

1 **Closure to “Local Scour Mechanism around**
2 **Dynamically Active Marine Structures in**
3 **Noncohesive Sediments and Unidirectional Current”**

4 M. Al-Hammadi¹ and R. R. Simons²

5 ¹Ph.D., Dept. of Civil, Environmental and Geomatic Engineering, Univ. College London, WC1E 6BT London, U.K.
6 (corresponding author). E-mail: mohammed.al-hammadi.13@ucl.ac.uk

7 ²Professor of Fluid Mechanics and Coastal Engineering, Dept. of Civil, Environmental and Geomatic Engineering, Univ.
8 College London, WC1E 6BT London, U.K. E-mail: r.r.simons@ucl.ac.uk

9 **Discussion:** by Dawei Guan and Yee-Meng Chiew: WWENG-1562R1

10 **Closure:** The discussers and the writers agree that the effects of structural movement need to be
11 considered when estimating seabed scour around monopile foundations. This applies both to self-
12 excited and forced motions. However, the discussers understate the main contribution of the paper as
13 “additional data supplementing understanding of vibration effects”, whereas the paper introduces a new
14 mechanism that is capable of generating scour depths significantly greater than reported by previous
15 authors and predicted by conventional approaches. This mechanism is caused by repeated periods of
16 structural movement interspersed with periods without motion, as is experienced by offshore structures
17 subject to a series of winter storms.

18 The discussion states that structural vibration can steepen the slope of the scour hole and reduce scour
19 depth. It is important to correct this statement: evidence from previous authors and in the present paper
20 shows that vibration causes the slope to be shallower.

21 The writers are grateful to the discussers for referring to the sub-surface convective cells which are an
22 integral part of the processes controlling the slope and lateral extent of the scour hole around a monopile
23 subject to structural movement. A similar process of sub-surface movement was also observed by one
24 of the writers (Al-Hammadi, 2018) in tests performed on rock armour around monopile foundations

25 undergoing forced movement. In these laboratory tests, the rock elements acted as tracers, showing the
26 extent of the sub-surface cells.

27 The discussers mention the effects of densification. Tests done by the writers and reported in the paper
28 (figure 2 of the original paper) suggest that densification does have the initial effect of slowing the rate
29 of scour development. However, it had no effect on the equilibrium depth of scour.

30 The 2-stage tests commented on in the discussion led to a 10% increase in scour depth and were a
31 crucial step in understanding the processes of scour with and without structural movement, in particular,
32 the increase in lateral extent of the scour hole. However, it is the repetition of the 2-stage tests, as shown
33 in figure 5 and figure 6 of the original paper, that demonstrates the far greater scour depth (>20% in the
34 present tests) that could occur during a series of storms.

35 The writers agree that measurement of the flow dynamics within the scour hole around a dynamic
36 monopile could provide a better understanding of the mechanisms explained in the present paper. The
37 possibility of turbulence being enhanced by the vibrations and structural movement is an interesting
38 concept. Whitehouse and Damgaard (2000) investigated the effects of externally generated turbulence
39 on sediment dynamics and showed that shear stresses can increase significantly, offering the potential
40 for scour to be enhanced by this process.

41 The discussers raise the challenging issue of scale and the various parameters requiring conflicting
42 scaling relationships to reproduce prototype conditions in an experimental model. The paper does not
43 claim to give an accurate description of field conditions to scale. It describes laboratory tests performed
44 at two different scales and demonstrates that similar results are observed in both cases. However, the
45 writers agree that field scale observations are desirable to confirm the range of applicability of the
46 mechanism described in the paper.

47 Finally, the writers agree with the discussers that the processes described in the paper as relevant to
48 marine structures will apply equally to river flows around bridge piers.

49

50 **References**

51 Al-Hammadi, M.R.S.A. 2018 “Scour and scour protection around dynamically active marine
52 structures.” Ph.D. thesis, Department of Civil, Environmental and Geomatic Engineering, UCL (Univ.
53 College London).

54 Whitehouse, R. and J. Damgaard. 2000. “Assessing bed stability at coastal structures with external
55 turbulence.” In 27th Int. Conf. on Coastal Engineering, edited by B. L. Edge, 3008–3020. Reston, VA:
56 ASCE.