

Original Research Article

Reservoir network modelling with alternative reservoir and sediment considerations

ABSTRACT (abstract need rewrite and have to include objective, method and brief result)

Reservoir network for flood control is not complete without sediment transport and provision of alternative reservoir. The inclusion of these two terms in the model reported in [1-3] leads to a formulation that is considered to best describe the behavior of the network. The determination of normal operating height of the alternative reservoir leads to a flexible criteria for reservoir location and pump selection among other considerations.

Keywords: mathematical modelling, reservoir, steady state, nonlinear system of ODE, normal operating height, linearization

1. INTRODUCTION

Mathematical modelling of reservoir for flood control remains a cost effective choice to study the management and control of runoff in this era. The conflicting scenario of scarcity of potable water and flooding requires a huge investment in study of reservoir for water use and flood control. The interplay between the wet and dry season on one hand and effect of global warming on the other hand should therefore be a driving force to invest in sustainable approach to the reservoir management.

The diverse nature of environmental modelling has also made the reservoir management imperative to find a unified approach to its modelling and eventual analysis. The projection of an annual water to be controlled between 9000km³ and 14000km³ as discussed by [4] makes management of reservoirs in term of retention, detention and dams to be a necessity. The continuous industrialization and urbanization have also made most catchment to be more impervious which has increased the volume of runoff [5-8]. This increase has made the catchment impossible for a single reservoir to militate against flooding, rather a network of reservoir [9-11]. The new age has also come with sophistication in weather forecast which makes flood forecasting a near accurate but still flood in on the increase. The missing link is therefore an effective management of runoff for domestic use and flood control.

The work reported in [2] utilizes the laboratory coupled tank approach to model interrelationship between reservoirs in a network for flood control, while the work in [1] determines the normal operating heights of the reservoirs in the network. The stability of the network reported in [3] is achieved through linearization of the nonlinear system. It was found that for a series connection of reservoirs, the Jacobian matrix associated with the linearized system is a tridiagonal diagonally dominant matrix with negative diagonal element. For a hypothetical connection of reservoirs on the other hand, the corresponding Jacobian matrix is only a diagonally dominant. The formal has been proved to be stable [1], while the stability of the later still depends on the matrix entries. The results from [1, 2] consider only water due to runoff which is the reason there is an increase in flood cases, while the sediment consideration in [3] does not include alternative reservoir. The combine effects of increase in rain intensity, short inter event time and long rain event have shown that the control reservoir (retention pond) may reach flood height over a period coupled with continuous sediment inflow. The excess water must be stored in location upland to reduce discharge to the connecting stream thereby preventing downstream from flooding. The model presented in this work therefore introduce alternative reservoir to serve as storage, control of water level and regulate activities in the retention pond.

2. MATHEMATICAL FORMULATION

47

48

49

50

The mathematical model presented in [2], which is modified for discharge through a weir in [1], is

$$51 \quad \left. \begin{aligned} A_j \dot{H}_j &= \begin{cases} 0 & ; H_j > H_j^0 \\ A_{sc_j} I + \sum_{i=\sigma_1}^{\sigma_r} (B_i \sqrt{H_i - H_j}) - B_j \sqrt{H_j - H_k} & ; H_j \leq h_j^0 \end{cases} \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, m-1 \\ A_m \dot{H}_m &= \begin{cases} 0 & ; H_m > H_m^{temp} \\ A_{sc_m} I + \sum_{i=\sigma_1}^{\sigma_r} (B_i \sqrt{H_i - H_m}) - B_m (H_m - H_s)^{3/2} - A_m f & ; H_m \leq h_m^{temp} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \right\}$$

52 and sediment consideration in [3] gives

$$53 \quad A_m \dot{H}_m = \begin{cases} 0 & ; H_m > H_m^{temp} \\ A_{sc_m} I + \sum_{i=\sigma_1}^{\sigma_r} (B_i \sqrt{H_i - H_m}) + T_e K \sum_{i=\sigma_1}^{\sigma_r} (B_i \sqrt{H_i - H_m})^\rho & \\ - B_m H_m^{3/2} - A_m f & ; H_m \leq h_m^{temp} \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

54 The sediment term in (1.2) considers the sediment inflow and the flow out through a weir
 55 does not give any information, where it flows to and the quantity of sediment discharge to the
 56 connecting stream. In order to achieve this, sediment transport in the entire catchment is
 57 captured from the inflow-outflow from the retention pond. The activities in the detention pond
 58 in a close cycle will not affect the formulation since detention pond discharges its entire
 59 content after the rain event. Equation (4.2) is modified on the retention pond to give

$$60 \quad \left. \begin{aligned} A_j \dot{H}_j &= \begin{cases} 0 & ; H_j > H_j^0 \\ A_{sc_j} I + \sum_{i=\sigma_1}^{\sigma_r} (B_i \sqrt{H_i - H_j}) - B_j \sqrt{H_j - H_k} & ; H_j \leq h_j^0 \end{cases} \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, m-1 \\ A_m \dot{H}_m &= \begin{cases} 0 & ; H_m > H_m^{temp} \\ A_{sc_m} I + \sum_{i=\sigma_1}^{\sigma_r} (B_i \sqrt{H_i - H_m}) + K \left[\sum_{i=\sigma_1}^{\sigma_r} (B_i \sqrt{H_i - H_m}) \right]^\rho & \\ - K(1 - T_e) [B_m (H_m - H_s)^{3/2}]^\rho - B_m (H_m - H_s)^{3/2} - A_m f & ; H_m \leq h_m^{temp} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (1.3)$$

61 The difference in the height obtained in (1.3) and (1.1) gives the effective height of retention
 62 pond in the nonlinear form. This height corresponds to the effective volume of the retention
 63 pond.

64

65

66

67

68


69

3. NETWORK MODIFICATION

The network configurations will determine the complexities of the governing equations as the summation sign gives the number of inflow reservoir to the referenced reservoir. In Figure 1, the series reservoir connection shows the number of reservoirs that is the same level of

70 the reservoir, while in the hypothetical reservoir in
 71 number of reservoirs is greater than the levels of the reservoirs.
 72


Figure 2 it shows that the



73

74 **Figure 1: Series Network Connection with 10 reservoirs**

75 The continuous flow of water to the stream especially when the inflow is higher than the
 76 stream discharges, the height of water in the stream continue to rise beyond its normal
 77 operating height. To guard against overflow, diversion of flow from retention pond becomes
 78 necessary as the water height gets to the flood level. This diversion cannot be achieved
 79 through the free flow any longer as the water has to be pumped to the alternative reservoir.
 80 The inflow and outflow of water from the alternative reservoir and the outflow from the
 81 retention pond to the stream and alternative reservoir give a complete formulation. The
 82 inclusion of alternative reservoir is shown in Figure 3.



83

84 **Figure 2: Hypothetical connection with 10 reservoirs**




Figure 3: Complete Network in series and hypothetical Connection with alternative reservoir

Based on the inclusion of the alternative reservoir in both configurations as shown in Fig.3, (1.3) becomes

$$\left. \begin{aligned} A_j \dot{H}_j &= \begin{cases} 0 & ; H_j > H_j^0 \\ A_{w_j} I + \sum_{i=\sigma_1}^{\sigma_j} (B_i \sqrt{H_i - H_j}) - B_j \sqrt{H_j - H_k} & ; H_j \leq h_j^0 \end{cases} \quad j=1,2,\dots,m-1 \\ A_m \dot{H}_m &= \begin{cases} 0 & ; H_m > H_m^{comp} \\ A_{w_m} I + \sum_{i=\sigma_1}^{\sigma_m} (B_i \sqrt{H_i - H_m}) + K \left[\sum_{i=\sigma_1}^{\sigma_m} (B_i \sqrt{H_i - H_m}) \right]^p + B_{A_r} \sqrt{H_{A_r} - H_m} & ; H_m < H_m^{comp} \\ -B_m (H_m - H_s)^{3/2} - A_m f - V_p K_p B_n \sqrt{H_m - H_{Ar}} - K(1-T_v) [B_m (H_m - H_s)^{3/2}]^p & ; H_m < H_m^{comp} \end{cases} \\ A_{A_r} \dot{H}_{A_r} &= \begin{cases} 0 & ; H_{A_r} > H_{A_r}^0 \\ V_p K_p B_n \sqrt{H_m - H_{Ar}} - B_{A_r} \sqrt{H_{A_r} - H_m} & ; H_{A_r} < H_{A_r}^0 \end{cases} \\ A_s \dot{H}_s &= B_m (H_m - H_s)^{3/2} - L_s \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (1.4)$$

Equation (1.4) is a full description of the network with alternative reservoir, the stream and sediment inflow consideration in the network. This can be used to study the entire behavior of the network and each of the parameter that contributes to the complete description of the network.

4. DETERMINATION OF NORMAL OPERATING HEIGHT

~~Here, we aim to~~ study the stability of the system represented by (1.4) which is a general equation for reservoir network with sediment consideration and connecting stream. The steady state heights are the points in which stability of the network will be considered. These heights are the normal operating heights on which stability of the network will be determined. Since the network configuration is dependent on the network topology, the hierarchy of the reservoirs in the network becomes necessary. A series network connection has the level of reservoir in the network the same for the number of reservoirs in the network. But, in a network with multiple reservoir inflows, the levels of the reservoirs are less than the number of reservoirs in the network. The hypothetical network in Fig. 3 has 10

106 reservoirs with 4 level hierarchies. This is a useful proof when studying the optimization of
107 the network.

108 The steady state heights of m connected reservoirs are obtained by solving the system of
109 algebraic equations arising from (1.4) when $dH_j/dt = 0 \quad \forall j$. Starting with reservoirs
110 $j = 1, 2, \dots, m-1$ and considering the first level of reservoirs without inflow from previous
111 reservoir, $i = 0$, (1.4) reduces to

$$112 \quad H_j(s) = \left(\frac{A_{sc_j} I}{B_j} \right)^2 + H_k(s) \quad (1.5)$$

113 For $i \neq 0$, the index of the connected reservoirs changes since the outflow of preceding
114 reservoir is the inflow of the succeeding reservoir, that is, in (1.5), $j := i$, and $k := j$.
115 Substituting (1.5) into (1.4) using the new index we have

$$116 \quad A_{sc_j} I + \sum_{i=\sigma_1}^{\sigma_r} \left(B_i \sqrt{\left(\frac{A_{sc_i} I}{B_i} \right)^2 + H_j - H_k} \right) - B_i \sqrt{H_j - H_k} = 0$$

117 or

$$118 \quad A_{sc_j} I + \sum_{i=\sigma_1}^{\sigma_r} (A_{sc_i} I) - B_i \sqrt{H_j - H_k} = 0$$

119 The term under the summation sign gives all the runoff $A_{sc_i} I$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, m-1$ which
120 flows into reservoir j in addition to $A_{sc_j} I$ for $j = m$ sums up all the runoff from sub-catchment
121 1 to sub-catchment j . Hence, the normal operating height of any reservoir between 1 to $m-1$
122 is

$$123 \quad H_j(s) = \left(\frac{I}{B_j} \sum_{r=1}^j A_{sc_r} \right)^2 + H_k(s) \quad (1.6)$$

124 Substituting (1.6) into (1.4) for $j = m$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & A_{sc_m} I + \sum_{i=\sigma_1}^{\sigma_r} \left(B_i \sqrt{\left(\frac{I}{B_i} \sum_{r=1}^i A_{sc_r} \right)^2 + H_m - H_m} \right) + \\
 & K \left(\sum_{i=\sigma_1}^{\sigma_r} \left(B_i \sqrt{\left(\frac{I}{B_i} \sum_{r=1}^i A_{sc_r} \right)^2 + H_m - H_m} \right) \right)^\rho - \\
 & B_m (H_m - H_s)^{3/2} - K(1 - T_e) \left(B_m (H_m - H_s)^{3/2} \right)^\rho - A_m f = 0
 \end{aligned}$$

where $j := m - 1 = i$ and $k = m = j$ and simplifying gives

$$\begin{aligned}
 & A_{sc_m} I + \sum_{i=\sigma_1}^{\sigma_r} \left(\sum_{r=1}^i A_{sc_r} I \right) + K \left(\sum_{i=\sigma_1}^{\sigma_r} \left(\sum_{r=1}^i A_{sc_r} I \right) \right)^\rho \\
 & - B_m (H_m - H_s)^{3/2} - K(1 - T_e) \left(B_m (H_m - H_s)^{3/2} \right)^\rho - A_m f = 0
 \end{aligned}$$

The inner summation sums up all runoff that flows into reservoirs in the referenced reservoir, the outer summation sums up the runoff that flows into the reservoir m and the runoff due to the sub-catchment m itself. This becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
 & A_{sc_m} I + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \left(A_{sc_i} I \right) + K \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \left(A_{sc_i} I \right) \right)^\rho - B_m (H_m - H_s)^{3/2} \\
 & - K(1 - T_e) \left(B_m (H_m - H_s)^{3/2} \right)^\rho - A_m f = 0
 \end{aligned}$$

which can be simplified as

$$x^\rho + \frac{1}{K(1 - T_e)} x - \frac{AI + K \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \left(A_{sc_i} I \right) \right)^\rho - A_m f}{K(1 - T_e)} = 0 \quad (4.7)$$

$$\text{where} \quad x = B_m (H_m - H_s)^{3/2} \quad (4.8)$$

relying on the value of ρ in [12]. We take $\rho = 2$ (4.7) becomes

$$x^2 + bx - c = 0 \quad (4.9)$$

where

$$b = \frac{e}{(1 - T_e)} \quad \text{and} \quad c = \frac{eAI + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \left(A_{sc_i} I \right) \right)^\rho - eA_m f}{(1 - T_e)}$$



140 Seeking the solution to (4.9), the discriminant must be either $b^2 = 4c$ or $b^2 > 4c$, hence
 141 the general solution is

$$142 \quad x = \frac{-e \pm \sqrt{e^2 - 4(1-T_e) \left(eAI + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} (A_{sc_i} I) \right)^\rho - eA_m f \right)}}{2(1-T_e)} \quad (4.10)$$

143 It can be seen in (4.10) that solution does not exist when trap efficiency is 100%. From (4.8),
 144 the normal operating height for the m^{th} reservoir is

$$145 \quad H_m = \left(\frac{x}{B_m} \right)^{2/3} + H_s \quad (4.11)$$

146 For the alternative reservoir on the other hand, we can see that setting (4.4) to zero we have

$$147 \quad H_{A_r} = H_m + \frac{AI + K \left[\sum_{i=\sigma_1}^{\sigma_r} (A_{sc_i} I) \right]^\rho - L_s - A_m f - K(1-T_e)L_s^\rho}{V_\rho K_\rho B_n - B_{A_r}} \quad (4.12)$$

148 This gives the normal operating height of the alternative reservoir. It should be noted that the
 149 denominator of (4.12) will play an important role in pump selection, that is,
 150 $V_\rho K_\rho B_n - B_{A_r} > 0$ implies that

$$151 \quad V_\rho K_\rho > \frac{B_{A_r}}{B_n} \quad (4.13)$$

152 as well as appropriate value of H_{A_r} , as $V_\rho K_\rho B_n - B_{A_r} \rightarrow 0$, $H_{A_r} \rightarrow \infty$. This criterion
 153 can be used to suite and select the available location of alternative reservoir. Equations (4.6)
 154 , (4.11) and (4.12) will be used to get all the normal operating heights of the reservoirs in the
 155 network.

157 4. DETERMINATION OF STABILITY OF THE NETWORK

158
 159 The normal operating height is the steady state on which the stability of the network relies,
 160 linearizing the nonlinear system (4.4) around the normal operating height. This is done as
 161 follows;

162 For $j = 1, 2, \dots, m-1$

$$163 \quad \left. \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \dot{H}_j}{\partial H_i} &= \sum_{i=\sigma_1}^{\sigma_r} \left(\frac{B_i}{2 A_j \sqrt{H_i^0 - H_j^0}} \right) \\ \frac{\partial \dot{H}_j}{\partial H_j} &= - \frac{\partial \dot{H}_j}{\partial H_i} - \frac{\partial \dot{H}_j}{\partial H_k} \\ \frac{\partial \dot{H}_j}{\partial H_k} &= \frac{B_j}{2 A_j \sqrt{H_j^0 - H_k^0}} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (4.14)$$

164 For $j = m$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \dot{H}_m}{\partial H_i} &= \frac{B_i}{2A_m \sqrt{H_i(s) - H_m(s)}} + \frac{\rho K B_i^\rho (\sqrt{H_i(s) - H_m(s)})^{\rho-2}}{2A_m} \\ \frac{\partial \dot{H}_m}{\partial H_m} &= -\frac{B_i}{2A_m \sqrt{H_i(s) - H_m(s)}} - \frac{\rho K B_i^\rho (\sqrt{H_i(s) - H_m(s)})^{\rho-2}}{2A_m} \\ &\quad - \frac{B_{A_r}}{2A_m \sqrt{H_{A_r}(s) - H_m(s)}} - \frac{3}{2A_m} B_m (H_m(s) - H_s(s))^{2/3} - \frac{V_p K_p B_m}{2A_m \sqrt{|H_m(s) - H_{A_r}(s)|}} \\ \frac{\partial \dot{H}_m}{\partial H_s} &= \frac{3}{2A_m} B_m (H_m(s) - H_s(s))^{2/3} \\ \frac{\partial \dot{H}_m}{\partial H_{A_r}} &= \frac{B_{A_r}}{2A_m \sqrt{H_{A_r}(s) - H_m(s)}} + \frac{V_p K_p B_m}{2A_m \sqrt{|H_m(s) - H_{A_r}(s)|}} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (4.15)$$

For $j = A_r$,

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \dot{H}_{A_r}}{\partial H_m} &= \frac{B_{A_r}}{2A_m \sqrt{H_{A_r}(s) - H_m(s)}} + \frac{V_p K_p B_m}{2A_m \sqrt{|H_m(s) - H_{A_r}(s)|}} \\ \frac{\partial \dot{H}_{A_r}}{\partial H_{A_r}} &= -\frac{B_{A_r}}{2A_m \sqrt{H_{A_r}(s) - H_m(s)}} - \frac{V_p K_p B_m}{2A_m \sqrt{|H_m(s) - H_{A_r}(s)|}} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (4.16)$$

and for $j=s$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \dot{H}_s}{\partial H_m} &= \frac{3}{2A_m} B_m (H_m(s) - H_s(s))^{2/3} \\ \frac{\partial \dot{H}_s}{\partial H_s} &= -\frac{3}{2A_m} B_m (H_m(s) - H_s(s))^{2/3} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (4.17)$$

The associated Jacobian matrix [13-16] is obtained by linearized (4.4) is a combination of (4.14), (4.15), (4.16) and which gives the linearized system which has been shown to be the best linear approximation of the nonlinear system [17, 18].

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \dot{h}_j &= \begin{cases} 0 & ; h_j > h_j^0 \\ \sum_{i=\sigma_1}^{\sigma_r} (\alpha_i + \eta_i) h_i - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\sigma_r} \alpha_i + \eta_i + \nu_j + \beta_j \right) h_j + (\beta_j + \nu_j) h_k & ; h_j \leq h_j^0 \\ j=1,2,\dots,m-1 \end{cases} \\ \dot{h}_m &= \begin{cases} 0 & ; h_m > h_m^{temp} \\ (\alpha_i + \eta_i) h_i - (\alpha_i + \gamma_m + T_e \gamma'_m + \sigma + \delta + \eta_i) h_m + (\sigma + \delta) h_{A_r} + (\gamma_m + T_e \gamma'_m) h_s & ; h_m \leq h_m^{temp} \end{cases} \\ \dot{h}_{A_r} &= \begin{cases} 0 & ; h_{A_r} > h_{A_r}^{\max} \\ (\sigma_{A_r} + \delta_{A_r}) h_m - (\sigma_{A_r} + \delta_{A_r}) h_{A_r} & ; h_{A_r} \leq h_{A_r}^{\max} \end{cases} \\ \dot{h}_s &= \begin{cases} 0 & ; h_s > h_s^{\max} \\ \gamma_s h_m - \gamma_s h_s & ; h_s \leq h_s^{\max} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (4.18)$$

176 Where,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left[\begin{aligned}
 \alpha_i &= \frac{B_i}{2A_j \sqrt{H_i^0 - H_j^0}} ; \beta_j = \frac{B_j}{2A_j \sqrt{H_j^0 - H_k^0}} ; \sigma_m = \frac{V_p K_p B_n}{2A_m \sqrt{H_m^0 - H_{A_r}^0}} \\
 \sigma_{A_r} &= \frac{V_p K_p B_n}{2A_{A_r} \sqrt{H_m^0 - H_{A_r}^0}} ; \gamma_s = \frac{3B_m}{2A_s} (H_m^0 - H_s^0)^{1/2} ; \delta_m = \frac{B_{A_r}}{2A_m \sqrt{H_{A_r}^0 - H_m^0}} \\
 \delta_{A_r} &= \frac{B_{A_r}}{2A_{A_r} \sqrt{H_{A_r}^0 - H_m^0}} ; v_j = \frac{K \rho B_j^\rho (\sqrt{H_j^0 - H_k^0})^{\rho-2}}{2A_j} ; \eta_i = \frac{K \rho B_i^\rho (\sqrt{H_i^0 - H_j^0})^{\rho-2}}{2A_j} \\
 \gamma_m &= \frac{3B_m}{2A_m} (H_m^0 - H_s^0)^{1/2} ; \gamma'_m = \frac{3}{2A_m} \rho K B_m^\rho (H_m^0 - H_s^0)^{\frac{3\rho-2}{2}}
 \end{aligned} \right] \quad (4.19)
 \end{aligned}$$

178 The coefficient matrix associated with (4.18) will produce $(m+1) \times (m+1)$ matrix with the
 179 coefficient given in (4.9) and depends on (4.11) and (4.12). The Jacobian matrix is
 180 then used to test for stability of the network i.e. a stable network in this case shows that the
 181 normal operating heights obtained will guarantee free flow of water in the network. A series
 182 connection will produce a Jacobian matrix that is diagonally dominant tridiagonal matrix with
 183 negative entries. This special feature is of interest in the properties of tridiagonal matrix[1].
 184

185 5. DISCUSSION OF RESULT

186
 187 The extension of the model and results presented in [1, 2] give rise to (4.4) which includes
 188 the introduction of alternative reservoir and sediment inflow in the network. These
 189 considerations make the determination of normal operating height lead to the quadratic
 190 equation (4.9). This is as a result of taking $\rho = 2$ which satisfy $\rho \in [2, 3]$ in [12]. The result
 191 (2) is unique due to flexibility it offers for the selection of the location of the alternative
 192 reservoirs in the face of other reservoir location criterion. Moreover, the criterion (4.4) is
 193 principally useful in selection of appropriate pump specification. Moreover, the stability of the
 194 network is dependent on the catchment parameters as well as the sediment inflow which
 195 affect the normal operating height of the retention pond. A series network has been shown to
 196 produce a diagonally dominant tridiagonal with negative diagonal entries to be negative
 197 definite as a criteria for the stability of the network. This cannot be said of hypothetical
 198 network since the network configuration will determine the Jacobian matrix. The only
 199 information in respect of Jacobian matrix of hypothetical network is negative diagonal
 200 diagonally dominant matrix which either similarity transformation or other conversion can
 201 ascertain its stability properties.
 202

203 6. CONCLUSION

204
 205 A complete model for reservoir network formulation is achieved through system of nonlinear
 206 ODE. This model has set the pace for several studies ranging from stability, control and
 207 optimization of the network for flood management. Specifically, in this work, since $\rho \in [2, 3]$,
 208 there is a need trying $\rho = 3$ which will produce a third order polynomial where appropriate
 209 criteria will be developed for a feasible solution to obtain the normal operating heights. Effort
 210 are on to determine the constants ρ and K from the stability study of the catchment using

inflow characteristics. The result is catchment dependent and must be between $\rho = 2$ and $\rho = 3$ apart from this however, different case studies will eventually give a clear insight into most appropriate choice of ρ .

REFERENCES

1. Abdulrahman, MKA, AA Moh'd Ismail, and SL Kek, *Determination of normal operating heights of reservoirs in a network using non-linear reservoir method*. British Journal Of Applied Science & Technology, 2012. 3(1): p. 34-47.
2. Abdulrahman, MKA, AA Mohd Ismail, and SL Kek, *Modelling of reservoir network for flood control using nonlinear reservoir routing model*. International Journal of Engineering Science and Technology (IJEST), 2012. 4(7): p. 3295-3303.
3. Abdulrahman, MKA, AA Mohd Ismail, and LK Sie, *Effects of sediment inflow on reservoir network for flood control*. International Journal of Mathematics and Applied Statistics, 2013. 45(15): p. 103-110.
4. Ahmed, MS, EZ Saghyroon, ME-S Sherif, M Muna, and G Semunesh, *Assessment of the current state of the Nile basin reservoir sedimentation problems*, in *Nile Basin Capacity Building Network 'NBCBN' River Morphology Research Cluster*, Ahmed S. and K. Gerrit, Editors. 2005.
5. Yiping, G and JA Barry, *Hydrologic analysis of urban catchments with event-based probabilistic models1. Runoff volume*. Water Resources Research, 1998. 34(12): p. 3421-3431.
6. Yiping, G and JA Barry, *Hydrologic analysis of urban catchments with event-based probabilistic models2. Peak discharge rate*. Water Resources Research, 1998. 34(12): p. 3433-3443.
7. Yiping, G and JA Barry, *An analytical probabilistic approach to sizing flood control detention facilities*. Water Resources Research, 1999. 35(8): p. 2457-2468.
8. Yiping, G and JA Barry, *Analysis of detention ponds for storm water quality control*. Water Resources Research, 1999. 35(8): p. 2447-2456.
9. John, WL, *Optimal operation of multireservoir systems: State-of-the-art review*. Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management, 2004. 130(2).
10. Quentin, BT and WM Larry, *Optimizing retention basin networks*. Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management, 2008. 134(5): p. 432-439.
11. Us Army Corps of Engineers, *Reservoir sedimentation*. Flood & Coastal Storm Damage Reduction R&D Program, 2010.
12. Vaibhav, G and V Jothiprakash, *Estimation of useful life of a reservoir using sediment trap efficiency*. Journal of Spatial Hydrology, 2008. 8(2): p. 1-14.
13. Zoran, G, *Linearization of nonlinear systems*.
14. Marsden, JE, L Sirovich, M Golubitsky, W Jäger, and F John, eds. *Differential equations and their applications: An introduction to applied mathematics*. Fourth ed. Texts in applied mathematics 11, ed. Braun M. 1992, springer.
15. Tin-Zhu, H, *A note on generalized diagonally dominant matrices*. LINEAR ALGEBRA AND ITS APPLICATIONS, 1995: p. 237-240.
16. Yi-Ming, G and W Xiao-Hui, *Criteria for generalized diagonally dominant matrices and m-matrices. II*. LINEAR ALGEBRA AND ITS APPLICATIONS, 1996. 248: p. 339-353.
17. Vidyasagar, M, *Nonlinear system analysis*. 1993, Englewood Cliff, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
18. Hassan, KK, *Nonlinear systems*. 2002, Upper Saddle: Prentice Hall.
19. Andelic, M and CM Dafonseca, *Sufficient conditions for positive definiteness of tridiagonal matrices revisited*. Positivity, 2011. 15(1): p. 5.

