling water
26 transport in fractured porous media. Transport in Porous Media, 22, 307-325.
- 27 Durner, W., 1994. Hydraulic conductivity estimation for soils with heterogeneous pore
28 structure. Water Resources Research, 30, 211-223.
- 29 Garnier, P., Perrier, E., Angulo Jaramillo, R. and Baveye, P., 1997. Numerical model of 3-
30 dimensional anisotropic deformation and 1-dimensional water flow in swelling soils. Soil
31 Science, 162, 410-420.

- 1 Germann, P.F. and Di Pietro, L., 1996. When is porous media flow preferential? A
2 hydromechanical perspective. *Geoderma*, 74, 1-21.
- 3 Haverkamp, R., Vauclin, M., Touma, J., Wierenga, P.J. and G. Vachaud, 1977. A comparison
4 of numerical simulation models for one-dimensional infiltration. *Soil Science Society of
5 America Journal*, 41, 285-294.
- 6 Hoogmoed, W.D. and Bouma, J., 1980. A simulation model for predicting infiltration into
7 cracked clay soil. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 44, 458-461.
- 8 Jaillard, B. and Cabidoche, Y.M., 1984. Etude de la dynamique de l'eau dans un sol argileux
9 gonflant: dynamique hydrique. *Science du sol*, 22, 239-251.
- 10 Jarvis, N.J., 1994. The MACRO model (version 3.1): technical description and samples
11 simulations. Reports and Dissertations No 19, Swedish University of Agricultural
12 Sciences, Uppsala.
- 13 Jarvis, N.J. and Leeds-Harrison, P.B., 1987. Modelling water movement in drained clay soil. I.
14 Description of the model, sample output and sensitivity analysis. *Journal of Soil
15 Science*, 38, 487-498.
- 16 Maheshwari, B.L., 1994. Values for the exponent of the storage-discharge equation in runoff-
17 routing models. *Journal of Hydrology*, 163, 95-106.
- 18 Marquardt, D.W., 1963. An algorithm for least squares estimation on non-linear parameters.
19 *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, 11, 431-441.
- 20 Philip, J.R., 1969. Hydrostatics and hydrodynamics in swelling soils. *Water Resources
21 Research*, 5, 1070-1077.
- 22 Ruy, S., 1997. Les trois voies simultanées de l'infiltration dans un vertisol de Guadeloupe:
23 études expérimentale et numérique. PhD. thesis, University of Montpellier II, Montpellier.
- 24 Ruy, S. and Cabidoche, Y.M., 1998. Hydraulic conductivity of the matric porosity of an
25 unsaturated Vertisol: a field and laboratory comparison. *European Journal of Soil Science*,
26 49, 175-185.
- 27 Stirk, G.B., 1954. Some aspects of soil shrinkage and the effect of cracking upon water entry
28 into the soil. *Australian Journal of Agricultural Research*, 5, 279-290.
- 29 Tamari, S., Bruckler, L., Halbertsma, J. and Chadoeuf, J., 1993. A simple method for
30 determining soil hydraulic properties in the laboratory. *Soil Science Society of America
31 Journal*, 57, 642-651.
- 32 Van Genuchten, M.T., 1980. A closed-form equation for predicting the hydraulic conductivity
33 of unsaturated soils. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 44, 892-898.
- 34 Voltz, M. and Cabidoche, Y.M., 1995. Non-uniform volume and water content changes in

- 1 swelling clay soil: I. Theoretical analysis. *European Journal of Soil Science*, 46, 333-343.
- 2 Wilding, L.P. and Tessier, D., 1988. Genesis of vertisols: shrink-swell phenomena. In: L.P.
- 3 Wilding and R. Puentes (Editors), *Vertisols: their distribution, properties, classification and*
- 4 *Management*, Texas A&M University Printing Centre, College Station TX, 55-81.
- 5 Yule, D.F. and J.T. Ritchie, 1980. Soil shrinkage relationships of Texas vertisols: II. Large
- 6 cores. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 44, 1285-1291.

Appendix 1: soil description at the experimental site

Appendix 2: calibration results

List of tables

Table 1: boundary condition for water flow at the soil surface. R is the rainfall intensity (cm s^{-1}), q^{in} (cm s^{-1}) the flux of water entering the matric porosity (subscript mat), the structural porosity (subscript struc) and the macro-crack (subscript crac). I^{max} (cm s^{-1}) is the infiltration capacity of the matrix, the structural porosity and the macro-crack, depending on the subscript.

Table 2: theoretical modelling of water flow in and between the three domains.

Table 3: sensitivity of model predictions of the amount of water stored in the matric porosity, the structural porosity, the macro-crack and the cumulated runoff to changes in input parameters. Initial values of parameters are: $k=0.85$, $c=0.01 \text{ cm s}^{-1}$, $d=1 \text{ cm}$ (set #0). For set #1 (resp. set #2), structural porosity is decreased (resp. increased) by 10 %, c is divided (resp. multiplied) by 2 and d is increased (resp. decreased) by 10 %.

Table 4: parameters of the model of Voltz & Cabidoche (1995) relating thickness variations to the matric water content. θ_s , θ_r , α and n are the parameters of the model of Van Genuchten

fitted to the retention curve: $\frac{\theta - \theta_r}{\theta_s - \theta_r} = \frac{1}{\{1 + (\alpha \cdot |\psi|)^n\}^{1-1/n}}$, where ψ is the matric potential (cm).

a and b are the coefficients of the logarithmic regression between the matric conductivity $K_{w/s}$ (cm day^{-1}) and the matric potential ψ (cm): $\log K_{w/s} = a + b \cdot \log|\psi|$.

Table 5: rainfall intensities and initial matric water content in the different experiments.

Table A1.1: soil characteristics at the experimental site (depth: 40-50 cm).

Table A1.2: soil profile at the experimental site.

Table A2.1: final parameters obtained from experiment Exp3.

Table A2.2: estimated parameters from all the experiments.

List of figures

Figure 1: scheme of the model simulating cracking, surface subsidence and water infiltration into the three porosities of a Vertisol.

Figure 2: layout of the experimental site.

Figure 3: validation of the model when run with one domain (matric flow + soil deformation) against experimental data of Angulo *et al.* (1990): (3a) shows the simulated and experimental evolution of the elevation of the surface of the bentonite paste; (3b) shows the simulated and experimental profiles of water content at different times.

Figure 4: simulation of water potential distribution inside a prism of a Vertisol from Guadeloupe during an infiltration. T is time. The macro-crack is on the right hand side of each figure, and the axis is on the left hand side. The amount of water that cannot infiltrate into the prism flows inside the macro-crack where it ponds. The model simulates lateral uptake of water by the prism and the vertical and horizontal swelling of the prism.

Figure 5: mean vertical swelling of various layers during Exp4. The dashed line indicates the time when the intensity increases.

Figure 6: variability of the vertical swelling of the 30-50 cm depth layer recorded during Exp5 by the various transducers. Grey, vertical continuous lines indicate rainfall duration.

Figure 7: variation of the mean swelling velocity of the 10-30 cm depth layer during Exp6.

Figure 8: sensitivity of model predictions of the amount of water stored in the matric porosity to changes in some input parameters.

Figure 9: variation of the measured and simulated swelling of the (9a) 10-30 cm and the (9b) 50-70 cm depth layers during Exp3. Continuous lines are for the 60 % confidence interval.

Figure 10: mean vertical swelling plotted against simulated swelling of all layers for (10a) Exp1 and (10b) Exp5.

Figure 11: variation of the measured and simulated swelling of the (11a) 30-50 cm and (11b) 70-90 cm depth layers during Exp6. Continuous lines are for the 60 % confidence interval.

Figure 12: variation of the measured and simulated water level in macro-cracks during Exp6.

Figure 13: hydraulic conductivity $K_{w/s}$ of the matric porosity and of the structural porosity of the 70-80 cm depth layer. θ is the volumetric water content ($\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$).

Table1

Rainfall intensity R			q_{mat}^{in}	q_{struc}^{int}	q_{crac}^{in}	Runoff
$R \leq I_{mat}^{max}$			R	0	0	0
$R > I_{mat}^{max}$	$R \leq I_{mat}^{max} + I_{struc}^{max}$		I_{mat}^{max}	$R - I_{mat}^{max}$	0	0
	$R > I_{mat}^{max} + I_{struc}^{max}$	$R \leq I_{mat}^{max} + I_{struc}^{max} + I_{crac}^{max}$	I_{mat}^{max}	I_{struc}^{max}	$R - I_{mat}^{max}$ $- I_{struc}^{max}$	0
		$R > I_{mat}^{max} + I_{struc}^{max} + I_{crac}^{max}$	I_{mat}^{max}	I_{struc}^{max}	I_{crac}^{max}	$R - I_{mat}^{max}$ $- I_{struc}^{max} - I_{crac}^{max}$

Table 2

porosity		Equations	
	law of motion	mass balance	water exchanges:
matric	Darcy's law : $\mathbf{q}_{\text{mat}} = -K_{w/s}(\psi) \cdot \vec{\nabla}(\psi + z)$ <p style="text-align: center;">2D</p>	Richards' equation: $c(\psi) \cdot \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(K_{w/s}(\psi) \cdot \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left(K_{w/s}(\psi) \cdot \left(\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z} + 1 \right) \right) + S_w$	$S_w = K_{w/s}(\psi) \cdot S_{\text{struc}} \cdot \frac{\psi_{\text{struc}} - \psi}{d^2},$ $\psi_{\text{struc}} = \psi^{ae} \cdot (1 - S_{\text{struc}})$
structural	Gravity flow across 7 reservoirs: $q_{\text{struc}} = c \cdot S_{\text{struc}}^b, b = 15,$ <p style="text-align: center;">1D</p>	for the <i>i</i> th reservoir : $\forall i \in [1..7], V_{\text{max},i} \frac{dS_{\text{struc},i}}{dt} = (q_{i-1} - q_i) - \int_i S_w(\theta_{\text{mat}}, S_{\text{struc},i}, z)$	
crack	instantaneously added at the bottom of the macro-crack,	variation of the depth z^{SL} of the surface of the ponded water according to: <p>(i) the flux of water at the surface of the macro-crack, (ii) the volume of ponded water that infiltrates horizontally into the soil prism, (iii) the swelling of the soil prism,</p>	macro-crack - matric porosity: below the surface of ponded water, Dirichlet boundary condition: $\psi(z \leq z^{\text{SL}}) = z^{\text{SL}} - z,$ macro-crack - structural porosity: no exchange

Parameters

matric porosity	hydraulic conductivity $K_{w/s}(\psi)$ retention curve $\psi(\theta)$ shrinkage curve	measured measured measured
structural porosity	c d b ψ^{ae}	unknown: to fit unknown: to fit 1.5 measured: -316 cm

Table 3

parameter	% variation		% variation output:			
	input		amount of water stored into:			
			matric porosity	structural porosity	macro-crack	runoff
	0.7	-18	-0	0	-6	+15
	0.765	-10	-0	0	-3	+8
k (-)	0.85	0	0	0	0	0
	0.935	10	0	0	+3	-7
	1	18	0	0	+5	-11
	0.001	-50	-35	-73	+32	+1849
	0.005	-15	-3	-39	+7	+1028
	0.0075	-6	0	-19	+4	+502
c^{\S}	0.01	0	0	0	0	0
(cm s^{-1})	0.0175	12	-26	+13	-100	-100
	0.025	20	-37	+13	-100	-100
	0.05	35	-53	+13	-100	-100
	0.1	50	-59	+13	-100	-100
	0.25	-75	+111	0	-100	+232
	0.5	-50	+95	+1	-79	+148
	0.9	-10	+15	0	-12	+18
d (cm)	1	0	0	0	0	0
	1.1	10	-12	0	+10	-15
	1.5	50	-39	-1	+34	-56
	2	100	-57	-1	+44	-72
structural	0.393	-10	+1	-4	0	+118
porosity	0.437	0	0	0	0	0
($\text{dm}^3 \text{kg}^{-1}$)	0.481	+10	-1	+4	-2	-100
set #1			-15	-43	+17	+1103
set #0			0	0	0	0
set #2			-23	+13	-100	-100

§: % of variation of input c is % variation of $|\log(c)|$

Table 4

layer	W^{ae}	ν_a^{ae}	ν_s	θ_s	θ_r	α	n	a	b
(cm)	(kg kg ⁻¹)	(dm ³ kg ⁻¹)	(dm ³ kg ⁻¹)	(m ³ m ⁻³)	(m ³ m ⁻³)	(cm ⁻¹)	(-)		
0-10	0.554	0.084	0.382						
10-30	0.534	0.080	0.379	0.6516	0.1141	0.1407	1.0468	-0.2328	-1.0926
30-50	0.508	0.075	0.373						
50-70	0.482	0.071	0.370						
70-90	0.456	0.066	0.370	0.6375	0.3675	0.1316	1.0801	-0.3141	-1.1718
90-110	0.430	0.061	0.370						

exponent ae is the crack air-entry point, W the matric water content, ν_a the specific volume of air, ν_s the specific volume of solid.

1
2
3

Table 5

Experiment	Date	Applied water			Initial matric water content			
		intensity	time	amount	layer	layer	layer	layer
		(mm h ⁻¹)	(min)	(mm)	10-30 cm	30-50 cm	50-70 cm	70-90 cm
Exp1	15/10/96	108.3	6	10.83	0.493	0.454	0.462	0.449
Exp2*	21/10/96	14.05	65	15.22	0.501	0.452	0.462	0.449
Exp3	24/10/96	14.43	60	14.43	0.524	0.456	0.462	0.449
Exp4	28/11/96	14.55	73	17.70	0.468	0.424	0.458	0.452
		62.12	13	13.46				
Exp5	12/12/96	72.31	53	63.87	0.490	0.433	0.460	0.452
Exp6	28/05/97	54.50	240	162.8	0.433	0.360	0.432	0.449

4 * partial loss of data

5

1

Appendix 1: Table A1.1

granulometry (fraction < 2mm)			Organic Carbon and Organic Matter		Exchangeable Cations				
$(10^{-2} \text{ kg}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1})$			$(10^{-3} \text{ kg}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1})$		$(10^{-2} \text{ mol kg}^{-1})$				
< 2 μm	2-50 μm	50-2000 μm	OC	OM	CEC	Ca ²⁺	Mg ²⁺	Na ⁺	K ⁺
81	12	7	21.4	36.9	46.0	62.9	8.4	3.2	6.0

2 INRA-Gardel, n=2.

3

4

1

Appendix 1: Table A1.2

Layer (cm)	Colour	Structure
0-20	Black	Centimetric nuciform structure deriving from earthworm casts
20-40	Brownish black	From nuciform to centimetric polyhedral subangular structure
40-50	Greyish yellow brown	Large polyhedral structure with some slickensides
50-140	Yellowish brown	Wide oblique slickensides forming an "edge-shape" structure

2

3

4

Estimation	c_{surf}		c_{deep}		d_{surf}		d_{mid}	
	/cm s ⁻¹		/cm s ⁻¹		/cm		/cm	
	initial	final	initial	Final	initial	final	initial	final
	$(\sigma)^{\S}$		$(\sigma)^{\S}$		$(\sigma)^{\S}$		$(\sigma)^{\S}$	
1	0.02	0.0303	0.005	0.0210	1	0.5143	1.5	4.69
		(0.0055)		(0.0070)		(0.0220)		(5.00)
2	0.03	0.0303	0.02	0.0210	0.5	0.5143	4.5	4.68
		(0.0055)		(0.0070)		(0.0220)		(5.00)
3	0.01	0.0306	0.0005	0.0213	0.7	0.5117	2.0	8.71
		(0.0055)		(0.0075)		(0.0225)		(17.0)
4 [#]	0.025	0.0360	0.01	0.0195	0.55	0.5240	3.0	1.31
		(0.0025)		(0.0020)		(0.0150)		(0.19)

2 [§]: σ is the standard error of the estimation of the parameter value (linear hypotheses).

3 [#]: for estimation #4, the time of simulation was 10000 sec instead of 4080 sec for the others.

4

Appendix 2: Table A2.2

experiment	$c_{\text{surf}} (\sigma^{\S})$	$c_{\text{deep}} (\sigma^{\S})$	$d_{\text{surf}} (\sigma^{\S})$	$d_{\text{mid}} (\sigma^{\S})$	$d_{\text{deep}} (\sigma^{\S})$
	/cm s ⁻¹	/cm s ⁻¹	/cm	/cm	/cm
Exp1	0.05	5.0	0.27	0.3	4
	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	
Exp2	0.0218	2.940	0.276	0.826	4
	(0.004)	(2.625)	(0.005)	(1.32)	
Exp3	0.0360	0.0195	0.524	1.31	4
	(0.0025)	(0.0020)	(0.015)	(0.19)	
Exp4	0.0395	0.725	0.293	39.14	4
	(0.008)	(0.223)	(0.02)	(460)	
Exp5	0.0420	0.0485	0.449	2.454	4
	(0.007)	(0.010)	(0.003)	(0.49)	
Exp5 [#]	0.0434	0.0478	0.440	2.450	2.62
	(0.007)	(0.009)	(0.003)	(0.53)	(7.5)

2 [§]: σ is the standard error of the estimation of the parameter value (linear hypotheses).


3 [#]: the five parameters have been estimated.

4

5

1

Figure 1




2

3

1

Figure 2

2



3


4

5

6

1

Figure 3




2

3

Figure 3a

4

5



6


7

Figure 3b

8

1

Figure 4




2

3

4

1
2


Figure 5



3
4
5

1
2

Figure 6




3
4
5

1

Figure 7

2




3

4

5

1
2
3


Figure 8



4
5
6

1

Figure 9



2

3


4

5

6

7

Figure 9a



8

9

10


11

12

Figure 9b

1

Figure 10



2


3

4

5

6

Figure 10a



7

8


9

10

Figure 10b


1

Figure 11



2
3
4
5
6
7

Figure 11a




8
9
10
11

Figure 11b

1

Figure 12




2

3

1
2

Figure 13



3
4