Prediction of bed load transport in Kurau River based on genetic programming
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ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the ability of genetic programming (GP) as a new approach for estimation of bed load transport in Kurau River in Malaysia. Data collections including bed load and flow discharge have been carried out at six study sites which are situated at Kurau River. The values of $R^2$, RMSE, and MAE are equal to 0.989, 0.055, and 0.045, respectively, for training sets and 0.915, 0.090, and 0.069, respectively, for testing sets. For all data sets, $R^2$ is equal to 0.961 while RMSE and MAE are equal to 0.082 and 0.060 respectively. The values of $R^2$, RMSE, and MAE for validation data set were obtained equal to 0.933, 0.096, and 0.067, respectively. In fact, the evolved model has obtained high accuracy for both testing and validation sets in order to confirm that enough generalization was obtained. Therefore it was found that the GP model could be employed successfully in predicting bed load transport.
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1 Introduction

The difficulties associated with bedload measurement field causes a long history of interest in developing equations for the prediction (e.g., duBoys, 1879; Schoklitsch, 1934; Bagnold, 1980).

Formula is usually based on hydraulic principles of ideal and attempted to relate the level of bedload transport to some correlate of flow (such as water discharge, shear stress or stream power) (Yvonne Martin, 2003). Because of relationship between the reliability and representativeness of the data utilized in defining reference values, constants, and other relevant coefficients and the performance of a particular equation, most sediment transport equations do not represent a fundamental or complete correlation and it is really difficult, if not possible, to recommend a single formula for engineers and geological to use in the field under all conditions. Wu et al., 2000; Camenen and Larson, 2005.

Genetic programming, which is a powerful tool for pattern recognition and data interpretation, was employed in this study to present an explicit predictive equation for bed load transport. Genetic Programming (GP) the extension of genetic algorithms (Poli, Langdon, & McPhee, 2008) is one of the well-known methods in artificial intelligence (AI) that plays an important role in modeling and simulation of many non-convex and complex phenomena to explain nonlinear relationships between some parameters (Liu et al., 2002; Tabesh & Dini, 2009; Naseri, M et al, 2011).

Prior to its inherent optimized behavior and touchable resulted formula, GP has been applied to a wide range of problems in artificial intelligence, engineering and science applications, industrial, and mechanical models such as water resources, hydraulic processes and electricity demand, etc. (Azamathullah et al., 2010; Ashour et al., 2003; Babovic and Bojkov, 2001; Babovic and Keijzer, 2003; Drecourt, 1999; Harris et al., 2003; Keijzer and Babovic, 2002; Khu et al., 2001; Lee et al., 1997; Muttil and Lee, 2005; Sivapragasam et al., 2007; Whigham and Crapper, 2001 and Zhang et al., 2005).

A number of applications of GP have been reported, which include sediment transport modelling, (Babovic and Abbott, 1997); effect of flexible vegetation on flow in wetlands (Harris et al., 2003; Babovic and Keijzer, 2000); sedimentary particle settling velocity equations (Babovic et al. 2001); emulating the rainfall runoff process (Whigham and Crapper, 2001; Liong et al., 2002) evolutionary computation approach to sediment transport modeling (Kizhissi et al., 2005). Multigene genetic programming is a recently developed approach for enhancing accuracy of GP that was developed by Hinchliffe et al. (1996) and Hiden (1998).

In multigene GP, several trees may describe the model but in traditional GP a single tree expresses the model and amount of tree that can be employed is the main difference between the multigene GP and GP.
All of genes have specific optimal weights and summation of weighted genes plus a bias term would form the final formula as the best obtained numerical model. Multigene GP can be written as:

\[ Y = d_0 + d_1 \cdot \text{gene}_1 + d_2 \cdot \text{gene}_2 + \ldots + d_n \cdot \text{gene}_n \]

Where \( d_0 \) is the bias term and \( d_i \) is weight of the \( i \)th gene. Actually, multigene GP is a linear combination of nonlinear terms, and this feature makes it possible to recognize the pattern of engineering problems in a highly precise manner (Hinchliffe et al., 1996). GPTIPS was utilized in the current study to perform a multigene genetic programming for precise estimation of bed load transport. This is a new “Genetic Programming & Symbolic Regression” code written based on multigene GP for use with MATLAB (Searson, 2009a).

2 Site description

Kurau River sub-basin (Figure 1) lies between latitude 570,000 (N) and 530,000 (N), longitude 290,000 (E) and 330,000 (E). The catchment area is approximately 40,000 hectares, consisting of two main river tributaries namely Kurau River and Ara River. Kurau River represents the main drainage artery of the basin, draining an area of approximately 682 km² that is generally low lying. The river originates partly in the Bintang Range and partly in the Main Range where the terrain in the upper reaches is steep and mountainous. Mid valleys of the river are characterized by low to undulating terrain, which give way to broad and flat floodplains. Ground elevations at the river headwaters are moderately high, being 1,200 m and 900 m. The slopes in the upper 6.5 km of the river averaged 12.5% whilst those lower down the valleys are much lower, of the order of 0.25% to 5%.

3 Field method

Six study sites were chosen in the kurau River for data collection. Hydraulic and bed load data were collected for detailed analysis on river (Ab. Ghani et al., 2003). All cross-sections in the kurau River are single thread channel width. The top with ranges between 7 and 19 m and the slopes are between 0.00076 and 0.001 indicating small-medium river and the cross-sections are still natural.

During the field season, each section was sampled 6 times. At the beginning of each sampling event, water surface height was surveyed. The channel cross-section was then divided into 8 equally spaced increments on the basis of flow width at time sampling. At each increment, flow depth and velocity was measured. Bed load was sampled immediately after velocity at each increment. Bedload was collected with a Helley-Smith bedload sampler which had a square 7.6 cm orifice, 0.25 mm mesh bag with frame. Table 1 shows the range of data collected from kurau River. According to U.S. Geology Survey protocol, in order to account for immediate transport variation while avoiding the risk of clogging the sampler bag, sampling time with a Helley-Smith is typically between 30 and 60 s (Glysson, 1993). Emmett (1980) has found that sampler efficiencies drop
off the sampler is 40% full. Otherwise, the sampling time up to 10 min has been used under low-flow conditions (Ashworth and Ferguson, 1980).

These data used for estimation of bed load rate in GP. The measured bed load rating curves for these six sites are illustrated in Figure 2.

![Figure 2 Bed load rating curve](image)

**Table 1 Range of Field Data for Kurau River**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Sites</th>
<th>Discharge, Q (m³/s)</th>
<th>Water surface slope, S₀</th>
<th>Mean Grain Size, d₅₀</th>
<th>Shields’ Parameter for Initiation of Motion, θ</th>
<th>Bed Load Rate, Tᵣ (kg/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ku2</td>
<td>3.99-12.79</td>
<td>0.54-0.82</td>
<td>0.0005-0.007</td>
<td>17-19</td>
<td>3.99-12.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ku6</td>
<td>1.6-6.1</td>
<td>0.5-0.73</td>
<td>0.0007-0.0185</td>
<td>9-10.3</td>
<td>2.87-8.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ku8</td>
<td>0.55-1.32</td>
<td>0.31-0.48</td>
<td>0.0006-0.0096</td>
<td>7-9.2</td>
<td>1.39-2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ku11</td>
<td>0.56-2.59</td>
<td>0.15-1.22</td>
<td>0.001-0.0062</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>1.99-3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ku12</td>
<td>2.32-6.6</td>
<td>0.53-1.56</td>
<td>0.0003-0.0051</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>2.57-9.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ara5</td>
<td>3.99-12.79</td>
<td>0.4-0.69</td>
<td>0.0003-0.0312</td>
<td>11.3-13</td>
<td>1.94-7.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Derivation of bed load models based on GP

A GPTIPS run with the following settings was performed: Population size = 500. Number of generations = 25. Tournament size = 7 (with lexicographic selection pressure), Dₘₐₓ = 3, Gₘₐₓ = 4. Elitism = 0.01 % of population, function node set = {plus, minus, times, protected/}. The default GPTIPS multigene symbolic regression function was used in order to minimize the root mean squared prediction error on the training data. (Searson, 2009b)

The following (default) recombination operator event probabilities were used: Crossover events = 0.85, mutation events = 0.1, direct reproduction = 0.05. The following sub-event probabilities were used: high level crossover = 0.2, low level crossover = 0.8, subtree mutation = 0.9, replace input terminal with another random terminal = 0.05. Gaussian perturbation of randomly selected constant = 0.05 (with standard deviation of Gaussian = 0.1) (Table 2).

The settings are not considered ‘optimal’ in any sense but were based on experience with modelling other data sets of similar size.

In genetic programming, as in any data-driven prediction model, the selection of appropriate model input variables is extremely important. The choice of input variables is generally based on a priori knowledge of causal variables and physical/ecological insight into the problem. Moreover, the use of lagged input variables also leads to better predictions in a dynamical system (Muttill and Lee, 2005).

Four input parameters as variable data including discharge(Q), water surface slope(S₀), mean grain size(d₅₀) and Shields’ parameter for initiation of motion (θ) as variable data and Tᵣ (bed load rate) as invariable data were used in the current study where:

\[ Tᵣ = f(Q, S₀, d₅₀, θ) \]

\[ θ = RS₀/(Gₛ-1)d₅₀ \]  

(1)
Table 2  Multigene GP Range of Initially Defined Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population size</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function set</td>
<td>+, -, *, /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of generations</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum number of genes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum number of nodes per tree</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum depth of trees</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability of GP tree mutation</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability of GP tree cross over</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability of GP tree direct copy</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Results and discussions

Numerous runs were performed with various initial settings and the performance of the developed equation was analyzed for each run. Consequently, the best models were selected according to statistical criteria such as \( R^2 \), RMSE, and MAE. In addition, a comprehensive parametric study was performed to monitor the behavior of each model versus variations of input variables. Figure 3 shows the expression of genes for GP formulation.

Accordingly, the following relationship was selected as the best model for bed load transport:

\[
T_b = 0.03903 x_1 + 0.2587(x_2 + x_4) - 26.29 x_2 x_1 + 0.01781 x_1^2 x_3 - 0.00905
\]  (2)

Where \( T_b \) is bed load transport rate (kg/s) and \( x_i \)'s are defined as cited in Table 3.

Table 3 Definition of Parameters Used in Eq. (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>symbol</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( x_1 )</td>
<td>( Q ) (m³/s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x_2 )</td>
<td>( S_0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x_3 )</td>
<td>( d_{50} ) (mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x_4 )</td>
<td>( \theta )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Precision of the developed equation is examined by plotting the measured versus predicted values of \( T_b \) for training, testing, and all data as shown in (Figure 4), (Figure 5) and (Figure 6), respectively. The values of \( R^2 \), RMSE, and MAE are equal to 0.989, 0.055, and 0.045, respectively, for training sets (Figure 4) and 0.915, 0.090, and 0.069, respectively, for testing sets (Figure 5).

Figure 3 Expression genes for GP formulation
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Figure 4 Measured versus predicted values of \( T_b \) for training data set

Figure 5 Measured versus predicted values of \( T_b \) for testing data set
For all data sets (Figure 6), $R^2$ is equal to 0.961 while RMSE and MAE are equal to 0.082 and 0.060 respectively. Figure 7 illustrates the measured versus predicted values of bed load rate for validation set. The values of $R^2$, RMSE, and MAE for this data set were obtained equal to 0.933, 0.096, and 0.067, respectively. In fact, the evolved model has obtained high accuracy for both testing and validation sets in order to confirm that enough generalization was obtained. Figure 8 shows the frequency of input data, the selected parameter have the same weight of frequency, therefore all parameters affected mostly the same on predicted function of genetic programming.

5 Conclusions

Correct estimation of sediment volume carried by a river is very important for many water resources projects. The prediction of river sediment load also constitutes an important issue in hydraulic engineering. This study presents the prediction of bed load transport in Kurau River in Malaysia by using genetic programming.

The developed model has shown reasonable performance under field conditions according to the verifications demonstrated in Figure 7. From the results of prediction of bed load with $R^2 = 0.96$ and root mean square error (RMSE= 0.082) and mean absolute error (MAE=0.06) respectively, it can be concluded that genetic programming can be used to predict bed load transport rate for Kurau River with only 4 parameters. The simplified equation is recommended as alternative equation for Kurau River in Malaysia for predicts the bed load transport.

References


