



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Design of active debris flow mitigation measures: a comprehensive analysis of existing impact models

This is the author's manuscript Original Citation: Availability: This version is available http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1711799 since 2019-11-14T08:36:46Z Published version: DOI:10.1007/s10346-019-01278-5 Terms of use: Open Access Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

DESIGN OF ACTIVE DEBRIS FLOW MITIGATION MEASURES: A COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF 2 **EXISTING IMPACT MODELS**

3

4 Federico Vagnon

5 Department of Earth Science, University of Turin, Via Valperga Caluso 35, 10125, Turin, Italy

6 email: federico.vagnon@unito.it - Tel: +39 0116705325

7 ORCID: 0000-0003-0539-0557

8

9 Abstract:

Debris flows occur in mountainous areas characterized by steep slope and occasional severe rainstorms. The massive 10 11 urbanization in these areas raised the importance of studying and mitigating these phenomena. Concerning the strategy 12 of protection, it is fundamental to evaluate both the effect of the magnitude (that concerns the definition of the hazard), 13 in terms of mobilized volume and travel distance, and the best technical protection structures (that concerns the 14 mitigation measures) to reduce the existing risk to an acceptable residual one. In particular, the mitigation measure 15 design requires the evaluation of the effects of debris flow impact forces against them. In other words, once it is 16 established that mitigation structures are required, the impacting pressure shall be evaluated and it should be verified 17 that it does not exceed barrier resistance. 18 In this paper the author wants to focus on the definition and the evaluation of the impacting load of debris flows on

19 protection structures: a critical review of main existing models and equations treated in scientific literature is here 20 presented. Although most of these equations are based on solid physical basis, they are always affected by an empirical 21 nature due to the presence of coefficients for fitting the numerical results with laboratory and, less frequently, field data. The predicting capability of these equations, namely the capability of fitting experimental/field data, is analysed and 22 23 evaluated using ten different datasets available in scientific literature. The purpose of this paper is to provide a 24 comprehensive analysis of the existing debris flow impact models, highlighting their strong points and limits. 25 Moreover, this paper could have a practical aspect by helping engineers in the choice of the best technical solution and the safe design of debris flow protection structures. Existing design guidelines for debris flow protection barrier have 26 27 been analysed. Finally, starting from the analysis of the hydro-static model response to fit field data and introducing 28 some practical assumptions, an empirical formula is proposed for taking into account the dynamic effects of the 29 phenomenon.

30

31 **Keywords:** debris flow, impact models, landslide-structure interaction, predicting capability

33 INTRODUCTION

- In the last decades, the climate changes have rapidly triggered the glacier melting, the permafrost degradation and the generation of extreme events like rapid and severe rainstorms. All these aspects have contributed to increase the possibility of occurrence of a particular type of landslide: debris flows (Zimmerman and Haerberli 1992).
- 37 Debris flow is a paroxystic phenomenon due to a rapid or extremely rapid mobilization of a mixture of water, sediments
- and floating material into a steep channel (Iverson 1997; Hungr 2005). Their high density, greater than 1700 kg/m³
- (ONR-24800 2009) and high runout velocity, up to 20 m/s (Hungr et al. 2014) make them decisive in the morphological
 evolution of mountain areas, often extensively urbanized and therefore characterized by high hazard degree (Fioraso
- 41 2000). Their worldwide diffusion and the colonization of virgin areas, joined with the world population increase, grow
- 42 up the probability for debris flow to cause disasters.
- 43 Like avalanches, debris flows occur with little warning and exert great loads on obstacles they encounter. Like water
- 44 floods, they are fluid enough to travel long distances in channels and inundate vast areas (Iverson 1997). Moreover,
- 45 their unpredictability hampers collection of detailed real event data.
- 46 Since risks cannot be eliminated but only mitigated, many mitigation strategies have been developed in the last years.
- When a potential source area is identified, since stabilization is not always a practical option, the consequences of failure must be considered. The latter are the basis for the design of mitigation measures and for the management of the residual risk (Jakob et al. 2016).
- 50 Mitigation measures can be divided in two different types:
- 51 Active measures, which are focused on the hazard and essentially they prevent the debris flow triggering, transport
- and deposition and can therefore change debris magnitude and frequency characteristics (Huebl and Steinwendtner
 2000; Kienholz 2003).
- Passive measures, which are focused on the potential damage and are used to change the vulnerability of debris flow
 either with hazard mapping (Bankoff et al. 2004; Griswold 2004) or through immediate disaster response (Kienholz
 2003; Badoux et al. 2009; Santi et al. 2010).
- Although passive measures are more advisable than active ones, the latter are necessary in order to correctly manage residual risk (Jakob and Hungr 2005). A correct land-use planning and a hazard management implicate lower costs (economical and social) but usually active measures are required, especially where there was an inadequate risk
- 60 management.
- 61 Since protection structures are designed to withstand the impact force of the moving mass, the estimation of the
- 62 potential impact pressure becomes a key aspect for safely design these mitigation measures. The scientific community
- has widely faced the challenge of debris flow hazard assessment, but universally recognized models for the design of
- 64 these structures are still missing (Vagnon et al. 2016).
- 65 Data availability and universal applicability are the main issues for the development of predicting impact models. The
- lack of data from monitoring of debris flow events forces to perform small-scale (e.g. Armanini and Scotton 1992;
- 67 Huebl and Holzinger 2003; Canelli et al. 2012; Wendeler and Volkwein 2015; Ashwood and Hungr 2016; Vagnon and
- 68 Segalini 2016) and full-scale flume experiments (DeNatale et al. 1999; Bugnion et al. 2012). Laboratory tests are useful
- but they are affected by scale effects that cannot be properly quantified and, consequently, they may not replicate or be
- comparable with field data (Iverson 1997; Huebl et al. 2009). Thus, their results must be interpreted with a healthy dose
- of scepticism (Iverson 2015) since performing analogue experiments of large scale phenomena require satisfy all the
- relevant similarity criteria but this is impossible for debris flows (Turnbull et al. 2015). Researchers have to choose if
- 73 maintain stress similarity or lost information on particle effects. The first scenario requires increasing the effective

- ravity and consequently, performing centrifuge experiments. The use of uniform material, as in chute experiments, is a
- huge simplification because produces limited pore-fluid pressure effects and excessive pore-fluid shear resistances that can lead to underestimation of solid-fluid drag and dynamic effects. Consequently, an appropriate scale analysis is
- always required for the study of mass movements such as debris flows.
- In 1996, the US Geological Surveys (DeNatale et al. 1999) performed debris flow impact text on flexible barriers in a
- full-scale concrete flume, highlighting that the inherent variability of a well-controlled, staged debris flow made it difficult to isolate the effect of any single parameter. Instead, Bugnion et al. (2011) in their full-scale experiments of
- 81 hillslope debris flows, stated that pressures depend primarily on the flow speed, which in turn appears to depend on the
- 82 grain-size distribution and water content.
- As a consequence, even if the results of full- and small- texts are comparable to those observed in real-scale measurements and simulate quite well the physics of idealised debris flows, they may not describe well the rheology, the complex topography and the presence of obstacles (buildings, infrastructures etc.) along the debris flow path (Gao et al. 2017).
- Many of these formulations yield a rough estimation of the debris flow impact pressure against structures due to their empirical nature, their validation only based on small-scale observations that could lead to high discrepancies with field observations (e.g. Hungr et al. 1984; Revellino et al. 2004; Zanchetta et al. 2004; Shen et al. 2018). Then, dimensions, types and inertial resistance of the barriers are completely neglected in most of these models (Vagnon and Segalini 2016).
- Finally, for what it concerns the model validation, it is performed on limited datasets, both in terms of number and typeof observations.
- 94 The aim of this paper is to analyse debris flow impact models proposed in scientific literature and evaluate the
- 95 discrepancies between measured and numerically predicted results using ten datasets available in scientific literature.
- 96 Sixteen formulations were accurately discussed, highlighting their strong points and their shortcomings. As a result of
- 97 the data analysis, a new formulation is here presented.
- 98 The insights carried out from this paper will be useful for engineers to design debris flow protection measures.
- 99 Moreover, the presented results will help engineers in the choice of the best debris flow impact model as a function of 100 phenomenon features and mitigation measures technical characteristics.
- 101 The present study is organized into six sections: the first one is introductory and presents the most common mitigation 102 methods for debris flows. The second section provides a review of debris flow impact models. Section three
- summarizes current international standards in debris-flow mitigation design. In section four and five, the impact models are compared and statistically analysed for evaluating their reliability in predicting measured pressure. Finally, an
- 105 empirical model is proposed and the main results of this study are summarised and discussed.
- 106

107 DEBRIS FLOW CONTROL BY BARRIERS

- 108 The use of mitigation measures depends on the adopted protection strategy and on the objectives established from the
- risk assessment (Huebl 2001). The choice of the best mitigation measure must be evaluated with respect to its technical,
 economical, ecological and political feasibility.
- 111 Generally, the areas susceptible to debris flow phenomena are narrow and not suitable for installing large structures.
- 112 Although setting only one structure is often by no means sufficient to make debris flow harmless and, moreover an
- 113 integration of both active and passive measures should be encouraged (Takahashi 2007), in the last three decades many
- 114 active mitigation measures have been installed worldwide. Active debris flow mitigation measures affect the initiation

or the transport or the deposition of debris flows. Mitigation measures have a direct effect on the magnitude and on the

- 116 frequency of the phenomenon, changing the probability of the event or manipulating the debris flow itself. They must
- be designed to resist the impact force and their main tasks are: i) dissipate the debris flow kinetic energy and ii) retain
- totally or partially the debris flow material (VanDine 1996; Mizuyama 2008; Brighenti et al. 2013; Song et al. 2017;

119 Wendeler et al. 2018).

Common debris flow structural measures include close-type check dams (Fig. 1a), open-type sabo dams (Fig. 1b),
concrete slit sabo dams (Fig. 1c) and flexible net barriers (Fig. 1d).

122

Fig. 1 Different types of debris flow active mitigation measures: check dam (photograph by Los Angeles County Flood Control District) (a), open type Sabo structures (photograph of steel check dam in Nagano prefecture, Japan) (b), concrete slit barrier (photograph by LCW Consult web site of protection works in St. Luzia River, Madeira, Portugal) (c) and flexible net barrier (photograph by Geovertical S.R.L web site of protection works in Terranova Pollino, Basilicata Region, Italy) (d)

128

129 The design of these structures should comply with two requirements: firstly, it should take into account geographical, 130 geological and site conditions. Secondly, at the end of design process the structural resistances shall be always greater 131 than the effects of the forces exerted on the structure. For what it concerns the barrier resistance, it can be easily 132 evaluated since the resistance of each single component is well known and accurately calculated. By contrast, the 133 definition of the impacting load on the structure is an open issue (Vagnon et al. 2017a): as it will be described in the 134 next section, there are many models for quantifying the stress distribution on the barrier, but none of them is universally 135 recognized. Moreover, their predicting capability, that is an evaluation of the discrepancy between measured and 136 estimated impact forces, especially using data collected from real events, is unknown. In particular, for mitigation 137 measure designers become of utter importance to know under which dynamic features the impact models lead to an 138 underestimation or excessive overestimation of the lad conditions.

Finally, it is important to underline that the accuracy of dimensioning procedure is therefore highly dependent on the quality of process scenario. Inaccurate assumptions may result in inefficient design or in a partial or total failure of the structure and can lead to negative consequences for the vulnerable area. This means that poor quality input data (flow velocity, thickness, density, volume etc.) arises uncertainties in the evaluation of impacting load.

143

144 **DEBRIS FLOW IMPACT MODELS**

For an efficient design of mitigation structures, the debris flow impact pressure exerted on barriers is of utter importance because it is the main factor that causes structural collapse (Hungr et al. 1984; Armanini 1997; Huebl et al. 2009; Ferrero et al. 2015). Furthermore, there is an increasingly greater need in predicting impact load for the assessment and the management of risk.

149 Debris flow involves fundamentally independent physical and dynamical processes that couldn't be controlled by one

or two parameters. The flow is heterogeneous and the mixture density evolves strongly as a function of time and space due to mixing, phase separation and particle sorting: this aspect leads to drastic change of the local material

- 152 composition and it can result in huge impact pressure differences during impact (Iverson 1997). Moreover, density,
- velocity and flow height should be considered as field variable due to their variation through space, along the channel
- 154 path, and time, during the flow process (Hungr et al. 1984; Kwan 2012). For all these reasons, the development of a
- 155 reliable debris flow impact scheme results extremely complex.

156 The design of mitigation structures should require simplified models to predict impact pressure with high reliability;

157 these models should be universally recognized and should include few parameters, related to material and flow 158 characteristics easy to estimate.

- Finally, the modelling of debris flow surges is difficult because the impact pressure depends on a dynamic component exerted by the heterogeneous flow, that can reach $10 - 5x10^3$ kN m⁻², and an impulsive component generated by the single impact of boulders: the latter can vary between 10^2 and 10^4 kN m⁻² (Suwa and Okuda 1983; Zhang 1993).
- Moreover, the flow composition and the impact mechanism strongly influenced the impact load and its distribution on structures (Song et al. 2017). Many studies (Choi et al. 2015; Sovilla et al. 2016; Ng et al. 2019) on this topic have highlighted that when dry granular flows impacting a rigid barrier, a pileup mechanism developed. On the contrary, viscous flows exhibited the formation of a vertical-jet mechanism upon impact. This happens when the flow inertia is larger than restoring gravitational field (Poudyal et al. 2019). In fact, in viscous flow, the effect of particle shearing in kinetic energy dissipation is less significant compared to frictional-grain stresses in dry granular flow.
- 168 It is obvious that debris flow modelling requires many assumptions for simplifying its real complex nature: a) the 169 mixture has to be considered as an equivalent fluid with averaged characteristics of density, b) the simultaneous 170 occurrence of maximum velocity and thickness values, c) the rigid behaviour of the flow at the impact (Osanai et al. 171 2010; Suda et al. 2010; Kwan 2012).
- On the basis of these hypotheses, in the last decades many methods were developed and, in general, they can be classified into hydraulic and solid-collision (Huebl et al. 2009) and shock-wave propagating upstream models (Chou et al. 2012; Albaba et al. 2018).
- Hydraulic models, derived from fluid momentum balance and Bernulli's equation, schematize the flowing mass as a homogeneous mean (characterized by an average density between fluid and solid component) and consider the load as a modified value of hydro-dynamic pressure or a multiple of the hydro-static load or a combination of both.
- 178 The maximum impact pressure considering hydro-static model can be evaluated using the following equation:
- 179

180	$p_{\text{peak}} = k \cdot \rho_m \cdot g \cdot h_f$		(1)
-----	--	--	----	---

181

- where p_{peak} is the maximum impact load in N m⁻², k is an empirical coefficient, ρ_m is the mean density of the debris impacting fluid in kg m⁻³, g is gravity in m s⁻² and h_f is the flow height in m. This model is based on a triangular load distribution and the load increase factor, k (e.g. Lichtenhahn 1973; Armanini 1997). The latter can assume values ranging from 2.5 to 7.5.
- Lichtenhahn (1973) firstly applied this equation for the evaluation of debris flow impact on concrete barrier, proposing *k* values between 3.5 and 5.5. Later, following the same theoretical principles of the previous study and comparing
 results with experimental tests, Armanini (1997) evaluated *k* as 4.5 times the hydro-static pressure. At the same time,
 Scotton and Deganutti (1997), performing small scale laboratory tests and measuring impact pressure on vertical
- obstacle, estimated *k* varying between 2.5 and 7.5, depending on the viscosity of the interstitial fluid and flow hydraulicconductivity.
- 192 The popularity of these formulations is due to their simplicity and the few number of parameters involved: in fact they

193 only require debris density and flow height and usually flow height is considered equal to channel depth. On the other

- hand, they do not take into account flow rheological properties and they are only applicable with small velocity values
- 195 or rather with flatter terrain.

196 Concerning hydro-dynamic models, the impact on the structure has a constant load distribution and the general equation

197

is:

198

199 $p_{\text{peak}} = \alpha \cdot \rho_{\text{m}} \cdot v_{\text{f}}^2$ (2)

200

201 where α is the dynamic coefficient and v_f is the flow velocity in ms⁻¹.

The parameter α include information about the flow type, the formation of vertical jet-like wave at the impact, the grain size distribution and the barrier type (Canelli et al. 2012).

Watanabe and Ikeya (1981) firstly applied this model for the analysis of volcanic mudflow in Japan. They found that α ranged between 2 and 4 as a function of the grain size distribution of the mixture.

The following equation is the Hungr et al.' equation (1984) and it is maybe the most famous hydro-dynamic formulation used for evaluating debris flow impact pressure against obstacles:

 $209 \qquad p_{peak} = 1.5 \cdot \rho_m \cdot v_f^2 \cdot \sin\beta \tag{3}$

210

211 where β is the least angle between the face of the barrier and the flow direction.

The dynamic coefficient equals to 1.5 was defined after the back-analysis of data from monitoring of real debris flow events occurred in British Columbia (Canada). This coefficient was included for considering the generation of a stagnant wedge behind protection barriers.

215 Moreover, in scientific literature exists a wide range of proposed values for the dynamic coefficient: Daido (1993)

suggested values varying between 5 and 12, Zhang (1993) recommended a range between 3 and 5, Bugnion et al.
(2011) measured values from 0.4 to 0.8, Canelli et al. (2012) between 1.5 and 5.

The values listed above prove that the range of variation of dynamic coefficient (between 0.4 and 12) deeply conditions the evaluation of peak pressure: consequently, from an engineering point of view, the design of protection barriers is strongly influenced by the choice of one formulation respect to another, arising uncertainties in the reliable evaluation of the probability of failure of the mitigation measure.

Huebl and Holzinger (2003) developed a modified hydro-dynamic formula introducing Froude number (F_r) to normalised impact force and achieved a scale-independent relationship:

225
$$p_{\text{peak}} = 5 \cdot \rho_{\text{m}} \cdot v_{\text{f}}^{0.8} \cdot (g \cdot h_{\text{f}})^{0.6}$$
 (4)

226

224

Using small-scale flume experiments and 155 sets of data coming from other authors, Cui et al. (2015) estimated the peak impact pressure as:

229

230
$$p_{\text{peak}} = 5.3 \cdot F_r^{-1.5} \cdot \rho_m \cdot v_f^2$$
 (5)

231

Combining Equation 1 and 2, many Authors hypothesized new relationships to estimate maximum impact pressure
 against barrier. The general relation is:

234

235
$$p_{\text{peak}} = \rho_{\text{m}} \cdot \mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{h}_{\text{f}} + \rho_{\text{m}} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{\text{f}}^2$$
(6)

237 Cross (1967) firstly modified the equation for perfect fluid used for evaluating tsunami impact forces introducing static 238 coefficient, k, and dynamic coefficient, α , respectively equal to 0.5 and 3 as follow:

239

240
$$p_{peak} = k \cdot \rho_m \cdot g \cdot h_f + \alpha \cdot \rho_m \cdot v_f^2$$
(7)

241

Later, Arattano and Franzi (2003), analysing measured data in Moscardo Torrent (Italy), validated Equation 6.

Other studies were carried out hypothesizing the total reflection of a flow against a vertical wall and, imposing the dynamic equilibrium (Lamberti and Zanuttigh 2004). The relation is:

245

246
$$p_{\text{peak}} = C_{c} \cdot \frac{(1+\sqrt{2}F_{r})^{2}}{2} \cdot \rho_{m} \cdot g \cdot h_{f}$$
(8)

247

where Cc is an empirical coefficient calibrated considering the vertical acceleration caused by the presence of fine particles and boulder equal to 1.5.

Another equation to evaluate the dynamic impact of a debris flow against a vertical wall is presented by Armanini et al.(2011):

252

253
$$p_{\text{peak}} = \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \cdot F_r^2\right) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\alpha \cdot F_r^2}{1 + \frac{1}{2} \cdot F_r^2}\right) \cdot \rho_m \cdot g \cdot h_f$$
(9)

254

255 where α is a coefficient equal to 1.

Recently, Vagnon and Segalini (2016), performing several small scale flume tests, proposed a new model that takes into account either flow characteristics, material properties and barrier dimensions. The numerical expression is given as:

258

259
$$p_{\text{peak}} = \left(\frac{1}{2}K_a(n^2 - 1)\cos\theta + \alpha Fr^2\cos\beta - \tan\varphi'\frac{n-1}{\sin\theta}\cos\beta\cos\theta\right)\rho_m gh_f$$
(10)
260

where K_a is active lateral earth pressure coefficient derived from Rankine theory, θ is slope angle in deg, β is the angle between the barrier and the normal at channel bottom, measured in deg, φ is the debris friction angle in deg and n is the filling ratio, that is the ratio between the barrier height and the flow height. In this relation, dynamic coefficient, α , can vary between 0.5 and 1.2.

265 Solid-collision models are based on the Hertz contact theory as the following:

266

267
$$F_B = K_c n a^{1.5}$$
 (11)

268

where K_c is the load reduction factor that depends on barrier stiffness (Hungr et al. 1984; Kwan 2012; Ng et al. 2016), n takes into account the radius of impacting boulder, its Poisson's ratio and the Young's modulus of the boulder itself and the barrier. The parameter a, depends on boulder mass and impact velocity. In scientific literature, many solid-collision models have been presented (Kwan 2012; Faug 2015; Ng et al. 2016; Song et al. 2017): their use is related to the ratio between boulder dimension and debris flow thickness. Ng et al (2016) highlighted that if this ratio is lower than 0.6, solid-collision contribution can be neglected and the impact of debris flow can be calculated using Equation 2 with α

equals to 2.5.

- For what it concerns shock-wave models, the impacting force is considered as a combination of inertial and depth-
- dependent forces associated with features of the incoming flow (Albaba et al. 2018). Although the shock-wave solution
- is obtained from the jump conditions of the mass and momentum balances, its predictions are in good agreement with

experimental results (Chou et al. 2012). The main limitation of these methods is the high sensitivity of peak force to

- sampling length (that defines the sample dimension for averaging flow motion characteristics): in particular, Albaba et
- al. (2018) highlighted that only for slope angle greater than 42.5° and sampling length greater than 35 times the average
- 282 particle diameter, the peak force is well predicted.
- 283 One further remark has to be made concerning the use of all the presented methods in numerical modelling: many
- numerical codes (Hutter et al. 1994; Brighenti et al. 2013; Albaba et al. 2015; Ashwood and Hungr 2016; Leonardi et al.
 2016; Vagnon et al. 2017b; Wendeler et al. 2018) have been developed on the basis of hydro-static and hydro-dynamic
- simplified approach.
- In this paper only hydraulic models has been treated and discussed, since not all the necessary parameters were available for evaluating the contribution of solid-collision and shock-wave models.
- Table 1 summarizes general equations of all the previous models, highlighting the range of variation for static (k) and dynamic (α) coefficient. Moreover, Table 1 includes information about the texting procedure and how α and kcoefficients were evaluated (cfr. columns three and four of Table 1). These coefficients depend on the type of mitigation measure considered and the characteristics of flow, in terms of grain size and viscosity. Mainly, they were calibrated performing small-scale tests on rigid (e.g. Armanini 1997; Scotton and Deganutti 1997; Kwan 2012) or flexible barriers (e.g. Canelli et al. 2015; Ashwood and Hungr 2016; Wendeler et al. 2018) and more rarely, they were evaluated as a result of full-scale test or real debris flows (Arattano and Franzi 2003; Bugnion et al. 2011).
- 296

297 **Table 1** – Summary of analysed hydraulic model for evaluating peak debris impacting pressure on barriers.

298

299 INTERNATIONAL GUIDANCES FOR MITIGATION DESIGN: AN OVERVIEW

300 At present, there are few existing international technical guidelines about debris flow mitigation measures, one of which 301 is undoubtedly the ONR series (ONR 24800 to ONR 24803) developed by the Austrian "Wildbach und 302 Lawinenverbauung" office (WLV). The debris flow load models and the design, construction and life cycle assessment 303 of protection works are arranged in these standards (Suda et al. 2010). In particular, ONR 24801 defines two models for 304 calculating debris flow impact pressure: the first one, named as simple model, is based on Equation 1, assuming that h_f 305 is equal to the barrier height and k ranges normally between 3 to 6. The second one, named as complex model, 306 corresponds to Equation 4. In both cases, the standard specifies that flow parameters must be given by an expert for 307 torrential control. Moreover, twelve stress combinations are defined depending on the functional type of mitigation 308 structure in order to take into account uncertainties and provide adequate design of mitigation measure. At European 309 level, ONR series are the only standards concerning debris flow mitigation structure design: recently, the European 310 Organisation for Technical Assessment published the new European Assessment Document (EAD 340020-00-0106 311 2016) concerning the flexible kits for retaining debris flows and shallow landslides/open hill debris flows. This 312 regulation defines the main components and the methods to assess the performance of the kit. These guidelines concern 313 only the certification of barrier performances but no information on load distribution are given.

Other existing standards are the Japanese NILIM (National Institute for Land and Infrastructure Management) 904 and 905 (Osanai et al. 2010) that define the design characteristics of Sabo barriers. Compare to Austrian ONR series, these guidances are less specific (Moase 2017) since they suggest considering different combination of external forces (static 317 water pressure, sediment pressure and fluid forces of debris flow) without providing any formulations for their 318 calculation.

One of the most comprehensive standard is that developed by Geotechnical Engineering Office (GEO) of Hong Kong. In particular, the GEO report 270 (Kwan 2012) presents guidelines on the design of debris-resisting barrier. For what it concerns impact model, the design guidance recommends that the design loading on barrier is based on multi-surge scenario and the total load is considered as the sum of dynamic impact and boulder impact (if the existence of boulders or large hard inclusions in the flow cannot be precluded). Boulder impact should be calculated using the simplified form of Equation 11 as following:

325

326
$$F = K_c 4000 v^{1.2} r^2$$

327

where K_c is equal to 0.1, v is the boulder impact velocity normal to the barrier and r is the radius of boulder. Dynamic load should be calculated using Equation 2 with α equals to 2.5.

Analysing the previous standards, it is clear that there is not a universally recognized impact model: each guideline is
 based on local experience of use of debris resisting barriers.

332

333 EVALUATION OF THE PREDICTING CAPABILITY OF DEBRIS FLOW IMPACT MODELS

As stated above, the design of mitigation measures requires defining the load exerted by the flow on structures. The equations listed in Table 1 show that universally recognize model does not exist and thus it becomes fundamental for designers to know the capability of these models to fit experimental and field measurements. The choice of a model in relation to another mainly depends on: a) how accurately is the calculated pressure compared to the measured one; b) the limitations (if any) in the applicability of the model.

339 The predicting capability of the previous models was evaluated by comparing the predicted results with data coming 340 from ten different datasets available in scientific literature. As listed in Table 2, their choice was made on the basis of 341 availability of both dynamic information (thickness, velocity and density) and impact features (impact load) and for ensuring that the datasets covered different testing scenarios (soil type, water content, channel slope, magnitude) and 342 343 different scale approaches. The datasets included values of flow velocity, thickness and impacting peak pressure 344 collected from small scale tests performed in specifically created flumes (Scheidl et al. 2013; Cui et al. 2015; Ashwood 345 and Hungr 2016; Vagnon and Segalini 2016), from full-scale debris flow (DeNatale et al. 1999; Bugnion et al. 2011) 346 and from monitoring of recurrent debris flow in the Jiangjia Ravine basin in China (Hu et al. 2011; Hong et al. 2015) 347 and Illgraben debris flow monitoring site in Switzerland (McArdell 2016; Wendeler et al. 2007).

Moreover, The choice of analysing both small-scale tests and field data was made to understand if the approach here presented could produce reliable results and to dispel any doubts on the result interpretation. The author is conscious that miniaturized tests are affected by scale effects and investigated materials are usually not satisfyingly representative of material involved in debris flow phenomena, but if a trend is recognized in both datasets, the analysis can be considered as a sign of a reliable approach.

353 In this paper, the data of peak impact pressure were normalized by those of hydro-static pressure as follows:

354

355
$$\tilde{p} = \frac{p_{peak_{measured}}}{\rho \cdot g \cdot h_f}$$
(13)

356

(12)

- 357 These values were plotted as a function of the Froude number, *Fr*, of the flow in order to achieve scale-invariant
- description. Froude number is defined as the square root of the ratio between kinetic and gravity force of the flow and it
- is useful for demarcating quasi static rate-independent from speed-squared force contributions (Faug 2015). An
- important remark has to be done for the evaluation of Fr values: a recent study published by Ng et al. (2019) highlighted that the choice of frontal velocity and maximum flow depth within the frontmost region of the flow is crucial for properly characterising the impact mechanism. In particular, an estimation of non-frontal Fr values may lead to an
- 363 underestimation of impact pressure by a factor of two.
- In general, laboratory and field data accordingly show the same range of variation of the normalized peak pressure; for what it concerns the Froude number, the range of variation related to laboratory tests is wider than the field one. As stated above, this discrepancy can be attributed to scale effects. However, the two dataset globally have the same trend for \tilde{p} as function of *Fr*.
- The normalized pressures, \tilde{p} , were compared to all the listed above predicting models, considering for each one the upper and the lower limit of the range of variability of empirical coefficients *k* and α . For the sake of simplicity and readability of figures, the models were pooled into three groups (hydro-static, hydro-dynamic and mixed models) and
- 371 plotted separately for better highlighting limitations and strong points for each model.
- In Fig. 2, the predicting capability of hydro-static models is evaluated: in general, these formulations underestimate the normalized peak pressure measured both in small- and full-scale tests (Fig.s 2a and 2b) and field data (Fig. 2c), regardless of the value of empirical coefficient k.
- In general, from an engineering point of view, the fact that hydro-static models underestimate the debris flow impact pressure (with the exception of Scotton and Deganutti (1997) model with k = 7.5 for Fr lower than 3) points out an inadequacy for the design of protection structures.
- 378

Fig. 2 Comparison between normalized debris flow impact force and hydro-static predicting models as function of
 Froude number considering small- (a) and full-scale experiments (b) and field data (c).

381

For a deeper analysis, the ratio between the measured peak pressure and the estimated one was calculated and reported in Fig. 3 as function of Froude number for both small- (a, d) and full-scale (b, e) and field datasets (c, f). The upper (7.5) and the lower (2.5) limits of the *k* range of variation were chosen in order to define the suitability for predicting

- impact pressure of the hydro-static models.
- The peak pressure ratio gives information about the discrepancy between predicted results using hydro-static methods and measured ones: if this ratio is lower than 1, the predicting value overestimates the measured one, vice-versa the peak pressure is underestimated. If this ratio is 1, there is a perfect correspondence (green continuous line in Fig. 3) between measured values and predicted one. From an engineering point of view, for providing safe results, predicting
- models should exhibit a ratio lower than unity, and in particular varying between 0.5 and 1, so that the impacting pressure is reasonably overestimated. This aspect will be better explained in the next section.
- 392 Analysing Fig. 3, hydro-static formula with k = 2.5 (that corresponds to the lower limit of Scotton and Deganutti (1997)
- 393 equation) always underestimates the measured peak pressure (Fig.s 3a to 3c). On the contrary, Scotton and Deganutti
- (1997) equation considering k = 7.5 simulates well about the 55% of the field data (Fig. 3f). These two equations define
- 395 the variability domain of the existing hydro-static formulations.
- Analysing Fig. 2 and Fig. 3, there is an evident non-linear relation between estimated pressure and Froude number: the
- 397 higher is Fr a, the higher is the distance between measured and estimated pressure value. Moreover, considering

- Scotton and Deganutti (1997) formulation (with k = 7.5), it seems that the prediction capability of this model is high for
- 399 Fr < 3; in this case the percentage of peak pressure ratio lower than 1 increases till 70%.
- It becomes obvious that hydro-static models are suitable only for low Froude numbers (generally lower than 3, Huebl
 and Holzinger 2003; Cui et al. 2015), namely when the flow is characterized by low velocity and dynamic components
 are negligible (Huebl and Holzinger 2003) (cfr. Fig. 3).
- In this study, starting from this observation, an attempt to take into account dynamic effects in hydro-static models willbe presented and discussed.
- 405

Fig. 3 Relationship between measured peak pressure and calculated hydro-static peak pressure with k respectively equal to 2.5 (a to c) and 7.5 (d to f) as a function of the Froude number considering both small- (a, d) and full- scale (b, e) and field dataset (c, f). The green continuous line represents the perfect correspondence between measured values and estimated ones.

410

Concerning hydro-dynamic models, they have a good capability in predicting the peak impact pressure (Fig. 4) except for models with dynamic coefficient, α , lower than 1 (Bugnion et al. (2011), cfr. Fig.s 5a to 5c). The two key points are: a) verify if the predicting capability is influenced by flow regime; b) considering maximum dynamic coefficient value ($\alpha = 12$ from Daido (1993)) the peak values are excessively overestimated. The latter point has a great impact on the design of mitigation measures, in particular on their construction costs (cfr. next section).

- In Fig. 4a, for very low Froude values (Fr < 2), it seems that hydro-dynamic models are affected by of the influence of
 flow regime, characterized by low velocity and high impact thickness. In this case, only Daido (1993) equation reaches
 to satisfactorily predict peak pressure.
- 419

Fig. 4 Comparison between normalized debris flow impact force and hydro-dynamic predicting models as function of
Froude number considering small- (a) and full-scale tests (b) as well as field data (c).

422

423 Focusing on Hungr et al. (1984) equation (continuous blue line in Fig. 4), which is certainly the most famous, in the 424 86% of cases it overestimates the measured peak pressure. This formulation has a high predicting capability for high 425 Froude values, meanwhile for Froude equal or lower 2 it underestimates measured pressure (Fig.s 4a and 4c). In Fig. 5, 426 this aspect is better clarified: observing the pressure ratio, it decreases when Froude number increases following an 427 inverse power law. Except for Bugnion et al (2011) equation (Fig.s 5a to 5c) for which the pressure ratio is almost never 428 lower than unity, in the other formulations this relationship is verified for Fr > 2. Daido (1993) formulation with $\alpha = 12$ 429 (Fig.s 5d to 5f) deserves a debate of its own: in fact it excessively overestimates the pressure values (except for Fr < 2, 430 confirming the observation made above), reducing pressure ratio close to 0. This latter point will be better argued in 431 next section.

432

Fig. 5 Relationship between measured peak pressure and calculated hydro-dynamic peak pressure with α respectively equal to 0.4 (a to c) and 12 (c to d) as a function of the Froude number considering both small- (a, d) and full-scale (b, e) and field dataset (c, f)

436

Summarizing, the analysis performed on small- and full-scale and field data has highlighted that pure hydro-static and
 pure hydro-dynamic models are not totally adequate to predict debris flow impact pressure on structures. In Froude

439 region lower than 3, where velocity are low and impacting thickness are high (cfr. Fig. 6) hydro-static formulations 440 perform well; on the contrary, hydro-dynamic models underestimate pressure values since kinetic effect are not 441 dominant (Huebl and Holzinger 2003, Cui et al. 2015; Faug 2015).

442

Fig. 6 Relationship between velocity (blue squares) and thickness (red diamonds) as function of Froude number for small-scale tests (a) and full-scale and field data (b). A negative correlation exists between velocity and thickness: when Froude number increases, velocity increases and consequently flow height decreases and vice-versa.

- 446
- 447

In the light of previous observations, mixed models are more suitable for predicting impact loads as clearly showed in Fig. 7 in which all data (both from small- and full-scale tests and field measurements) fall into the region defined by these formulations.

451

452 Fig. 7 Comparison between normalized debris flow impact force and mixed predicting models as function of Froude
453 number considering small- (a) and full-scale test (b) as well as field data (c).

454

455 For evaluating the performance of each formulation, the peak pressure ratio was evaluated, as shown in Fig. 8. For 456 readability of the figure, only field data were plotted. However, mixed models showed the same behaviour regardless 457 the choice of dataset. Generally, despite their prediction capability is more suitable than hydro-static and hydro-458 dynamic formulations, not all mixed models can be universally usable in practise. For instance, Huebl and Holzinger 459 (2003) and Cui et al. (2015) equations perform well for Froude values lower than 3 (Fig.s 8a and 8b). Arattano and 460 Franzi (2003) formulation provides a good correspondence between field data and predicted ones: on the contrary, 461 Cross (1967) equation excessively overestimates pressure peak values (providing a peak pressure ratio close to 0, cfr. 462 Fig. 8c). Armanini et al. (2011) equation shows a neglecting dependence with Froude number, which causes, 463 particularly for low values (Fr<2), an underestimation of the peak pressure (Fig. 8e). This dependence is not evident in 464 the other models (Fig. 8c and 8f).

465

466 Fig. 8 Relationship between measured peak pressure and calculated peak pressure for different mixed models as a
467 function of the Froude number considering field dataset (a to f).

468

469 A COMPREHENSIVE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF PREDICTING IMPACT MODEL

470 In this section, the predicting capability of debris flow impact models has been statistically analysed.

471 In Table 3, the results of the comparison between all the described models and small- and full-scale/field datasets are 472 presented. The percentage is referred to the number of predicted values greater than measured ones. This condition 473 occurs when the model overestimates the impacting peak pressure. If the percentage is high, the model has a good capability of overestimating measured peak pressure; on the contrary, if the percentage is low, the model is not suitable 474 475 for predicting impact pressure. However, the percentage of overestimated peak pressure values is not sufficient for 476 evaluating the reliability of a predicting model. From an engineering point of view the excessive overestimation shall be 477 avoided as much as underestimation since it is related to mitigation measure construction costs. Thus, for each models was calculated the percentage of data that fall into four classes of peak pressure ratio, defined as follow: 478

- From 0 to 0.5 (orange class): it represents an excessive overestimation and consequently higher construction
 costs. If the predicting model shows a high percentage of data in this class, it should be discarded.
- From 0.5 to 0.7 (yellow class): if the predicting model shows a high percentage of data in this class, a careful
 analysis of cost benefit should be conducted when considering the suitability of the model.
- From 0.7 to 1 (green class): if the predicting model shows a high percentage of data in this class, it is
 extremely accurate in estimating impact pressure.
- From 1 to 1.3 (yellow class): taking into account the uncertainties related to parameter measurement, a careful
 analysis should be performed for choosing or discarding the model.
- 487 Greater than 1.3 (red class): if the predicting model shows a high percentage of data in this class, it is not
 488 suitable for estimating debris flow impact pressure.
- 489 This classification gave indications about the level of overestimation/underestimation, which is important especially for 490 defining the degree of safety of the mitigation measure and, indirectly, its construction costs.
- 491 Figures 9 to 11 add more information to Table 3 about predicting capability of analysed impact models: in general, all 492 the hydro-static models (Fig. 9) are not suitable to describe debris flow impact behaviour since they has an high 493 percentage (greater than 30%) of values that fall into red class, regardless the k-coefficient value. Hydro-dynamic 494 formulations have a high propensity to excessively overestimate impact pressure when $\alpha > 2$ (Fig.s 10d to 10h). Vice-495 versa, when dynamic coefficient is lower than unit (Fig.s 10a and 10b), these models are not suitable for predicting 496 impact load. Hungr et al. (1984) and Canelli et al. (2012) models with α =1.5 (Fig. 10c) seem to be a good compromise 497 between overestimation and prediction capability. Except for Croos (1967) equation (Fig. 11a) that exhibits an 498 excessive overestimation, mixed models prove their adequacy as predicting methods since they show high percentage of 499 values that fall into green class. In particular, Arattano and Franzi (2003), Armanini et al. (2011) and Vagnon and 500 Segalini (2016) models (Fig.s 11b, 11c and 11g) result the most suitable for predicting real debris flow impact on 501 structures due to the high percentage of data that fall into green class (more than 40%).
- 502
- 503 Fig. 9 Predicting capability analysis of hydro-static models using field dataset.
- 504
- 505 **Fig. 10** Predicting capability analysis of hydro-dynamic models using field dataset.
- 506
- 507 **Fig. 11** Predicting capability analysis of mixed models using field dataset.
- 508

509 TOWARDS A GENERALISED IMPACT MODEL

As highlighted in previous Sections, hydro-static formulations can be used, with a reliable degree of safety, to predict impact pressure for flows with Fr < 3. Moreover, analysing Table 3 and Fig. 9, it is evident how the predicting capability of these methods is very low: considering the highest *k* value, less than 55% of the peak pressure values are overestimated. This aspect cannot be neglected by mitigation measure designers and consequently, it makes these formulation not completely suitable for the estimation of impact forces on structures.

- 515 In the light of these aspects, is it possible to revise hydro-static model, improving its capability to overestimate field 516 data?
- 517 Fig. 12 shows that a power law governs the trend between peak pressure ratio and Froude number. In particular the 518 relation is:
- 519

520
$$\frac{p_{peak_measured}}{\rho \cdot g \cdot h_f} = a \cdot Fr^b$$

522 where *a* and *b* are respectively equal to 1.38 and 1.64.

Fig. 12 Relationship between field measurements of the peak pressure and calculated peak pressure using hydro-static formulation with k = 1 as a function of the Froude number of the flow

526

527 Starting from Equation 14 and taking into account that estimated values should overestimate measured ones, the 528 following modified hydro-static equation is proposed:

529

530
$$p_{peak} = 1.5 \cdot a \cdot Fr^b \cdot \rho \cdot g \cdot h_f = k^* \cdot \rho \cdot g \cdot h_f$$
(15)

531

where *a* and *b* are respectively equal to 1.38 and 1.64 as derived from data interpolation (Fig. 12) and 1.5 is an increasing coefficient for overestimating the impact pressure. The choice of 1.5 is done in order to obtain an average peak pressure ratio of 0.8 (red line in Fig. 13) so that the estimated pressure is reasonably overestimated.

It has been observed that in 86% of cases this formulation overestimates field data; this percentage is comparable with that obtained using hydro-dynamic and mixed models. The statistical analysis of predicting capability is comparable with that of mixed model, with high percentage of values falling into yellow and green classes (Fig. 13b). Moreover, analysing Fig. 13a, the Froude dependence exhibited by classic hydro-static models (cfr. Fig. 2 and Fig. 3) is not present in this modified formulation. On average, the peak pressure ratio (as function of Fr) has a horizontal trend. Only in correspondence of Fr = 2, few estimated values underestimate measured ones; however this aspect also occurs in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3 for other hydro-static models.

542

Fig. 13 Relationship between peak pressure ratio for the modified hydro-static model as a function of the Froude
number (a) and statistical evaluation of the predicting capability of the proposed model (b).

545

546 This new formulation, although it follows the same theoretical concepts of hydro-static models, has an empirical nature 547 since its empirical coefficient results from the analysis of field data. Fig. 14 shows the comparison between the 548 proposed equation and the impact models that, on the basis of the previous statistical analysis, have exhibited the best 549 predicting capability. Moreover, Lamberti and Zanuttigh (2004) and Armanini et al. (2011) models have some 550 similarities with the proposed. In fact, the three formulations have analogous trends of p^{-} as function of Fr; in general, 551 mixed hydro-static models overestimate field data, particularly with high Fr, compared to the proposed one. Moreover, 552 the new formulation introduces (on the basis on the used field dataset) the concept of reasonable overestimation (the 553 increasing value of 1.5 of Equation 15 has been chosen for obtaining peak pressure ratio equals to 0.8) that it is not taken into account by other formulations. Obviously, the empirical coefficient k* should be reviewed increasing field 554 555 data in order to reach more robust statistical analyses.

556

Fig. 14 Comparison between the proposed model (black line) and others hydro-dynamic (Hungr et al. 1984 and Canelli
et al. 2012) and mixed (Arattano and Franzi 2003, Huebl and Holzinger 2003, Lamberti and Zanuttigh 2004, Armanini
et al. 2011, Cui et al. 2015 and Vagnon and Segalini 2016) models.

560

(14)

561 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

- In this paper, sixteen debris flow impact models have been described and their predicting capability, or better their capability to fit experimental and field data, has been evaluated using three different dataset: one coming from smallscale flume tests, one from full-scale experiments and one from real data collected at Jiangjia Ravine (China) and Illgraben (Switzerland) basins. At first sight, the small-scale dataset showed dimensionless pressure values shifted to higher Froude numbers compared to those obtained from on-site dataset. This difference is a consequence of the scale effects that affect the small-scale tests and probably due to the influence of the triggering mechanism.
- This study is a first attempt to compare the most famous debris flow impact models, analysing their strong points and limitations and evaluating their capability of fitting experimental and field data for helping designers in the choice of the best models to design mitigation measures (Kwan 2012).
- For the sake of simplicity and for a direct comparison between the described methods, the models have been classified into three groups: hydro-static, hydro-dynamic and mixed models. For each model, key points and limitations have been highlighted and the main findings can be summarized as follow:
- 574 1. Hydro-static models require few input parameters (flow density and thickness) for evaluating impact pressure on 575 structures. This aspect is particularly important for what it concerns the level of uncertainties coming from the 576 whole debris flow scenario: since these parameters can be easily evaluated analysing past events, the result 577 variability depends mainly by the dimensionless coefficient k. By contrast, the performed analyses have shown 578 that the predicting capability reached an acceptable level of safety for Froude number lower than 3. Moreover, the 579 predicting capability decreases of about the square of the Froude number, confirming that when the velocity of the 580 flow increases (and consequently the flow thickness decreases) these models are not able to predict impact load. 581 The performed statistical analysis also confirmed the limited suitability of these models.
- 582 2. Hydro-dynamic models provide impact pressure considering the flow density and the square velocity of the flow. 583 The latter parameter is particularly difficult to measure during debris flow event and for this reason the related 584 uncertainties can result high. As highlighted above, except for those models with α lower than 1 (Bugnion et al., 585 2011), hydro-dynamic formulations have a good capability to predict and overestimate impact pressure especially 586 for high Froude numbers (predicting capability is low when Fr is lower than 2). However, the main limitation is 587 the excessive overestimation in predicting impact load that may results in a large increment of costs for structure 588 construction. A dynamic coefficient equal to 2 is suggested, as a good compromise between predicting capability 589 and excess of overestimation.
- 590 3. Mixed models seem to be best methods for predicting debris flow impact pressure on barriers, since they include 591 both information about the static and the dynamic component of the flow. The increase in the numbers of 592 parameters increases the uncertainties and, consequently, the degree of reliability of these methods decreases.
- The main hypothesis behind the described methods is that the entire load is totally transferred to the structure, without any dissipation during the impact. In terms of barrier design, this hypothesis should lead to over-conservative design since stiffness and drainage capability are not taken into account. Analysing field results, the overestimation induced by this hypothesis is not always verified probably due to the hit of single boulders on the barrier, condition that required the introduction of specific equations (Kwan 2012; Faug 2015; Ng et al. 2016; Song et al. 2017) or the increase of the dimensionless coefficient (*k* and α).
- 599 Finally, the model proposed in this paper exhibits a good capability to predict impact load. It is able to take into account 600 both the static and the dynamic behaviour of the flow without being affected by of the influence of flow regime. Further 601 monitoring field data will be helpful eventually to review the statistics at the basis of this new formulation and to

- 602 improve its predicting capability. Moreover, additional monitoring debris flow systems would be very welcome to
- 603 improve the knowledge about these disastrous phenomena and help to design mitigation measures with increasing level
- 604 of safety and reliability.
- 605 It is expected that the results proposed in this paper will be useful for designer, helping them for the best choice of
- 606 debris flow impact models on barriers.

607	References
608	Albaba A, Lambert S, Nicot F, Chareyre B (2015) Relation between microstructure and loading applied by a granular
609	flow to a rigid wall using DEM modeling. Granular matter 17(5):603-616.
610	
611	Albaba A, Lambert S, Faug T (2018) Dry granular avalanche impact force on a rigid wall: Analytic shock solution
612	versus discrete element simulations. Physical Review E 97:052903-1-12.
613	
614	Arattano M, Franzi L (2003) On the evaluation of debris flows dynamics by means of mathematical models. Nat
615	Hazards Earth Syst Sci 3:539–544. doi:10.5194/nhess-3-539-2003.
616	
617	Armanini A, Scotton P (1992) Experimental analysis on the dynamic impact of a debris flow on structures. In
618	Proceedings of the Internationl Symposium Interpraevent. Bern, Switzerland 107-116.
619	
620	Armanini A (1997) On the dynamic impact of debris flows. Recent developments on debris flows. In: Armanini A. and
621	Michiue M. (eds) Lecture notes in Earth Sciences 208-224. Springer, Berlin.
622	
623	Armanini A, Larcher M, Odorizzi M (2011) Dynamic impact of a debris flow front against a vertical wall. Ital J Eng
624	Geol Environ 1041–1049.
625	
626	Ashwood W, Hungr O (2016) Estimating the total resisting force in a flexible barrier impacted by a granular avalanche
627	using physical and numerical modeling. Can Geotech J 53(10):1700-1717.
628	
629	Badoux A, Graf C, Rhyner J, Kuntner R, McArdell BW (2009) A debris-flow alarm system for the Alpine Illgraben
630	catchment: design and performance. Nat Hazards 49:517-539.
631	
632	Bankoff G, Frerks G, Hilhorst D (eds) (2004) Mapping vulnerability: disasters, development and people. Earthscan,
633	London
634	
635	Brighenti R, Segalini A, Ferrero AM (2013) Debris flow hazard mitigation: a simplified analytical model for the design
636	of flexible barriers. Comp Geotech 54:1-15.
637	
638	Bugnion L, McArdell BW, Bartelt P, Wendeler C (2011) Measurements of hillslope debris flow impact pressure on
639	obstacles. Landslides 9:179–187.
640	
641	Canelli L, Ferrero AM, Migliazza M, Segalini A (2012) Debris flow risk mitigation by the means of rigid and flexible
642	barriers - experimental tests and impact analysis. Nat Hazards Earth Syst Sci 12:1693-1699. doi:10.5194/nhess-12-
643	1693-2012.
644	
645	Choi CE, Au-Yeung SCH, Ng CWW (2015) Flume investigation of landslide granular debris and water run-up
646	mechanisms. Géotechnique Letters 5(1):28-32.
647	

648	Chou SH, Lu LS, Hsiau SS (2012) DEM simulation of oblique shocks in gravity-driven granular flows with wedge
649	obstacles. Granular Matter 14(6):719-732.
650	
651	Cross RH (1967) Tsunami Surge Forces. Journal of the Waterways and Harbors Division, ASCE 93(4):201-231.
652	
653	Cui P, Zheng C, Lei Y (2015) Experimental analysis on the impact force of viscous debris flow. Earth Surface Process
654	and Landforms 40:1644–1655.
655	
656	Daido A (1993) Impact force of mud debris flows on structures, Technical Session B. In Proceedings of the XXV IAHR
657	Congress. Tokio, Japan 211–213.
658	
659	DeNatale JS, Iverson RM, Major JJ, LaHusen RG, Fiegel GL, Duffy JD (1999) Experimental Testing of Flexible
660	Barriers for Containment of Debris Flows. USGS Open File Report 38:99-205.
661	
662	EAD 340020-00-0106 (2016) Flexible kits for retaining debris flows and shallow landslides/open hill debris flows.
663	
664	Faug T (2015) Macroscopic force experienced by extended objects in granular flows over a very broad Froude-number
665	range. Eur Phys J E 38(34):1-10.
666	
667	Ferrero AM, Segalini A, Umili G (2015) Experimental tests for the application of an analytical model for flexible debris
668	flow barrier design. Engineering Geology 185: 33-42.
669	
670	Fioraso G (2000) Indagini geologico-morfologiche su aste torrentizie della valtellina e della Valle di Susa
671	ricorrentemente soggette a colate detritiche torrentizie (debris flow). Quaderni di studi e documantazione 23,
672	Supplemento GEAM 1:3-59 (in Italian)
673	
674	Gao L, Zhang LM, Chen HX (2017) Two-dimensional simulation of debris flow impact pressures on buildings.
675	Engineering Geology 226: 236-244.
676	
677	Griswold JP (2004) Mobility statistics and hazard mapping for non-volcanic debris flows and rock avalanches. MS
678	thesis, Portland State University
679	
680	Hong Y, Wang JP, Li DQ et al. (2015) Statistical and probabilistic analyses of impact pressure and discharge of debris
681	flow from 139 events during 1961 and 2000 at Jiangjia Ravine, China. Engineering Geology 187:122-134.
682	
683	Hu K, Wei F, Li Y (2011) Real-time measurement and preliminary analysis of debris-flow impact force at Jiangjia
684	Ravine, China. Earth Surface Processes and Landforms. 36:1268-1278.
685	
686	Huebl J, Steinwendtner H (2000) Debris flow hazard assessment and risk mitigation. Felsbau, Rock and Soil
687	Engineering, Vol.1, 17-23, Verlag Glueckauf (in German)
688	

- Huebl J (2001) Strategy of protection. In: R. Didier and F. Zanolini (eds), Risques torrentiels. Universit\u00e0 Europ\u00e9enne
 d'Et\u00e9 sur les Risques Natureles, Grenoble, France.
- 691
- Huebl J, Holzinger G (2003) Kleinmassstaebliche Modellversuche zur Wirkung von Murbrechern. WLS Report 50,
 Institut für Alpine Naturgefahren, Wien. 3 pp. (in German).
- 694
- Huebl J, Suda J, Proske D et al. G (2009) Debris Flow Impact Estimation. In Proceedings of 11th International
 Symposium on Water Management and Hydraulic Engineering (WMHE2009) Vol. 1:137-148.
- 697
- Hungr O, Morgan GC, Kellerhals R (1984) Quantitative analysis of debris torrent hazard for design of remedial
 measures. Can Geotech J 21:663–667.
- 700
- Hungr O (2005) Classification and terminology. In: Debris flow Hazards and Related Phenomena. Edited by M. Jakob
 and O. Hungr. Praxis Publishing Ltd., Chichester, UK 11-51.
- 703
- Hungr O, Leroueil S, Picarelli L (2014) The Varnes classification of landslide types, an update. Landslides 11: 167-194.
- 705
- Hutter K, Svendsen B, Rickenmann D (1994) Debris flow modeling: A review. Continuum mechanics and
 thermodynamics 8(1):1-35.
- 708
- 709 Iverson RM (1997) The physics of debris flows. Rev Geophys 35:245–296.
- 711 Iverson RM (2015) Scaling and design of landslide and debris-flow experiments. Geomorphology 244:9-20.
- 712

Jakob M, Hungr O (2005) Debris-flow Hazards and Related Phenomena. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 445-487.

714

Jakob M, Holm K, McDougall S (2016) Debris-flow risk assessment. Oxford Research Encyclopedias – Natural Hazard
 Science. DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780199389407.013.37

- 717
- Kienholz H (2003) Early warning systems related to mountain hazards. In: J. Zschau and A. Kueppers (eds), Early
 Warning System for Natural Disaster Reduction: 3rd International IDNDR Conference on Early Warning System for the
 Reduction of Natural Disasters. Postdam, 1998, 555-564, Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- 721
- Lamberti A, Zanuttigh B (2004) Experimental analysis of the impact of dry granular debris flows against obstacles.
 XXIX Convegno di idraulica e costruzioni idrauliche, Trento 571–578.
- 724
- Leonardi A, Wittel FK, Mendoza M, Vetter R, Herrmann HJ (2016) Particle–fluid–structure interaction for debris flow
 impact on flexible barriers. Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering 31(5):323-333.
- 727
- Lichtenhahn C (1973) Die Berechnung von Sperren in Beton und Eisen- beton, Kolloquium on Torrent Dams, Heft,
 Mitteilungender Forstlichen Bundensanstalt Wien. 91–127. (in German)

731	Mizuyama T (2008) Structural countermeasures for debris flow disasters. International Journal of Erosion Control
732	Engineering 1(2):38-43.
733	Moase EE (2017) Guidance for debris-flow and debris-flood mitigation design. Simon Fraser University. Master Thesis
735	
736	Ng CWW, Song D, Choi CE, Koo CH, Kwan JSH (2016) A novel flexible barrier for landslide impact in centrifuge.
737	Géotechnique Lett 6(3):221-225.
738	
739	Ng CWW, Choi CE, Goodwin GR (2019) Froude characterization for single-surge unsteady dry granular flows: impact
740	pressure and run up. Can Geotech J DOI: 10.1139/cgj-2018-0529.
741	
742	Osanai N, Mizuno H, Mizuyama T (2010) Design Standard of Control Structures Against Debris Flow in Japan. Journal
743	of Disaster Research 3(5):307-314.
744	
745	Poudyal S, Choi CE, Song D et al. (2019) Review of mechanisms of debris-flow impact against barriers. In Proceeding
746	of the 7 th International Conference on Debris-Flow Hazards Mitigations, Colorado, USA 1027-1034.
747	
748	Revellino P, Hungr O, Guadagno FM, Evans SG (2004) Velocity and runout simulation of destructive debris flows and
749	debris avalanches in pyroclastic deposit, Campania region, Italy. Environmental Geology 45:295-311.
750	
751	Santi PM, Hewitt K, VanDine DF, Barillas Cruz E (2011) Debris-flow impact, vulnerability, and response. Nat Hazards
752	56(1): 371-402. DOI: 10.1007/s11069-010-9576-8
753	
754	Scheidl C, Chiari M, Kaitna R, Mulleger M, Krawtschunk A, Zimmerman T, Proske D (2013) Analysing Debris Flow
755	Impact Models, Based on a Small Scale Modelling Approach. Surv Geophys 34:121-140.
756	
757	Scotton P, Deganutti AM (1997) Phreatic line and dynamic impact in laboratory debris flow experiments. In
758	Proceedings of the 1 st ASCE International Conference on Debris-flow Hazard Mitigation: Mechanics, Prediction and
759	Assessment. San Francisco, USA 777–786.
760	
761	Shen W, Zhao T, Zhao J, Dai F, Zhou G (2018) Quantifying the impact of dry debris flow against a rigid barrier by
762	DEM analyses. Engineering Geology 241:86-96.
763	
764	Song D, Choi CE, Ng CWW, Zhou GGD (2017) Geophysical flows impacting a flexible barrier: effects of solid-fluid
765	Interaction. Landslides 15(1):99-110.
766	
767	Sovilla B, Faug T, Kohler A, Baroudi D, Fischer J, Thibert E (2016) Gravitational wet avalanche pressure on pylon-like
768	structures. Cold Regions Science and Technology 126:66–75.
/69	

770	Suda J, Huebl J, Bergmeister K (2010) Design and construction of high stressed concrete structures as protection works
771	for torrent control in the Austrian Alps. In Proceedings of 3 rd fib international Congress, Washington, USA, 1-12.
772	
773	Suwa H, Okuda S (1983) Deposition of debris flows on a fan surface, Mt. Yakedake, Japan. Zeitschrift Geomorph N F
774	Suppl Bd 46:79–101.
775	
776	Takahashi T (2007) Debris Flow. Mechanics, Prediction and Countermeasures. Taylor and Francis Group.
777	
778	Turnbull B, Bowman ET, McElwaine JN (2015) Debris flow: experiments and modelling. Comptes rendus physique
779	16:86-96.
780	
781	Vagnon F, Ferrero AM, Segalini A (2016) EC7 design approach for debris flow flexible barriers: applicability and
782	limitations. In: Gercek H., Ulusay R., Hindistan M.A., Tuncay E., Aydan O. (eds), Mechanics and Rock Engineering:
783	From the Past to the Future. International Symposium on International Society for Rock Mechanics, ISRM 2016.
784	Cappadocia, Turkey, 29-31 August 2016, 1, 499-504, CRC Press/Balkema.
785	
786	Vagnon F, Segalini A (2016) Debris flow impact estimation on a rigid barrier. Nat Hazards Earth Syst Sci 16:1691-
787	1697. doi:10.5194/nhess-16-1691-2016.
788	
789	Vagnon F, Ferrero AM, Umili G, Segalini A (2017a) A Factor Strength Approach for the Design of Rock Fall and
790	Debris Flow Barriers. Geotech Geol Eng 35(6):2663-2675.
791	
792	Vagnon F, Ferrero AM, Latham JP, Xiang J (2017b) Benchmarking of debris flow experimental tests using combined
793	finite-discrete element method, FEMDEM. In Proceedings of ISRM Afrirock – Rock Mechanics for Africa, 739-752.
794	
795	VanDine DF (1996) Debris flow control structures for forest engineering. Research Branch, BC Ministry of Forests,
796	Victoria, BC. Working paper 08/1996. 75 pages.
797	
798	Watanabe M, Ikeya H (1981) Investigation and analysis of volcanic mud flows on Mount Sakurajima, Japan. Erosion
799	sediment transport measurement. In: Int Assoc Hydrol Sei Publ, 133, Florence, 245-256.
800	
801	Wendeler C, Volkwein A (2015) Laboratory tests for the optimization of mesh size for flexible debris-flow barriers, Nat
802	Hazards Earth Syst Sci 15:2597-2604. DOI:10.5194/nhess-15-2597-2015.
803	
804	Wendeler C, Volkwein A, McArdell BW, Bartelt P (2018) Load model for designing flexible steel barriers for debris
805	flow mitigation. Canadian Geotechnical Journal 99:1-39.
806	
807	Zanchetta G, Sulpizio R, Pareschi M, Leoni F, Santacroce R (2004) Characteristics of May 5-6, 1998 volcaniclastic
808	debris flows in the Sarno area (Campania, southern Italy): Relationships to structural damage and hazard zonation.
809	Journal of volcanology and geothermal research 133:377-393.
810	

Zhang S (1993) A comprehensive approach to the observation and prevention of debris flows in China. Nat Hazards 7:1–23.

- Zimmerman M, Haeberli W (1992) Climatic change and debris flow activity in high mountains areas. A case study in
- the Swiss Alps. Catena Suppl 22:59-72.

817	List of Figures
818	Fig. 1 Different types of debris flow active mitigation measures: check dam (photograph by Los Angeles County Flood
819	Control Distric) (a), open type sabo structures (photograph of steel check dam in Nagano prefecture, Japan) (b),
820	concrete slit barrier (photograph by LCW Consult web site of protection works in St. Luzia River, Madeira, Portugal)
821	(c) and flexible net barrier (photograph by Geovertical S.R.L web site of protection works in Terranova Pollino,
822	Basilicata Region, Italy) (d).
823	
824	Fig. 2 Comparison between normalized debris flow impact force and hydro-static predicting models as function of
825	Froude number considering small- (a) and full-scale experiments (b) and field data (c).
826	
827	Fig. 3 Relationship between measured peak pressure and calculated hydro-static peak pressure with k respectively equal
828	to 2.5 (a to c) and 7.5 (d to f) as a function of the Froude number considering both small- (a, d) and full- scale (b, e) and
829	field dataset (c, f). The green continuous line represents the perfect correspondence between measured values and
830	estimated ones.
831	
832	Fig. 4 Comparison between normalized debris flow impact force and hydro-dynamic predicting models as function of
833	Froude number considering small- (a) and full-scale tests (b) as well as field data (c).
834	
835	Fig. 5 Relationship between measured peak pressure and calculated hydro-dynamic peak pressure with α respectively
836	equal to 0.4 (a to c) and 12 (c to d) as a function of the Froude number considering both small- (a, d) and full-scale (b,
837	e) and field dataset (c, f)
838	
839	Fig. 6 Relationship between velocity (blue squares) and thickness (red diamonds) as function of Froude number for
840	small-scale tests (a) and full-scale and field data (b). A negative correlation exists between velocity and thickness: when
841	Froude number increases, velocity increases and consequently flow height decreases and vice-versa.
842	
843	Fig. 7 Comparison between normalized debris flow impact force and mixed predicting models as function of Froude
844	number considering small- (a) and full-scale test (b) as well as field data (c).
845	
846	Fig. 8 Relationship between measured peak pressure and calculated peak pressure for different mixed models as a
84/	function of the Froude number considering field dataset (a to f).
848	Eta O Desdictina conchilita enclusia effectas atotis un dela usina field detect
849	Fig. 9 Predicting capability analysis of hydro-static models using field dataset.
850	Fig. 10 Producting comphility analysis of hydro dynamic models using field detect
851 852	Fig. 10 Predicting capability analysis of hydro-dynamic models using field dataset.
832 852	Fig. 11 Predicting conchility analysis of mixed models using field dataset
833 854	rig. II Predicting capability analysis of mixed models using field dataset.
0J4 855	Fig. 12 Relationship between field measurements of the neak pressure and calculated neak pressure using bydro static
856	Fig. 12 relationship between new measurements of the peak pressure and calculated peak pressure using hydro-static formulation with $k=1$ as a function of the Froude number of the flow
857	formulation with k-1 as a function of the Floude number of the now
031	

- Fig. 13 Relationship between peak pressure ratio for the modified hydro-static model as a function of the Froude number (a) and statistical evaluation of the predicting capability of the proposed model (b).
- 860

Fig. 14 Comparison between the proposed model (black line) and others hydro-dynamic (Hungr et al. 1984 and Canelli

- et al. 2012) and mixed (Arattano and Franzi 2003, Huebl and Holzinger 2003, Lamberti and Zanuttigh 2004, Armanini
- et al. 2011, Cui et al. 2015 and Vagnon and Segalini 2016) models.
- 864

List of Tables

866	Table 1 – Summary	v of hvdraulic model fo	or evaluating peal	k debris impacting r	pressure on barriers

Author	Coefficient	Data source	Notes
Lichtenhahn (1973)	3.5 - 5.5	Theoretical and construction experience	Hydro-static formula
Armanini (1997)	4.5	Theoretical and laboratory experiments	Hydro-static formula
Scotton and Deganutti (1997)	2.5 - 7.5	Laboratory experiments	Hydro-static formula
Watanabe and Ikeya (1981)	2.0 - 4.0	Field measurements of volcanic mud flows	Hydro-dynamic model
Daido (1993)	5 - 12	Analytical results	Hydro-dynamic model
Bugnion et al. (2011)	0.4 - 0.8	Measurements of generated hillslope debris flow at Canton Aargau, Switzerland	Hydro-dynamic model
Canelli et al. (2012)	1.5 - 5.5	Laboratory experiments and field measurements	Hydro-dynamic model
Hungr et al. (1984)	1.5	Back-analysis data in British Columbia, Canada	Hydro-dynamic model
Zhang (1993)	3.0 - 5.0	Field measured data in Jiangjia ravine, China	Hydro-dynamic model
Huebl and Holzinger (2003)	5	Field and laboratory experimental data	Mixed model
Cui et al. (2015)	5.3	Field and laboratory experimental data	Mixed model
Cross (1967)	$k = 0.5$ $\alpha = 3$	Tsunami wave pressure	Mixed model
Arattano and Franzi (2003)	1	Field measured data in Moscardo Torrent, Italy	Mixed model
Lamberti and Zanuttigh (2004)	1.5	Theoretical and laboratory experiments	Mixed model
Armanini et al. (2011)	1	Theoretical and laboratory experiments	Mixed model
Vagnon and Segalini (2016)	0.5 - 1.2	Theoretical and laboratory experiments	Mixed model

	Dataset	Apparatus/Basin	Material	Measured Physical Quantities	Dimension of the dataset
	Scheidl et al. 2013	Wood flume with constant inclination of 30° and measuring section 4.5 m long and 0.45 m wide. The reservoir section can release a volume equals to 0.33 m3 of mixture.	Mixture with constant dry mass and variable water content (from 0.16 to 0.27). The grain size distrubution ranges between 0.0002 and 50 mm	Flow velocity, impacting height and horizontal impact forces recorded in real time during the experiments.	30 experiments but only 16 selected for further analyses
Small-scale experiments	Cui et al. 2015	Steel flume 0.2 m wide and 3 m long with slope ranging from 10° to 15°.	Material collected in the Jiangjia Ravine basin (China) with grain size distrubution varying between 0.001 and 10 mm. The liquid concentration varies from 0.34 to 0.76.	Flow velocity, impacting height and pressure recorded in real time during the experiments.	27 tests with different density (1600-2300 kg m-3) and slopes (10-13°).
	Ashwood and Hungr 2016	Steel flume 0.3 m wide and 3 m long with slope ranging from 22° to 34°.	Uniform quartz sand and pea gravel	Flow velocity, impacting height, profile, barrier deflection and pressure recorded in real time during the experiments.	28 tests with different density (1560-1780 kg m-3) and slopes (122-34°).
	Vagnon and Segalini 2016	Steel flume 4 m long and 0.39 m wide in which the slope is variable between 30° and 35°	Saturated sand with constant liquid concentration (0.4) and mixture density (1920 kg m-3). The grain size distribution varies between 0.0001 and 5 mm.	Flow velocity, impacting height and impact forces recorded in real time during the experiments.	63 test with different volume released and different slopes.
Full-scale experiments	DeNatale et al. 1999	A 41m long, 8m wide channel constructed on the side of a rock quarry near Velthein, Switzerland. Average inclination of 30°	Mixture of soil, bedrock and water	Flow height at the middle of channel, velocity of upper flow surface, impact pressure on two different steel plates	16 tests with single or multiple releases. Density varies between 1760 and 2110 kg/m3
	Bugnion et al. 2011	USGS debris flow flume, 95m long, 2m wide and 1.2 deep, with constant slope of 31°	Poorly graded, clean and saturated gravelly sand	Flow height, velocity, impact pressure on flexible barrier	6 experiments on flexible barriers
	Wendeler et al. 2007	Barrier system installed at the Illgraben basin, Switzerland	Muddy debris flow	Flow height, load cells, velocity from video record	May 18th 2006 event
Field measurements	Hu et al. 2011	Jiangjia Ravine basin, located near the city of Dongchuan (China). the basin has an area of 48.6 km2 and the mainstream has a	The bulk density ranges from 1600 to 2300 kgm-3 with fluid concentration ranging from 0.15 to 0.6. The dimension of the solid particles varies	Flow velocity, impacting height and impact forces recorded in real time during debris flow events.	38 surges occurede on August 25, 2004 after short intence rainfall

868 Tal	le 2 – Summary	of the main	dataset	characteristics.
----------------	----------------	-------------	---------	------------------

100 mm.

Hong et al. 2015	Jiangjia Ravine basin, located near the city of Dongchuan (China). the basin has an area of 48.6 km2 and the mainstream has a length of 13.9 km.	The bulk density ranges from 1600 to 2300 kgm-3 with fluid concentration ranging from 0.15 to 0.6. The dimension of the solid particles varies between 0.001 and 100 mm.	Channel width, flow velocity, impacting height, density, duration and impact forces recorded in real time during debris flow events.	139 events during 1961 and 2000
McArdell 2016	Illgraben basin, Switzerland	Quarzite and dolomite boulders, clat-size particles	Flow height, load cells, velocity from video record	29 July, 8 August and 24 August 2013 events

Model trme	Equation	Empirical	Percentage of overestimated peak pressure values [%]		
widder type	Equation	[-]	Small-scale dataset	Full-scale dataset	Field measurement
sle	Liebtenber (1072)	3.5	14.2	8.3	14.6
mode	Lientennan (1973)	5.5	17.2	12.5	35.6
static	Armanini (1993)	4.5	15.7	8.3	25.4
/dro-s	Scotton and Deganutti	2.5	11.2	8.3	5.4
H	(1997)	7.5	20.9	33.3	54.7
	Watanabe and Ike	2	82.1	100	91.2
	(1981)	4	91	100	97.6
	Hungr et al. (1984)	1.5	72.4	91.7	86.1
dels	$\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{n}}$ (1002)	5	93.3	100	99
c mo	Daldo (1992)	12	100	100	98.7
'nami	Zong (1002)	3	88.1	100	95.3
ro-dy	Zang (1993)	5	93.3	100	99
Hyd	Bugnion et al. (2011)	0.4	0	4.2	2
		0.8	34.33	66.7	16.9
	Canelli et al. (2012)	1.5	72.4	91.7	86.1
		5.5	93.3	100	99
	Cross (1967)	$k = 1; \alpha = 3$	88.1	100	94.3
	Arattano and Franzi (2003)	1	48.5	83.3	66.8
odels	Huebl and Holzinger (2003)		38.1	79.2	80.9
ked mc	Lamberti and Zanuttigh (2004)		64.2	100	87.9
Miy	Armanini et al. (2011)	1	70.1	91.7	76.8
	Cui et al. (2015)		20.9	54.2	65.4
	Vagnon and Segalini (2016)	1.2	85.1	87.5	84.6
Number	of small-scale tests			134	
Number	of small-scale tests			24	
Number of	field measurements			298	

870 Table 3 – Evaluation of the peak pressure prediction capability for debris flow impact models.

873 Figures



Fig. 1 Different types of debris flow active mitigation measures: check dam (photograph by Los Angeles County Flood
Control Distric) (a), open type sabo structures (photograph of steel check dam in Nagano prefecture, Japan) (b),
concrete slit barrier (photograph by LCW Consult web site of protection works in St. Luzia River, Madeira, Portugal)
(c) and flexible net barrier (photograph by Geovertical S.R.L web site of protection works in Terranova Pollino,
Basilicata Region, Italy) (d).

880





Fig. 2 Comparison between normalized debris flow impact force and hydro-static predicting models as function of
Froude number considering small- (a) and full-scale experiments (b) and field data (c).



Fig. 3 Relationship between measured peak pressure and calculated hydro-static peak pressure with k respectively equal to 2.5 (a, to c) and 7.5 (d to f) as a function of the Froude number considering both small- (a, d) and full- scale (b, e) and field dataset (c, f). The green continuous line represents the perfect correspondence between measured values and estimated ones.



Fig. 4 Comparison between normalized debris flow impact force and hydro-dynamic predicting models as function of
Froude number considering small- (a) and full-scale tests (b) as well as field data (c).



Fig. 5 Relationship between measured peak pressure and calculated hydro-dynamic peak pressure with α respectively equal to 0.4 (a to c) and 12 (c to d) as a function of the Froude number considering both small- (a, d) and full-scale (b, e) and field dataset (c, f).



Fig. 6 Relationship between velocity (blue squares) and thickness (red diamonds) as function of Froude number for
 small-scale tests (a) and full-scale and field data (b). A negative correlation exists between velocity and thickness: when
 Froude number increases, velocity increases and consequently flow height decreases and vice-versa.



Fig. 7 Comparison between normalized debris flow impact force and mixed predicting models as function of Froude
number considering small- (a) and full-scale test (b) as well as field data (c).



Fig. 8 Relationship between measured peak pressure and calculated peak pressure for different mixed models as afunction of the Froude number considering field dataset (a to f).



Fig. 9 Predicting capability analysis of hydro-static models using field dataset.



913pmeasured VS pcalculated [-]pmeasured VS p914Fig. 10 Predicting capability analysis of hydro-dynamic models using field dataset.



917 Fig. 11 Predicting capability analysis of mixed models using field dataset.



Fig. 12 Relationship between field measurements of the peak pressure and calculated peak pressure using hydro-static
formulation with k=1 as a function of the Froude number of the flow.





Fig. 13 Relationship between peak pressure ratio for the modified hydro-static model as a function of the Froude
number (a) and statistical evaluation of the predicting capability of the proposed model (b).

927

a)



928

Fig. 14 Comparison between the proposed model (black line) and others hydro-dynamic (Hungr et al. 1984 and Canelli
et al. 2012) and mixed (Arattano and Franzi 2003, Huebl and Holzinger 2003, Lamberti and Zanuttigh 2004, Armanini

et al. 2011, Cui et al. 2015 and Vagnon and Segalini 2016) models.