

human activities such as deforestation and water diversion might cause sedimentation or erosion in coastal regions. Such sediment-related problems could be more serious in the future because of further dam construction, climate variability, and deforestation (Walling, 2011; Zarfl et al., 2014). Currently, river basins in Southeast Asia have serious soil erosion potential and excessive sedimentation. They are also experiencing dramatic land surface changes, such as forest clearing, reservoir construction, and hydropower construction and water diversion (Tacio, 1993), because of rapid population and economic growth in the region (Walling, 2009).

A wide range of models exists for simulating erosion and sediment transport. These models differ in terms of complexity, processes considered, and the data required for model calibration and model use (Roberto et al., 2012). In general, there is no “best” model for all applications. The most appropriate model will depend on intended use, spatial scale, and characteristics of the catchment being considered. The Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) (Wischmeier and Smith, 1978) and its revised version (RUSLE) (Renard and Freimund, 1994) are widely used as tools for empirical assessment of soil erosion. Both USLE and RUSLE account for sediment eroded from the catchment in the long term (e.g., for 20 years). In these empirical equations, however, the deposition of sediment is not considered to occur in the modeled area.

A number of process-based soil erosion and sediment transport models have also been developed, but those applications are limited to individual storm events and small (max. 2.6 km²) catchments (Duna et al., 2009). The Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) was designed for application to large river basins and long-term simulations (Arnold et al., 1998) and has been implemented in river basins of over 4000 km² (Santhi et al., 2001). It is a semi-distributed conceptual model, capable of daily simulation using hydrologic response units as the basic computational unit to group input information about combinations of land use and soil land management (Neitsch et al., 2002). However, semi-distributed models like SWAT do not generally incorporated with a fine resolution of spatial information, such as land use and soil information which are dominant factors affecting on soil erosion. Thus, effective river basin management

6757

requires the development of process-based models to estimate the effects of the soil erosion rate, sediment transport, and deposition at specific locations and especially in large river basins.

Process-based models are based on the solutions of fundamental physical equations describing stream flow and sediment production in a river basin. They represent the physical processes observed in the real world, such as surface runoff, subsurface flow, ground flow, and evapotranspiration. Process-based models provide several major advantages over empirical and conceptual model, including capabilities for estimating spatial and temporal distributions of net soil loss (or gain, in the case of deposition) for an entire hillslope or for each point on a hillslope. Further, process-based models can estimate sediment simulation on a daily, monthly, or an average annual basis. Since these models are process-based, they can also be seasonally interpolated and extrapolated to some extent to a broad range of conditions, including some conditions that might be difficult to measure with field testing. Given the complexity of the relationships affecting sediment dynamics, it is important to develop a robust process-based model of sediment dynamics that can be used to predict the consequences of natural systems as well as human-induced environmental changes and impacts, especially in large catchments.

This study aimed to develop a process-based distributed model that can simulate the sediment dynamic process at a large basin scale. The feasibility of the model was confirmed in large catchments (i.e., > 100 000 km²) of Southeast Asia. The sediment model continuously simulates the sedimentary process, including erosion and sediment transport. Hydrologic data, soil type, land use, and topography were used as input data. Soil loss and its transport process were coupled with an existing distributed hydrological model to create a comprehensive sediment assessment tool for large catchments in Southeast Asia. The sediment model separately simulated deposition and detachment in rivers, which have not been considered in most existing models. This paper also describes applications of the sediment model in two large river

6758

basins in Southeast Asia: the Chao Phraya and Mekong River basins. The two basins are characterized by different soil properties and hydrogeology.

2 Model structure

The important processes of sediment dynamics (soil erosion, sediment transport, and deposition) were modeled and integrated with a process-based distributed hydrological model (DHM) (Fig. 1). In the sediment model, sediment dynamics on hillslopes and rivers were separately modeled and systematically linked each other. The sediment model was developed using FORTRAN to create a compatible link to the adopted distributed hydrological model. The runoff and river routing were incorporated within the sediment model. Hydrological and sediment-related processes were calculated on a daily time-step. The overall model was designed to target suspended sediment load (SSL), because suspended sediment (SS) is dominant portion of the transported sediment in many of the world's rivers (Ongley, 1996), and it is frequently assumed that the suspended load makes up about 90 % of the total load in the world (Milliman and Meade, 1983).

2.1 Hydrological model

The distributed hydrological model used in this study is a geomorphology-based hydrological model (GBHM) developed by Yang et al. (2001). It solves the continuity, momentum, and energy equations using two modules: hillslope module and river routing module.

In the GBHM, the target watershed is divided into grids, and a digital elevation model (DEM) is used to determine the flow direction and accumulation pattern that creates the river network. Each subbasin is divided into a number of flow intervals. In the subbasins, flow intervals are defined as a function of distance from the subbasin's outlet. Lateral flow to the main stream estimated by accumulating runoff at each grid

6759

in one hillslope unit. This means that all hillslopes of a flow interval drain into the main stream in this model. The flow interval–hillslope system enabled the GBHM to realize a fast flow computation even in a large basin. The hillslope unit is viewed as a rectangular inclined plane with a defined length and unit width. The inclination angle is given by the corresponding surface slope.

In the hillslope model, each grid is divided into four layers: canopy, soil surface, unsaturated zone, and groundwater. Vegetation covered the surface soil and prevented direct rainfall onto the land. The deficit of canopy interception is calculated by vegetation coverage and leaf area index. The evapotranspiration module simulated the water volume that evaporated from the surface soil and transpired from the canopy, where pan observation could also be used. In the module, Priestley–Taylor's method was applied for the canopy water storage, root zone, surface storage, and soil surface. In order to describe the unsaturated zone water flow, a vertical one-dimensional Richards equation is used with soil infiltration rate and soil moisture contents in the root zone. Saturated water flow and exchange with the river is described using basic mass balance equations and Darcy's Law. The simulation module of surface water flow estimated the infiltration excess and saturation excess discharging into the river system as lateral flow.

In the river routing system, the Pfafstetter numbering system is applied to track water flow efficiently from upper to downstream. The water routing on the river network is determined along the river stream using one-dimensional kinematic wave equations. Further details are described by Yang et al. (2001).

2.2 Sediment model

2.2.1 Soil detachment

Soil detachment by raindrop impacts was estimated by Eq. (1) (Torri et al., 1987).

$$D_R = (1 - C_g)kEe^{-zh}, \quad (1)$$

6760

version2_1/SRTM3/). The model has 90 m spatial resolution. In the study area, the resolution was aggregated to 1 km for simulation. Soil type classification relied on the Digital Soil Map of the World (version 3.6) from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO/UN). The dominant soil is clay and sand in the upper region and sandy silt in the lower region. Land use data (2001) were obtained from the Land Development Department of Thailand (<http://www.ldd.go.th/>). The land use categories are paddy field, farm land, forest, grassland, bare land, urban area, and water body. Daily precipitation data were collected from two kinds of rain gauge network systems. The first is open-source rain gauge network data provided by the Hydrology and Water Management Center for the upper northern region of the Royal Irrigation Department (RID). The other is managed by the Thai Meteorological Department (TMD). Both data sources have daily temporal resolution. Daily dam operational data such as water level, storage, inflow, and outflow (release) for the Sirikit Dam and Bhumibol Dam were gathered from RID and the Electricity Generating Authority of Thailand (E-GAT).

River discharge and SSL were calibrated and validated in combination with dam operation for the period from 2001 to 2010 at four stream gauges in the upper region (P73-Ping River, W3A-Wang River, Y37-Yom River, and N13A-Nan River) and one stream gauge in the outlet (C2-Chao Phraya River) (Fig. 2). Taking into account the availability of data, the monthly river discharge and SSL data for 2001 were used for the calibration model at all five stream gauges, whereas the observation data from 2002–2010 were used for validation. For the parameter calibration, a semi-automatic calibration method was used. It was the Shuffled Complex Evolution (SCE) algorithm (Duan et al., 1992). It was implemented in 2001 to identify suitable parameters. The dominant factors affecting the hydrological process and soil erosion, such as land use and soil characteristics, were considered for parameter calibration, as listed in Table 1. As for parameters related to sediment transport and soil erosion, the FAO global soil dataset was used to consider spatial distribution of soil properties. The parameters of sediment detachability from rain drop (k) and from sheet flow (K_f) in the basin were calibrated respectively based on the observed SSL at Khong Chiam. Soil cohesion

6767

(J) was determined in each subbasin. In the sediment model, the sediment particle size (d_{50}) was assumed to be 50 μm based on the suspended sediment distribution in a river near Chiang Mai (unpublished data). To demonstrate the applicability of the proposed model, the model was calibrated and validated with two efficiency criteria: the Nash–Sutcliffe efficiency coefficient (NSE) and correlation coefficients (r) for 2001–2010. Lastly, the eleven soil types in the Chao Phraya Basin were reclassified into three types: clay, sand, and silt.

3.1.2 Results and discussion of model performance

The monthly calibration for the hydrological and sediment process was implemented with SCE in Chao Phraya in 2001 (Table 1). The parameters for sediment (k , J) were calibrated to be larger than the reported values (Morgan et al., 1998), but they are within the reasonable range for the Chao Phraya River Basin (Bhattarai and Dutta, 2005).

Model evaluation revealed that the river discharge simulation performed satisfactorily, as shown by NSE and r in Table 2 (refer to Fig. A1 for hydrographs). The values of NSE and r at P73 were closer to 1 than in other drainage basins and were the lowest at C2 among the gauges. The reason for the lowest NSE occurring at the downstream gauge is related to the flooding situation in the Chao Phraya River Basin. Normally, the river discharge overflows every year during rainy season in the lower region because the discharge capacity around C2 is low. Therefore, the overestimated discharge is likely to overflow to land in real situations. Moreover, the average slope is 1.3% in the lower basin, whereas it is 3.1% in the upper mountainous region where surface water can inflow smoothly to the river channel. Thus, the condition lengthens retardation time and river discharge gets stuck in the lower regions. In addition, water withdrawal for irrigation canals, which was not modeled in this study, also has an effect on the lowest hydrological simulation in the lower region.

Regarding SSL, NSE for all stream gauges was larger than 0.5 except at C2 (Table 2). The simulation results captured the high peak of SSL during rainy season,

6768

as shown in Fig. 3. Overall, the performance of the model in the Chao Phraya River Basin indicated sufficient accuracy for long-term simulation (Table 2). The results from C2, located at the lowest reach, were not as good as in other stream gauges. At C2, the results indicate underestimation, even though the total simulated river discharge at the lower reach was overestimated and supposedly resulted in higher simulated SSL in the lower reach than in the upper reach. However, it appears the simulation error may have been larger at the lower reach because of accumulating uncertainty. The average total annual SSL was estimated to be $1.28 \times 10^6 \text{ tyr}^{-1}$ showing a ten-year increase from 5.72×10^6 to $8.10 \times 10^6 \text{ tyr}^{-1}$. This estimate was slightly lower than the reported estimate of the average total annual SSL in the Chao Phraya River Basin ($11 \times 10^6 \text{ tyr}^{-1}$), as reported by FAO/AGL (2005). The different locations of the control points could be a reason for these different estimates of SSL.

It is inferred that the process of soil loss was strongly influenced by rainfall intensity. This was clearly shown by the simulated SSL at the Nan River (Fig. 3), where rainfall is higher (1341.8 mm) than at other tributaries. In contrast, the simulated SSL was lowest at the Wang River due to that area having the lowest annual average rainfall (1181.3 mm). Walling (2009) reported that the annual SSL in Chao Phraya declined from around $28 \times 10^6 \text{ tyr}^{-1}$ in the 1960s and early 1970s to around $6 \times 10^6 \text{ tyr}^{-1}$ in the 1990s. In this study, the average annual SSL was estimated to be $1.28 \times 10^6 \text{ tyr}^{-1}$ over 10 years based on simulation in the 2000s. In fact, the observed SSL shows a decreasing trend with a decline in annual runoff, primarily reflecting the trapping of sediment by a large number of small dams and irrigation structures and also by the larger Bhumibol and Sirikit dams (Walling, 2009). But for the 10 years targeted in this study, the observed SSL at C2 shows no decreasing trend. Nevertheless, climate change, population growth, land clearance, land use change, reservoir construction, and other infrastructure development can be expected to cause some changes in the SSL over the longer-time scale of 50 years in large river basins like the Mekong River Basin (Walling, 2011).

6769

The simulated SSC also shows good correlations with observed data at all upper stream gauges, indicated by r larger than 0.5 except at the watershed outlet, C2 (Table 2). Possible errors in simulated SSC at the outlet could be related to river discharge simulation. The overall average relative mean square error (RMSE) between simulated and observed SSC ranged from 0.07 to 0.09 kg m^{-3} in the upper basins (P73, W3A, Y37, and N13A) and 0.09 kg m^{-3} in the outlet, C2. Basically, we confirmed two peaks every year in both observed and simulated SSC in four stream gauges: P73, W3A, Y37, and N13A (Fig. 4). The first peak occurred in May, which is the beginning of the rainy season. Beginning in June, the concentration fell while river discharge increased from the upper stream, due to the starting rainy season. The second peak occurred in the main monsoon periods (August, September, and October), which have heavy rainfall that increases the volume of river discharge.

3.1.3 Sensitivity of SSL to sediment-related parameters

The sensitivity of modeled SSL was also investigated for the reasonable ranges of the input parameters. The target parameters for this sensitivity analysis were soil detachability from rain drop (k), soil detachability from sheet flow (K_f), and soil cohesion (J). The target period for this analysis was one year 2005 at P73.

First, results were obtained by changing the detachability of soil (k) from 7.0 (for clay and silt) and 9.1 (for sand) (g J^{-1}) by +50, -50, and -75% from those calibrated values. The theoretical range of this soil detachability index is $0.01\text{--}10 \text{ g J}^{-1}$, where the minimum is for clay, and the maximum is for sand (Gumiere et al., 2009; Morgan et al., 1998; Morgan, 2001). The peak of SSL increased as the detachability increased (Fig. 5a). The calibrated parameter k for dominant clay soil (7.0 g J^{-1}) was larger than one for the dominant sandy soil in the Chao Phraya River Basin (3.5 g J^{-1} , Bhattarai and Dutta, 2005) and one for a wide range of soil texture that are commonly used for agriculture in Europe (2.0 g J^{-1} , Morgan et al., 1998). Basically, the soil detachability is associated with soil texture, showing a higher detachability with a lower clay content. Thus, soils having a high clay content are difficult to detach by raindrops (Sharma

6770

land use data for nine classes and the soil data for eight classes. Daily precipitation and air temperature data from 65 station weather stations were obtained from the Mekong River Commission (MRC).

Annual records of river discharge and SSC in the study were extracted from the historical record published by the MRC (Mekong River Commission, 2005). The historical record tabulated measurements of river discharge, SSC, water quality, and other physical characteristics at gauging stations located along the Mekong River Basin and those of the river's tributaries. In this study, river discharge and SSC records from the three targeted stations were identified and used to calibrate and validate SSL simulation. The stations were selected based on their relative locations and the completeness of river discharge and sediment records at the station. Unlike river discharge, which was measured daily, SSC was monitored monthly. SSC samples were collected near the surface of the river (0.3 m depth) in the middle of the main stream (MRC, 2000). In this study, monthly observed SSL was computed from the monthly measured SSC and the corresponding measured daily river discharge.

The river discharge and SSL were simulated by considering an existing dam in the Chinese section of the main stream (Manwan Dam). The model simulated river discharge, SSL, and SSC for 10 years from 1991 to 2000, and three stream gauges along the main stream were adopted for calibration and validation (Fig. 6). The daily river discharge and sediment data for the period from 1991 to 1995 were used for calibration, whereas the data from 1996 to 2000 were used for validation. For the sediment particle size (d_{50}), 50 μm were adopted in this study area because all the sediment is commonly < 62 μm in diameter (i.e., silt and clay), and sediments less than 2 μm make up 45% of the section near Vientiane (Ahlgren and Hessel, 1996). The five parameters shown in Table 1 were initialized with empirical values and then calibrated according to the observed river discharge and SSL at the three gauges. All the parameters were calibrated by SCE (Duan et al., 1992). Observation at Chiang Sean was used for calibration of parameters that reflect only the upper basin, whereas observation at Khong Chiam was used for calibration for the middle basin and

6773

observation at Phnom Penh was used for the lower basin. The fit between simulated and observed results (river discharge and SSL) was evaluated using the NSE (Nash and Sutcliffe, 1970) and correlation coefficients (r) at monthly intervals from 1991 to 2000.

3.2.2 Results and discussion of model performance

The river discharge of the Mekong was well simulated at all three stations (Table 3) (refer to Fig. B1 for hydrographs). The NSE values for river discharge at Chiang Sean, Khong Chiam and Phnom Penh were larger than 0.7 for calibration and validation from 1991 to 2000. The average correlation r between observation and simulation discharge was equally high ($r > 0.8$). These indicators imply the GBHM satisfactorily describes the seasonal cycle and spatial distribution of the hydrology processes in the Mekong River Basin, although the simulated discharge showed slightly higher peaks.

For the sediment model, we calibrated the same parameters as in the Chao Phraya River basin. In the Mekong River, wider ranges were determined for k and K_f , whereas the range of J narrowed slightly due to different physical characteristic such as topography (e.g., rill, interill, and gully) and structure of soil (e.g., erodibility and type of soil content). For example, the range of k for the Mekong (7.0–100.0 kg J^{-1}) is wider than that for the Chao Phraya (7.0–9.1 kg J^{-1}) (Table 1). This is probably because of the soil structure and content. The Chao Phraya River Basin is mostly covered with sandy soil, which can be easily detached. In contrast, the Mekong River Basin is dominantly covered by clay soil. This may be why SSL is not sensitive to k , and k is not important for sediment yield in the Mekong River Basin.

Figure 7 shows the simulated results of monthly SSL compared with measurements at three gauging stations from 1991 to 2000. The simulated results are in good agreement with observations, as summarized in Table 3. NSE was larger than 0.6 for the upper, middle, and lower stations in the calibration (1991–1995) and validation (1996–2000) periods, except in the case of the validation period for the upper station (Chiang Sean) (NSE = 0.51). The model simulation underestimated at the upper

6774

(Chiang Sean) station (Fig. 7), and this error may have been caused by the effect of the Manwan Dam on the main stream in the upper basin of the Mekong River Basin (Lu and Siew, 2006). Nevertheless, the linear correlation coefficient (r) between simulated and observed SSL was in the range of 0.80–0.86 for all three stations. Generally, the SSL was fairly well simulated at the three stations (Fig. 7). The simulated results describe the seasonal pattern of SSL in the Mekong River Basin, and higher SSL is expected during the rainy season, as described also by Walling (2008). The model results reveal that, for the entire period of 1991–2000, the average annual SSL values were the highest ($8.9 \times 10^7 \text{ tyr}^{-1}$) at the middle region, whereas the upper and lower regions showed average annual SSL values of 3.4×10^7 and $5.6 \times 10^7 \text{ tyr}^{-1}$, respectively. Walling (2009) reported that the annual SSL is high in the middle region before increasing further downstream. Our simulated results also showed higher SSL in the middle region (i.e., Khong Chiam station) than in other regions. This is probably due to the large tributary drainage area. The annual SSL at Lower Mekong (after the Chinese boundary, including the middle region) tends to increase as basin area increases.

The simulated total annual SSL at Phnom Penh fluctuated over the period 1991–2000 (average = $6.86 \times 10^7 \text{ tyr}^{-1}$). This study shows a 57% lower SSL than the reported average annual SSL ($16.0 \times 10^7 \text{ tyr}^{-1}$) (FAO/AGL, 2005). Lu and Siew (2006) reported the average annual SSL for the period 1962–2003 in the Mekong River Basin was about $14.5 \times 10^7 \text{ tyr}^{-1}$ based on rating curve estimation. The difference in SSL between those reports and our estimate here is probably due to the different locations of the control stations. In FAO/AGL (2005), SSL was estimated for the whole Mekong River Basin area, including the Mekong delta. This study covered only the area to Phnom Penh. In addition, different methods for SSL estimation could explain the variances.

The monthly SSC simulation at the stream gauging stations for the period 1991–2000 is shown in Fig. 8. The correlation coefficient r was larger than 0.5 between monthly observed and simulated SSC at the three gauging stations (Table 3). The overall

6775

average RMSE between the observed and simulated SSC was 0.31 at Chiang Sean, 0.25 at Khong Chiam and 0.14 kg m^{-3} at Phnom Penh. The results reveal a decreasing trend in the SSC along the three regions from upstream to the downstream (Fig. 8). The average monthly SSC was the highest at Chiang Sean station (estimated to be 0.33 kg m^{-3}). The average SSC was lowest at Phnom Penh (estimated to be 0.13 kg m^{-3}). The low value at Phnom Penh was due to the sediment deposition in the lower region. This trend was due to the decrease in the main stream water velocity, which promotes sediment deposition and decreases SSC. In fact, a decreasing trend in mean monthly SSC was observed along the entire length of the Mekong River since water quality measurement began in 1985 (Lu and Siew, 2006). The model results also show that the SSC was higher in the rainy season (July, August, and September) than the dry season at all three stations (Fig. 8). This is due to the intensive soil erosion mainly caused by heavy precipitation in the rainy season. The high simulated SSC in July at the upper station showed a good agreement with the observed SSC, which recorded the highest concentrations occurring early in rainy season, in mid-July. After mid-August, the observed SSC began to decline, continuing to decline through early September. This trend matches the simulated SSC trend, which showed a decline in August and September.

3.2.3 Sensitivity of SSL to sediment-related parameters

A sensitivity analysis was applied for SSL in the Mekong River Basin in the same manner as in the Chao Phraya River Basin. First, all the parameters were set to calibrated values, which were $k = 7 \text{ g J}^{-1}$, $K_f = 1 \text{ mg m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, and $J = 3 \text{ kPa}$. The same factor was used in the Mekong River Basin and Chao Phraya River Basin in order to compare the sensitivity of the parameters for SSL in the both basins. The SSL was simulated at Khong Chiam station for all the parameters in 1999.

The results revealed that SSL increases slightly in September when k decreases by 50% from the initial (Fig. 9a). In addition, the peak SSL kept increasing and showed smaller changes with further decreases (at a factor of 25%) from the initial value. Thus,

6776

in the Mekong River Basin, SSL is less sensitive to k than in the Chao Phraya River Basin. The subtle response of SSL for different k implies that soil strength and clay content are not important, although studies of soil strength for the different group soils of sands, loams, and clays (Sharma, 1999) show that k decreases as soil strength increases. Such results from a sensitivity analysis suggest that soil detachment by raindrop contributes little to SSL generation in the Mekong River Basin.

Regarding K_f , the peaks in SSL in 1999 decreased by 40% with the multiplying a factor of 100% (Fig. 9b) due to the increase of soil detachability from sheet flow. The simulated SSL also drastically decreased with decreasing K_f (with factors 0.1 and 0.01). The simulated SSL reveals the opposite trends from that reported by Bhattarai and Dutta (2005), who found the simulated SSL peaks from August to October increased with increasing K_f values (0.4 to 0.6 $\text{mg m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$). This result implies that soil detached from sheet flow is important input for SSL transport in the river in the Mekong River Basin. The literature does not contain conclusive results on the sensitivity range of K_f (Lukey et al., 2000; Bathurst et al., 2002). For example, sediment modeling using K_f with a small range from 0.0019 to 0.0045 $\text{mg m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ in New Zealand (Russell and Sandy, 2006) showed the inverse trend of the result shown in Mekong for the same range, where the simulated SSL increased with increasing K_f .

The analysis of soil cohesion (J) shows that the SSL peak in September increases by 150% with a factor of 1.25 for J (Fig. 9c). In contrast, the SSL peak decreases by 70 and 80% by decreasing the soil cohesion factor by 0.75 and 0.5, respectively. The change in SSL is more sensitive to soil cohesion than k and K_f , as soil cohesion indicates soil detachability within rivers. In the equations for net soil detachment in rivers (Eqs. 9 and 10), soil cohesion limits the detachment of sediment. Soil cohesion is recognized to be related to erodibility, and no unique relationship exists even for a single size of soil (Govers et al., 1990).

The three input parameters that describe soil erodibility have a significant influence on the output of SSL. Generally, soil cohesion (J) is the most sensitive parameter in both river basins. The SSL change was sensitive to soil detachability over land (K_f) in

6777

the Mekong, whereas SSL change was more sensitive to detachability by raindrop (k) in the Chao Phraya.

4 Conclusion

In this study, a physically-based model of sediment transport targeting a large basin scale was developed and coupled with a distributed hydrological model. The model enables us to simulate rainfall-runoff processes and sediment transport on hillslope and within a river network. In its application to the Chao Phraya River and Mekong River basins, the sediment dynamics (i.e., yield and erosion) were reasonably simulated in hillslope areas. As it is a grid-based model, it can identify locations of serious sediment dynamics by a fine grid scale. Moreover, the present model applications estimated soil cohesion (J) and detachability (k , K_f) in the Chao Phraya and Mekong rivers, and revealed the high sensitivity of SSL to soil detachability (k , K_f) in both basins.

However, the present model assumed a single SS size instead of a wide range of SS sizes, due to limited information in both case studies. Thus, insufficient modeling of SS size distribution might have limited the applicability of the sediment model in the case studies. Therefore, the model performance may be further improved by incorporating multi-size sediment particles into the model. Uncertainties in terms of model inputs, parameters and structure may also have influenced the simulation results. For example, the estimation of net sediment detachment (Eq. 9) could be improved by revising the equations. Currently, this equation (Eq. 9) assumed that the soil particles were detached (limitation to deposition) and limited by factors such as soil cohesion. Thus, this equation should be improved by considering the reasonable balance between erosion and deposition, especially for river basins. Sediment management in river basins is highly affected by both processes.

Nevertheless, the outputs from this model at the basin scale may provide useful information to developers, decision makers, and other stakeholders when planning and implementing appropriate basin-wide sediment management strategies, which

6778

- MRC: Lower Mekong Hydrologic Yearbook, Mekong River Comm., Phnom Penh, 2000.
 MRC: Annual report 2005 [CD-ROM], Mekong River Comm., Vientiane, Mekong, 2005.
 Milliman, J. D. and Meade, R. H.: World-wide delivery of river sediment to the oceans, *J. Geol.*, 91, 1–21, 1983.
- 5 Morgan, R. P. C.: A simple approach to soil loss prediction: a revised Morgan–Morgan–Finney model, *Catena*, 44, 305–322, 2001.
- Morgan, R. P. C., Quinton, J. N., Smith, R. E., Govers, G., Poesen, W. A., Auerswald, K., Chisci, G., Torri, D., and Styczen, M. E.: The European Soil Erosion Model (EU-ROSEM): a dynamic approach for predicting sediment transport from fields and small catchments, *Earth Surf. Proc. Land.*, 23, 527–544, 1998.
- 10 Nash, J. E. and Sutcliffe, J. V.: River flow forecasting through, Part I: A conceptual models discussion of principles, *J. Hydrol.*, 10, 282–290, 1970.
- Nearing, M. A., Jetten, V., Baffaut, C., Cerdan, O., Couturier, A., Hernandez, M., Bissonnais, L. Y., Nichols, M. H., Nunes, J. P., Renschler, C. S., Souchere, V., and Oost, K. V.: Modeling response of soil erosion and runoff to changes in precipitation and cover, *Catena*, 61, 131–154, 2005.
- 15 Neitsch, S. L.: Soil and Water Assessment Tool User's Manual Version 2000, SWRL Report 202, Texas Water Resources Institute, College Station, Texas, 02–06, 2002.
- Ongley, E.: Sediment measurement, in: *Water Quality Monitoring, Design and Implementation of Fresh Water Quality Studies and Monitoring Programmes*, chap. 13, World Health Organization, Geneva, 301–315, 1996.
- 20 Ponce, V. M.: *Engineering Hydrology: Principles and Practices*, vol. 640, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall, 1989.
- Rauws, G. and Govers, G.: Hydraulic and soil mechanical aspects of rill generation on agricultural soils, *J. Soil Sci.*, 39, 111–124, 1988.
- 25 Renard, K. G. and Freimund, J. R.: Using monthly precipitation data to estimate the R-factor in the revised USLE, *J. Hydrol.*, 157, 287–306, 1994.
- Roberto, R., Thanh, H., and Maria, C.: A RUSLE approach to model suspended sediment load in the Lo river (Vietnam): effects of reservoirs and land use changes, *J. Hydrol.*, 422–423, 17–29, 2012.
- 30 Russell, A. and Sandy, E.: Physically based modeling of sediment generation and transport under a large rainfall simulator, *Hydrol. Process.*, 20, 2253–2270, 2006.

6781

- Santhi, C., Arnold, J. G., Williams, J. R., Dugas, W. A., Srinivasan, R., and Hauck, L. M.: Validation of the SWAT model on a large river basin with point and nonpoint sources, *J. Am. Water Resour. As.*, 37, 1169–1188, 2001.
- Sharma, P. P., Gupta, S. C., and Foster, G. R.: Raindrop-induced soil detachment and sediment transport from interill areas, *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, 59, 727–734, 1995.
- 5 Tacio, H. D.: *Sloping Agricultural Land Technology (SALT): a sustainable agroforestry scheme for uplands*, *Agroforest. Syst.*, 22, 145–152, 1993.
- Thai Meteorological Department: *Weather outlook for Thailand during rainy season (June–October 2012)*, Thai Meteorological Department, Bangkok, Thailand, 2012.
- 10 Torri, D., Sfalanga, M., and Delsette, M.: Splash detachment–runoff depth and soil cohesion, *Catena*, 14, 149–155, 1987.
- UNEP Environment Assessment Programme for Asia and the Pacific Bangkok: *Land Cover Assessment and Monitoring*, Environment Assessment Technical Reports, Volume 8-A, Bangkok, Thailand, 1997.
- 15 Valeriano, O. C. S., Koike, T., Yang, K., and Yang, D.: Optimal dam operation during flood season using a distributed hydrological model and a heuristic algorithm, *J. Hydrol. Eng.*, 15, 580–586, 2010.
- Walling, D. E.: *Evaluation and Analysis of Sediment Data from the Lower Mekong River*, Report to the Mekong River Commission, Vientiane, 61 pp., 2005.
- 20 Walling, D. E.: The changing sediment load of the Mekong river, *Ambio*, 37, 150–157, 2008.
- Walling, D. E.: The sediment load of the Mekong River, in: *The Mekong Biophysical Environment of an International River Basin*, edited by: Campbell, I. C., Elsevier, New York, 113–142, 2009.
- Walling, D. E.: Human Impact on the sediment load of Asian rivers, sediment problems and sediment management in Asian rivers basin, *Walling ford, IAHS Publ.*, 349, 37–51, 2011.
- 25 Walling, D. E. and Fang, D.: Recent trends in the suspended sediment loads of the world's rivers, *Global Planet. Change*, 39, 111–126, 2003.
- Wang, J. J., Lu, X. X., and Kumm, M.: Sediment load estimates and variations in the Lower Mekong River, *River Res. Appl.*, 27, 33–46, 2011.
- 30 Wischmeier, W. H. and Smith, D. D.: Predicting rainfall erosion soil losses: a guide to conservation planning, in: *Agriculture Handbook*, No. 282, No. 537, US Department of Agriculture Research Service, Washington, D.C., 244–252, 1978.

6782




Figure 1. Structure of the distributed sediment model integrated with a process-based distributed hydrological model.

6787




Figure 2. The target area of Chao Phraya River Basin.

6788




Figure 3. Monthly suspended sediment load (SSL) at stream gauge stations in Chao Phraya River Basin for 2001–2010.

6789




Figure 4. Average monthly suspended sediment concentration (SSC) at stream gauge stations in Chao Phraya River Basin for 2001–2010.

6790




Figure 5. Sensitivity of suspended sediment load (SSL) at P73 in Chao Phraya River Basin to **(a)** detachability from rain drop (k), **(b)** detachability from sheet flow (K_f) and **(c)** soil cohesion (J). Difference among lines in **(b)** is invisible due to the minor response of SSL to K_f .

6791




Figure 6. The target area and the modelled river network of Mekong River Basin.

6792




Figure 7. Monthly suspended sediment load (SSL) at stream gauge stations in the Mekong River Basin for 1991–2000.

6793




Figure 8. Monthly suspended sediment concentration (SSC) at stream gauge stations in Mekong River Basin for 1991–2000.

6794




Figure 9. Sensitivity of suspended sediment load (SSL) at Khong Chiam station in Mekong River Basin to (a) detachability from rain drop (k), (b) detachability from sheet flow (K_f), (c) soil cohesion (J). Difference among lines in (a) is invisible due to the minor response of SSL to k .

6795




Figure A1. Monthly average river discharge at stream gauge stations from 2001 to 2010 at Chao Phraya River Basin.

6796




Figure B1. Monthly average river discharge at stream gauge stations from 1991 to 2000 at Mekong River Basin.