

University of Parma Research Repository

Statistical analysis of the interaction between wind-waves and currents during early wave generation

This is the peer reviewd version of the followng article:

Original

Statistical analysis of the interaction between wind-waves and currents during early wave generation / Chiapponi, L.; Addona, F.; Carrasco, P. D.; Losada, M. A.; Longo, S. - In: COASTAL ENGINEERING. - ISSN 0378-3839. - 159:103672(2020), pp. 1-15. [10.1016/j.coastaleng.2020.103672]

Availability: This version is available at: 11381/2880398 since: 2020-09-27T08:14:28Z

*Publisher:* Elsevier B.V.

Published DOI:10.1016/j.coastaleng.2020.103672

Terms of use:

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available

Publisher copyright

note finali coverpage

(Article begins on next page)

# Statistical analysis of the interaction between wind-waves and currents during early wave generation L. Chiapponi<sup>a</sup>, F. Addona<sup>a</sup>, P.D. Carrasco<sup>b</sup>, M.A. Losada<sup>b</sup>, S. Longo<sup>a</sup> <sup>a</sup>Department of Engineering and Architecture, University of Parma, Parco Area delle Scienze, 181/A, 43124 Parma, Italy <sup>b</sup>Instituto Interuniversitario de Investigación del Sistema Tierra, Universidad de Granada, Avda. del Mediterráneo s/n, 18006 Granada, Spain

# 8 Abstract

We present the experimental analysis of the interaction between wind waves 9 and currents, during the generation process, through laboratory experiments 10 in a wind-waves-current tunnel. The objective is the quantification of the 11 effects of a co-/counter-current on the main characteristics and statistical 12 estimators of the wave field. Twenty-two experiments were performed with 13 two different wind speed values and eleven different current speed values 14 (including zero values, absence of current), with a ratio of current speed to 15 group celerity  $u_c/c_q \in [-0.47, +0.30]$ , measuring the instantaneous water 16 level in different sections with ultrasonic probes. The collected data allow 17 the characterization of the free surface statistics, the calculation of the phase 18 and group celerity of the waves, the analysis of the grouping. The aim is the 19 description of the complex interaction between different forcing terms effec-20 tive during wave generation. We found that (i) spectral shape and evolution 21 is extremely sensitive to tiny counter-currents, with a fast grows of a second 22 peak, (ii) grouping and the statistics of the free surface reflect the action of 23 the current; (iii) energy transfer and breaking are significantly affected by 24 the currents. The results are new and original and represent a set of data 25 for understanding the generation of waves by the wind in all conditions in 26 which the currents are not negligible, for example in the surf zone, lagoons, 27 estuaries, swamps, shallow lakes and shallow reservoirs. 28

<sup>29</sup> Keywords: wind-generated waves, currents, grouping, laboratory

30 experiments

## 31 1. Introduction

The interaction between wind generated waves and currents is quite frequent in many natural and artificial environments, such as lakes, lagoons and reservoirs. In these areas there are often currents generated by tides, estuarine inlets, thermal and density effects, while sea and land breezes act cyclically generating waves. A frequent scenario is that of a wind that blows and generates free surface gravity waves (sea waves) in the absence of swelling and in the presence of current.

The applications of practical interest are the most varied. Sclavo *et al.* 39 [1] explored the interaction of surface gravity waves and oceanic currents and 40 how they influence bottom sediment dispersal and bathymetry evolution in 41 the shallow northern Adriatic Sea (namely Gulf of Venice); Chiapponi et al. 42 [2] analysed the wave-current interaction in the Porto di Lido entrance of the 43 Venice Lagoon in order to evaluate the wave climate and the harbour tran-44 quility of a planned landing cruise. More recently, Melito et al. [3] studied 45 the propagation of infragravity waves up the Misa river (Senigallia, Italy) 46 during storm conditions. 47

48

The first aspect and starting point is wind wave generation. The process 49 of energy transfer from the wind to the water waves has been widely dis-50 cussed and debated by many researchers: Phillips [4] suggested that waves 51 growth at the initial stage is generated by the resonance between atmospheric 52 turbulent pressure fluctuations and perturbation of water surface; the Miles' 53 theory [5] for wind wave growth, later on was extended by Miles [6], Phillips 54 [7], Janssen [8] and Miles [9] to include viscous and turbulent effects. A 55 validation of this theory is reported by Hristov *et al.* [10] in the field, and 56 by Grare *et al.* [11] in the laboratory. Liberzon & Shemer [12] provided 57 as comprehensive as possible set of experimental data that are valuable for 58 comparison with theoretical models. Longo [13] measured in a systematic 59 way wind and water waves in a wind tunnel with a water tank inside: he 60 found that the phase celerity of the waves, affected by the current in the tank 61 flowing in the opposite direction of wind action and of waves propagation, 62 by wind drift and Stokes current, was larger than the theoretical celerity in 63 the absence of the current. The group celerity was changed in a similar way, 64 and a model was developed to account for the relative variation of phase 65 celerity and group celerity, which includes a dependence of the drift velocity 66 on the wave steepness. Further details on the turbulence structure for the 67

same experiments are given in Longo *et al.* [14, 15].

69

A second relevant aspect is the interaction of mechanically generated 70 waves and currents. Van Hoften & Karaki [16] measured the wave ampli-71 tude attenuation along a laboratory wave channel to compare wave dissipa-72 tion with and without flow. They found that energy is extracted from the 73 waves, diffused downward and ultimately dissipated with an increment of 74 bottom shear stress. Grant & Madsen [17] developed an analytical theory 75 to describe the combined motion of waves and currents and the associated 76 boundary shear stress in the vicinity of a rough bottom. Kempt & Simons 77 [18, 19] presented the first extensive experimental program to investigate the 78 interaction between gravity waves and a turbulent current. Changes induced 79 in the mean-velocity profiles, turbulent fluctuations, bed shear stresses and 80 wave attenuation rates were considered for a range of wave heights, keeping 81 the wave period constant. Groeneweg & Klopman [20] presented a general-82 ized Lagrangian mean formulation (GLM) to describe changes of the mean-83 velocity profiles in the combined wave-current motion. Many other researches 84 focussed on the structure of the flow due to the interaction between waves 85 and currents (Sleath [21], Klopman [22, 23], Umeyama [24], Smith [25], Roy 86 et al. [26]). 87

88

A third aspect is energy dissipation due to breaking in the presence of 89 currents, and frequency downshift due to nonlinear interaction. The energy 90 dissipation due to current-limited wave breaking in monochromatic and ran-91 dom waves was studied experimentally by Chawla & Kirby [27, 28]. They 92 observed that opposing current slows down the waves, leading to an increase 93 in the wave steepness which sometimes leads to wave breaking. The waves 94 get blocked when the current is strong enough to prevent the wave energy 95 from travelling upstream, i.e. when the group celerity  $c_q$  goes to zero. For 96 the largest wave amplitudes the wave energy shifts to a lower frequency due 97 to side band instabilities, and the waves do not get blocked. Suastika et 98 al. [29] performed laboratory experiments of wave blocking with periodic 99 and random waves, with partial and complete wave blocking. They success-100 fully identified the incident and reflected components of the wave thanks 101 to an analysis in the frequency-wave number space. Ma *et al.* [30] experi-102 mentally studied in a wave-current flume the nonlinear evolution of regular 103 waves in the presence of opposing current, observing downshift even with very 104 small initial steepness. The downshift was generally gradual and occasionally 105

abrupt. Long & Huang [31] used a laser probe in order to measure the slopes 106 of wind waves generated on both co- and counter-currents. The data were 107 processed to yield an average wave-slope spectrum and it was found that the 108 peak frequency and the intensity of the spectra were strongly influenced by 109 the current. Zou & Chen [32] studied the wind and current effects on ex-110 treme waves formation and breaking. They combined a Navier–Stokes solver 111 with the Smagorinsky subgrid-scale stress model and volume of fluid (VOF) 112 air-water interface capturing scheme, comparing the model predictions to 113 some laboratory experiments: the wave breaking location and intensity are 114 modified by the following and opposing wind in a different fashion. 115

An entire body of literature has been devoted to the effects of currents 116 on the statistics of waves, focussed on the appearance of rogue waves trig-117 gered when waves enter a field of opposing current (Onorato *et al.* [33]). 118 Experiments in a wave tank showed that in the tertiary wave interaction 119 the growth of the infinitesimal wave is reduced by a background current field 120 (opposing and coflowing current conditions), more as an effect of the variabil-121 ity rather than for the presence of a mean current [34]. An adverse current 122 gradient triggers modulational instability and, unless breaking induced by 123 three-dimensional effects stops the process, the waves develop the maximum 124 amplification. A strongly non-Gaussian statistics of the free surface elevation 125 is favoured, with enhanced probability of extreme waves: the effect is stronger 126 for unidirectional waves, but is evident also in the presence of directionality 127 of the sea states [35, 36, 37, 38]. In passing, experiments on wave propaga-128 tion in counter-current have been used as analog model of Hawking effect [39]. 129 130

With the exception of some field observations (Lambrakos [40], Wolf & 131 Prandle [41], van der Westhuysen [42] and Viitak *et al.* [43]), there is a 132 scarcity of studies of the coupling between growing wind waves and currents. 133 The interaction depends on the regime: at low wind speed, capillary waves 134 are generated by the fluctuations in air pressure due to the corresponding 135 fluctuations in the wind stream; then for increasing speed the wind boundary 136 layer becomes turbulent and rhombic cells are formed and, for larger wind 137 speed, wave breaking occurs and gravity replaces the surface tension as a 138 key parameter for the wind-wave interaction. This interaction is affected by 139 the presence of currents: currents change the effective wind because of the 140 different relative velocity between the air and water with respect to the case 141 of water at rest. Once formed and freely propagating like swell, the waves are 142 refracted by currents (as well as by bathymetry changes). Near the coasts, 143

where current gradients often increase, refraction may be stronger and the angle wave-current is spatially non-homogeneous. When current and waves are in the same direction, the result is the lengthening of waves and the reduction of wave heights. On the other hand, the waves are shortened and steepened by an opposing current, often to the extent of inducing breaking.

The previous arguments and most of the above-mentioned studies, are 149 for long-crested waves. Short-crested waves interacting with rip currents 150 were recently studied by Wei *et al.* [44]. They found that (i) the non-linear 151 interaction between intersecting waves, and (ii) the interaction between rip 152 current and short-crested wave crest, generate isolated waves propagating 153 shoreward with an increased wave celerity. Hedges et al. [45] developed a 154 theoretical model to describe the interaction of short-crested random waves 155 with large-scale currents, with the prediction of the transformed spectral 156 densities using the principle of wave action conservation. 157

As a matter of evidence the topic is variegate and with several possible 158 combinations of wind, current, swell, bathymetry changes, breaking. The 159 review by Cavaleri *et al.* [46] depicts the numerous aspects already inter-160 preted and the still open questions. In order to clarify some aspects of these 161 phenomena, a series of tests were carried out in a wind wave current tank. 162 In these tests, gravity waves are generated in a laboratory only by the wind, 163 with currents flowing in the same or opposite direction of the waves (co-164 current and counter-current, respectively). The main aim is the analysis 165 of the evolution of the waves in terms of statistical indicators in time and 166 frequency domains. 167

This manuscript is organized as follows. In §2 the experimental apparatus and the measurements procedures and protocols are described. In section §3 the experimental results on water waves are presented and discussed, with a focus on the phase and group celerities. Wave grouping is analysed in §4. The conclusions are presented in §5. In Appendix A the relevant dimensionless groups are described and the scaling rules are discussed.

## <sup>174</sup> 2. Experimental set-up

The experiments were conducted in the Atmosphere-Ocean Interaction Flume (CIAO) at IISTA (Instituto Interuniversitario de Investigación del Sistema Tierra en Andalucia), shown in Figure 1. The CIAO is a wave fume 1.0 m wide and 16.0 m long, designed for a water depth of 70 cm. The flume has a paddle at each of its ends, which allow the generation of regular up to



Figure 1: The experimental flume adopted for the tests, with the representation of the Ultrasonic probes (US1-7) located in the measurement sections,  $x_{\text{US1-7}} = 770,920,993,1008,1024,1042,1054$  cm.

second order and irregular waves with period from 1 to 5 s and height up 180 to 25 cm. A closed-circuit wind-generation system (wind tunnel) with wind 181 speed up to  $12 \text{ m s}^{-1}$  directly generates waves with an effective fetch length 182 approximately equal to 10 m. A current generation system allows currents up 183 to  $0.75 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ . For the present activity, waves were generated by wind with a 184 free stream velocity,  $U_{w\infty}$ , equal to 7.4 - 10.8 m s<sup>-1</sup> (low wind speed, LWS, 185 and high wind speed, HWS, respectively). In both conditions the generation 186 of waves was initially observed without current and then with co- or counter-187 current. Seven UltraLab ULS 80D acoustics wave gauges were employed for 188 water level measurements along the flume, with a maximum repetition rate 189 equal to 75 Hz, a vertical resolution of  $\approx 0.5$  mm and a reproducibility of 190  $\pm 0.15\%$ . The level signals were acquired for at least 600 s with a data rate of 191 100 Hz. Measurements of the wind speed were performed with a Pitot tube in 192 the section 9.95 m away from the wave paddle N1 (both paddles are not used 193 for the present tests). The velocity profile in the water side was measured in 194 the absence of current with a two-component Laser Doppler Velocimeter by 195 TSI. Figure 2 shows the flume during one of the tests. The mean velocity of 196 the currents (measured without wind and waves) was estimated with a micro-197 propeller meter for a given rotation rate of the pump, see the velocity profile 198 shown in Figure 3a. Considering that the installation allows to precisely 199 control the pump rotation rate, and that during the experiments there were 200 no significant variations of the hydraulic resistances of the circuit, a high 201

reproducibility of the flow discharge is guaranteed by fixing the rotation rate
of the pump. For this reason, the velocity measurements were not repeated
during the tests to prevent local disturbances in the fluid domain. The main parameters of the experiments are listed in Table 1.

Exp.	$U_{w\infty}$	$u_c$	$N_{\text{waves}}$	$T_{rms}$	$H_{rms}$	$a_{crms}$	$a_{trms}$	$H_{1/3}$	$u_c/c_g$	$H_{rms}/L$	$Re_w$
	$(\mathrm{ms^{-1}})$	$(\mathrm{cm}\mathrm{s}^{-1})$	#	(s)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)	(mm)			
21	7.4	0	1770	0.34	17.0	8.6	8.6	22.7	0.00	0.062	1300
1	7.4	-4	1292	0.46	21.2	11.2	10.7	29.3	-0.06	0.056	1700
2	7.4	-9	1209	0.50	21.2	11.1	10.5	29.5	-0.10	0.054	1500
3	7.4	-13	1082	0.55	25.9	13.7	12.6	36.2	-0.13	0.045	2100
4	7.4	-17	952	0.63	28.4	15.0	13.9	39.7	-0.11	0.032	2200
5	7.4	-21	791	0.76	39.3	20.8	19.0	54.0	-0.24	0.084	3500
16	7.4	4	2109	0.28	14.4	7.4	7.3	19.7	0.05	0.086	1200
17	7.4	9	2179	0.27	14.5	7.4	7.4	19.9	0.10	0.061	1200
18	7.4	13	2342	0.26	13.0	6.6	6.7	17.9	0.14	0.067	1000
19	7.4	17	2401	0.25	11.7	6.0	6.0	16.2	0.12	0.054	900
20	7.4	21	2505	0.24	10.0	5.2	5.2	13.8	0.22	0.080	700
22	10.8	0	1339	0.45	32.6	17.6	15.4	43.8	0.00	0.076	4300
6	10.8	-4	1085	0.55	40.1	22.1	18.9	55.1	-0.04	0.072	5500
7	10.8	-9	888	0.67	40.7	22.3	19.8	56.1	-0.08	0.071	4600
8	10.8	-13	863	0.69	41.5	22.9	19.9	56.7	-0.11	0.064	4700
9	10.8	-17	890	0.67	43.0	23.5	20.2	59.2	-0.21	0.062	5100
10	10.8	-21	801	0.75	54.2	29.0	25.8	75.0	-0.26	0.064	7000
11	10.8	4	1573	0.38	29.9	16.1	14.2	40.1	0.05	0.060	4200
12	10.8	9	1629	0.37	28.6	15.3	13.7	38.4	0.10	0.053	3900
13	10.8	13	1713	0.35	27.2	14.5	13.1	37.0	0.15	0.045	3700
14	10.8	17	1736	0.35	27.2	14.4	13.1	36.8	0.25	0.073	3700
15	10.8	21	1785	0.34	25.8	13.8	12.5	35.4	0.24	0.081	3500

Table 1: Parameters of the tests.  $U_{w\infty}$  is the wind asymptotic velocity,  $u_c$  is the depthaveraged current velocity, positive if coflowing and negative if counter-flowing condition,  $N_{\text{waves}}$  is the number of waves detected in the record with a zero-crossing analysis,  $T_{rms}$ is the root mean square wave period,  $H_{rms}$ ,  $a_{c\,rms}$ , and  $a_{t\,rms}$  are the root mean square values of the wave height, of the crest and of the troughs,  $H_{1/3}$  is the one-third wave height,  $c_g$  is the group celerity,  $Re_w$  is the Reynolds number for the water side near the free surface. Data refer to section US3.

205

In order to check if the waves are in intermediate or deep water, Figure 3b shows the relative depth h/L for all the experiments. Since h/L > 0.5 for all tests, the waves propagate in deep water.



Figure 2: A picture of the flume during tests.



Figure 3: a) Velocity profiles, air side ( $\Rightarrow$ ) and water side ( $\diamond$ ), measured in the absence of imposed currents. The green/red lines refer to the minimum and maximum depth-averaged velocity of the co-/counter-currents during the experiments.  $U_w$  is the wind velocity,  $u_c$  is the current velocity,  $u_*$  is the friction velocity of the wind,  $c_g$  is the group celerity of the waves, h is the mean water depth,  $z_0$  is the roughness length. b) Relative depth h/L for tests at different current speed.



Figure 4: Time series of the free surface elevation for LWS tests. a) Data at section US1 (minimum fetch), b) data at section US7 (maximum fetch).

# 209 3. Experimental results

#### 210 3.1. Wave statistics in the time domain

Figures 4–5 show the water surface time series at section US1 and US7 for LWS and HWS tests, respectively, with evident differences between tests with different current velocity. The abrupt modifications due to a small counter-current are evident, with a progressive increment of the wave period for increasing speed of the counter-current.

The instantaneous water surface elevation data were elaborated by applying a phase-average operator, defined as

$$\widetilde{\eta}(t) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N_p} \eta(t + iT_p)}{N_p},\tag{1}$$



Figure 5: Time series of the free surface elevation for HWS tests. a) Data at section US1 (minimum fetch), b) data at section US7 (maximum fetch).



Figure 6: Phase-averaged surface elevation at section US3 for test 10  $(u_c = -21 \text{ cm s}^{-1})$ , test 22  $(u_c = 0)$  and test 15  $(u_c = 21 \text{ cm s}^{-1})$ , all in HWS conditions. The dashed lines indicate  $\pm 1$  standard deviation, the dash-dotted lines indicate the maximum and minimum level recorded during the experiment.

where  $T_p \equiv 1/f_p$  is the peak period of the spectrum and  $N_p$  (see §3.2 for de-218 tails on spectral analysis) is the number of waves characterized by a period 219 in the interval  $T_p(1 \pm 5\%)$ . Figure 6 shows the results for three experiment 220 in HWS conditions: a co-current results in a smoothing of the wave, with 221 respect to the absence of current, while a counter-current induces a growth in 222 wave height and a higher value of the standard deviation, which indicates a 223 greater variability of the observed profiles. In counter-current also the max-224 imum/minimum levels of the waves are larger than in co-current, coherently 225 with a wave statistic highly affected by the opposing flow [30]. 226

The data were analysed with a mean level up-crossing technique, obtain-227 ing the wave height H, the wave crest  $a_c$  and trough  $a_t$  amplitudes listed 228 in Table 1 and depicted in Figure 7 for the tests without currents. The 229 results indicate a monotonic increase in the wave height with fetch, and a 230 fairly good symmetry of the waves in LWS and for large fetch, but with 231 crests being higher than troughs for HWS tests. The HWS tests reach very 232 fast the asymptotic trend with  $H \propto x^{0.6}$  and the LWS tests show an initial 233 faster growth followed by a region with constant growth rate with  $H \propto x^{0.4}$ . 234 Hasselmann et al. [47] proposed  $H \propto x^{0.5}$  for short fetches. 235



Figure 7: Wave evolution with non-dimensional fetch in the absence of currents: test 22 (HWS condition,  $U_{w\infty} = 10.8 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ , solid symbols) and test 21 (LWS condition,  $U_{w\infty} = 7.4 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ , empty symbols). Root mean square values of the wave height  $(\bullet, \circ)$ , wave crest  $a_c$  ( $\blacktriangle, \triangle$ ) and wave trough  $a_t$  ( $\nabla, \bigtriangledown)$ .

Figure 8a shows the wave evolution in the presence of co- and counter-236 current, and Figure 8b shows the same data in terms of variation of the 237 wave height with respect to the wave height measured in section US1, the 238 smallest fetch. In co-current conditions the evolution of the waves with fetch 239 length is regular, with wave height generally decreasing for increasing speed 240 of the current. For increasing co-current the growth rate exponent in HWS 241 decreases from 0.6 to a minimum of 0.2. In LWS the growth rate for varying 242 current speed is less regular, and reaches a minimum value 0.38. 243

In counter-current conditions the evolution of the waves is highly irregu-244 lar, with decay beyond a given fetch length and with a dispersion of the data. 245 In LWS, the growth rate is definitely negative beyond a given fetch, reaching 246 the value of -2.6 for the strongest counter-current speed. This phenomenon 247 is mainly attributed to the wave breaking which dissipates energy in excess 248 with respect to the energy transferred to the waves by the wind. Recent 249 experiments by Toffoli *et al.* [38] have demonstrated the destabilising effect 250 of the counter-current on mechanically generated waves, with deviations of 251 the statistical properties favouring rogue waves and breaking: above the lim-252 iting condition  $k_p h \to 1.36$ , where  $k_p$  is the wave number corresponding to 253 spectral peak, a direct cascade due to wave breaking occurs. In the present 254 experiments  $k_p h \gg 5$ , hence the mechanism of direct cascade of energy is 255 always effective. 256



Figure 8: Wave evolution with fetch length. a) Dimensionless wave height  $H_{rms}$ ; b)  $H_{rms}$  normalized with respect to its value measured in section US1. Filled symbols refer to high wind speed condition,  $U_{w\infty} = 10.8 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ , empty symbols refer to low wind speed condition,  $U_{w\infty} = 7.4 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ . •, • no current; •, • co-current; •, • counter-current. The size of the symbols is proportional to the speed of the current.

Figure 9a shows the effect of the current on  $H_{rsm}$ . The wave height in-257 creases for decreasing average velocity of the current, with a minimum value 258 for the maximum co-current speed, and maximum value for the maximum 259 counter-current speed, according to the prediction by Longuet-Higgins & 260 Stewart [48]. The scaling with  $u_c/c_q$  indicates non monotonic trends for the 261 counter-current case, mainly for the LWS case. We remind that breaking, 262 a candidate to explain this odd behaviour, is favoured for milder counter-263 current by the non-uniformity in the current flows [38]. The effects of the 264 currents on the period  $gT_{rms}/u_*$ , are shown in Figure 9b. The wave period 265 increases for decreasing current velocity, weakly for co-currents and strongly 266 for counter-currents. The increasing of the wave period is the classical fre-267 quency downshift. 268

Figure 10a depicts the steepness  $H_{rms}/L$  for varying current speed and 269 Figure 10b shows the kurtosis of the instantaneous free surface level, a clas-270 sical indicator of the gaussianity of the field, assuming a value of 3 for a 271 perfect Gaussian pdf. The wave steepness has a maximum for weak counter-272 currents and then decreases with the speed of the current for both co- and 273 counter-current conditions. This behaviour is expected for co-current condi-274 tions, with increased wave length, but looks odd for a counter-current (except 275 locally when breaking occurs): the wave height increases but the wave length 276 increases even faster. The phenomenon is addressed to non-linear wave-wave 277 interactions, responsible for the energy transfer towards lower frequency wave 278 components [49]. The maximum steepness occurs at large fetch for mild 279 counter-current,  $u_c/c_q \approx -0.10, -0.15$ , where the kurtosis shown in Fig-280 ure 10b has a maximum. Steepness reduction in counter-currents is accom-281 panied by a decreasing kurtosis (with a significant deviation from Gaussian 282 statistics), whereas is accompanied by an increasing kurtosis in the presence 283 of co-currents, although always less than 3. 284



Figure 9: Wave properties at different fetches as a function of  $u_c/c_g$ . a) Wave height, and b) wave period. Empty and filled symbols refer to LWS and HWS tests, respectively.



Figure 10: a) Wave steepness  $H_{rms}/L$  at different fetches as a function of  $u_c/c_g$ . Empty symbols and filled symbols refer to LWS and HWS tests, respectively. The curves connect the data for the same fetch. b) Kurtosis of the free surface elevation.

#### 285 3.2. Wave statistics in the frequency domain

The power spectra of the free surface elevation are computed by means of a Welch's averaged, modified periodogram method, with a spectral resolution of 0.05 Hz and windows of 30 s with overlap of 50%, resulting in a bandwidth of 0.033 Hz and 78 degree of freedom for each spectral estimate.

Figure 11 shows the power spectra for the HWS condition at section US3, 290 with a shape strongly affected by the current and with a peak shifted toward 291 higher/lower frequencies for increasing speed of the co/counter-current, even-292 tually with a secondary peak for counter-currents. In general the non linear 293 transfer induces a downshift of the peak frequency even without counter-294 current, but the presence of a counter-current induces a substantial and 295 quick downshift of the peak, as already detected in the evolution of random 296 mechanically generated wave fields [38]. 297

Figure 12 shows the spectra for increasing fetch for three counter-current 298 tests with HWS, starting from  $u_c/c_g = 0$ . A straight line refers to PSD 299  $\propto f^{-4}$  and corresponds to the prediction of the weak wave turbulence theory 300 [50]. The present experiments show steeper spectra  $\propto f^{-6}$ , as observed in 301 other laboratory experiments [see 51, 52, 53]. We observe that in all tests 302 there is a peak above  $\approx 1$  Hz, which become only one for the two con-303 ditions without current and with the maximum counter-current speed. For 304 tests with moderate and progressively stronger counter-current, a second low-305 frequency peak appears at frequency slightly less than 1 Hz, which becomes 306 dominant for tests with  $u_c/c_q = -0.08; -0.11$ . The variation of the spectrum 307 shape with the fetch is quite evident for test in panel d): the low frequency 308 peak at  $\approx 0.9$  Hz is stable in frequency and increases fourfold its value; the 309 high-frequency peak slowly shifts to a lower frequency, slightly increases the 310 width but without significant reduction. As a result, at short fetch the high 311 frequency peak dominates, at long fetch it is the opposite. 312

It has been recently demonstrated that the growth of wind-waves in the 313 generation phase is a strongly non-linear phenomenon [38], with a statistics 314 prone to the generation of rogue waves. The presence of counter-current 315 triggers modulational instabilities [33], in particular in the presence of a 316 non-homogeneous counter-current field [37]. We expect that the presence of 317 both forcing terms, i.e. a wind-wave generation field and a counter-current, 318 enhances the instabilities and the non-linearity [38], and accelerates nonlinear 319 energy transfer. The effects are more prominent for increasing values of  $u_c/c_g$ 320 and, for mechanically generated waves, the maximum value of the kurtosis 321 of the wave statistics in [38] was reached for  $u_c/c_g = -0.25$ . In the present 322



Figure 11: Power spectra of the free surface elevation at section US3. Test with co-current (test 13), without current (test 22), and with counter-current (test 8). Dashed curves are the 95% confidence limits.

tests we observe that the strongest variability is at  $u_c/c_g \approx -0.11$ , when 323 the maximum spatial evolution of the power spectrum is observed, with an 324 evident growth of the low-frequency peak which finally is more energetic than 325 the high frequency one. The high frequency component does not vanish and 326 remains almost constant. In comparing these spectral evolution we bear mind 327 that a continuous influx of energy is due to the blowing wind, which partially 328 hides the expected spectral evolution with a progressive growth of the low 329 frequency component and a vanishing high frequency peak. We also notice 330 that the relatively short fetch limits the observation of further evolution of 331 the phenomena. 332

Figure 13 shows the spatial evolution of the spectra analysed in Figure 12. 333 A tiny counterflow with  $u_c/c_g = -0.04$  in panel b) is sufficient to favour 334 the growth of a low frequency component. For stronger counter-current, 335 the evolution is variegate, with a concentration of energy at  $\approx 1$  Hz for 336  $u_c/c_q = -0.08$ , followed by a reappearance of the peak at  $\approx 1.5$  Hz for 337  $u_c/c_g = -0.11$  which becomes the most energetic peak for  $u_c/c_g = -0.21$ . 338 In the strongest counter-current test, with  $u_c/c_g = -0.26$ , the low frequency 339 peak disappears and the spectrum is again a single-peak spectrum with most 340 of the energy at  $\approx 1.25$  Hz. In summary, the counter-current facilitates the 341 growth of a low frequency contribution which shares the energy with the 342



Figure 12: Power spectra of the free surface elevation for counter-current tests with HWS,  $u_c/c_g = 0, -0.04, -0.08, -0.11, -0.21, -0.26$ . Thin red curves refer to section US1, dash-dotted orange curves refer to section US3, and thick black curves refer to section US7, with fetch increasing from US1 to US7. See Figure 13 for the spatial evolution of the spectra.



Figure 13: Fetch evolution of the power spectra of the free surface elevation for countercurrent tests with HWS,  $u_c/c_g = 0, -0.04, -0.08, -0.11, -0.21, -0.26$ . Note that the scales of the colorbar are different for each test and have units mm<sup>2</sup> Hz<sup>-1</sup>. The dashed line represents section US3, see Figure 12.

original high frequency term, visible in the experiment without counter-flow.
The transfer seems extremely sensitive to the speed of the counter-current.

The presence of a current highly affect the statistics of the wind generated waves, with changes in the statistical estimators and in the spectrum. The effects are significant if the ratio between the scales of the waves and of the current, e.g., the velocity and the group celerity, is of  $O(10^{-1})$ , see the analysis of celerity in §3.3.

## 350 3.3. Phase and group celerities of the waves

In the presence of uniform currents the following classical dispersion equation for gravity waves holds:

$$\omega - kU = \pm \left[ \left( gk + \frac{\sigma}{\rho} k^3 \right) \tanh kh \right]^{1/2}, \qquad (2)$$

where  $\omega = 2\pi/T$  is the angular frequency, T is the wave period,  $k = 2\pi/L$ is the wave number, L is the wave length,  $\rho$  the water mass density,  $\sigma$  is the surface tension. In the presence of wind drift Liberzon & Shemer [12] proposed an empirical dispersion relation,

$$c = c_0 \left( 1 + ak + bk^2 \right), \tag{3}$$

with  $c_0 = \omega/k$  computed using the gravity capillary wave dispersion, a and b are fitting coefficients.

In the present experiments, even the longer waves propagate in deep water conditions, hence  $\tan kh \approx 1$ . Since the waves are not monochromatic, for computations we will refer to the dominant (most energetic) wave component. The experimental phase celerity is estimated by the cross-correlation of the synoptic data recorded in two neighbour Ultrasound sensors. The average phase celerity between two sensors can be computed as

$$c_{ave} = \frac{\Delta x}{\tau},\tag{4}$$

where  $\Delta x$  is the distance between two sensors and  $\tau$  is the time delay of the highest peak of the cross-correlation function. The relative uncertainty in the estimate of the phase celerity is equal to

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}c_{ave}}{c_{ave}} = \frac{\mathrm{d}\Delta x}{\Delta x} + \frac{\mathrm{d}\tau}{\tau}.$$
(5)

The first contribution is due to the uncertainty in the probes positions and to the dispersion of the Ultrasound cone. By assuming  $d\Delta x = 4$  mm, it results  $d\Delta x/\Delta x \approx 3\%$ . The second contribution is addressed to the uncertainty in locating the peak of the cross-correlation function, and can be computed according to Longo [13], giving a value of 1%. Therefore the overall uncertainty in phase celerity estimate is  $dc_{ave}/c_{ave} \approx 4\%$ .

The results are shown in Figure 14 and are compared with eq.(2). An evident discrepancy is observed between experiments and theory, with minor differences when counter-current is present. On the opposite, in presence of a co-current the experimental phase celerity is in excess with respect to theory. This effect could be due to the drift currents induced by the wind and to the change in the velocity profiles caused by the wave motion [18, 19].

The theoretical group celerity is computed by differentiating the dispersion relation eq.(2):

$$c_g \equiv \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial k} = \frac{c}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{2kh}{\sinh 2kh} \right) + U, \tag{6}$$



Figure 14: Phase celerity as a function of the wave number. The bold line is the dispersion relation without current, the dashed lines are the dispersion relation with current of different velocity, positive and negative. Empty and filled symbols refer to experiments in LWS and HWS conditions, respectively. The size of the symbols is proportional to the speed of the current.

<sup>382</sup> and in deep water becomes

$$c_g = \frac{c}{2} + U,\tag{7}$$

<sup>383</sup> where we have neglected capillarity.

The experimental group celerity can be estimated by the cross-correlation 384 of the envelopes of the water levels measured in two neighbour sections. 385 Under the hypothesis of narrow bandwidth signals, the same results can be 386 achieved computing first the cross-correlation of the water level signals and 387 then the Hilbert transform of the cross-correlation. The delay of the peak 388 of the envelope,  $\tau_q$ , yields the computation of the group celerity  $c_g = \Delta x / \tau_g$ 389 (Bendat & Piersol [54], Longo [13]). A comparison of the results obtained 390 by adopting both methods are shown in Figure 15a. The error bars were 391 estimated using the Monte Carlo method: the errors affecting both water 392 levels and probes positions are supposed to have a Gaussian distribution. 393 For each test, 10000 random realizations of these variables were generated 394 and the group celerity was estimated, producing a new population which also 395 have Gaussian distribution. The mean value of the distribution represents 396 the estimated value of  $c_q$ , while the standard deviation of the population is 397



Figure 15: a) Group celerity, comparison between two different computational methods. Filled symbols refer to HWS and empty symbols refer to LWS condition, respectively. The size of the symbols is proportional to the speed of the co/counter-current, circles refer to the absence of current. The bold line is the perfect agreement. b) Ratio between group and phase celerity excesses. Filled symbols refer to HWS condition, empty symbols refer to LWS condition. The size of the symbols is proportional to the speed of the coor counter-current. The dashed line is the theoretical model (Longo [13]) fitted for steep waves.

assumed to be the uncertainty of the estimate. The results from the two 398 approaches are comparable for almost all tests, with differences appreciable 399 and sometime relevant (up to 25%) in presence of a strong counter-current. 400 This behaviour is due to the modification of the spectrum shape induced 401 by counter-currents, which are responsible for a faster transition towards 402 a double peak spectrum. The method from Bendat & Piersol reduces the 403 uncertainty by approximately 15%, since the group celerity is obtained by 404 applying only a cross-correlation and the envelope algorithms, instead of 405 the classical method, by calculating two envelopes and one cross-correlation. 406 Results are similar for probes that are faraway, like probes in sections US1 407 and US2. 408

Focusing on the energy propagation, it is known that the theoretical kinematic limit is reached if there is an adverse uniform current exceeding  $1/4c_0$ , where  $c_0$  is the phase celerity without current. This limit is equivalent to  $u_c/c = -1/2$ , a convection velocity equal and opposite to the group celerity in deep water,  $u_c/c_g = -1$ , hence energy cannot propagate (Phillips, [7], where it is also shown that wave breaking appears earlier than forecast by the kinematic limit). In the present study, when counter-currents are present, the experimental group celerity is generally lower than in the absence of currents; however a clear trend can not be detected, presumably as a consequence of breaking which dissipates energy along the channel in a way that can not be easily predicted.

The ratio between group and phase celerity excesses (both calculated 420 with respect to the theoretical values in the presence of the current) is shown 421 in Figure 15b as a function of the wave steepness. The wind drift and the 422 Stokes current are both variable in space, but we observe that they affect 423 the phase and the group celerities in a similar way when co-currents are 424 present, with a ratio between the excesses equal to one. We remind that in 425 the absence of currents the variation  $(c_g - c_{g0})$  is greater than  $(c - c_0)$ . The 426 experimental evidence is interpreted by the model proposed by Longo [13], 427 based on the assumption that the group celerity excess differs from the phase 428 celerity excess as a monomial function of the wave steepness: 429

$$\frac{c_g - c_{g0}}{c - c_0} \equiv \frac{\bar{u}_s + kH \left[ \mathrm{d}\,\bar{u}_s/\mathrm{d}\,(kH) \right]}{\bar{u}_s} = f\left(kH\right), \quad \text{with} \quad f(kH) = r \cdot \left(kH\right)^{\beta},$$
(8)

where  $\bar{u}_s$  represents the surface drift, r and  $\beta$  are an empirical coefficient and exponent, respectively. The integration of eq.(8) yields an exponential function

$$\frac{\bar{u}_s}{\bar{u}_{sr}} = \frac{k_r H_r}{kH} \exp\left[\frac{r}{\beta} \left(\frac{kH}{k_r H_r}\right)^\beta - 1\right],\tag{9}$$

where  $\bar{u}_{sr}$  is the drift speed in the section where the steepness is  $k_r H_r$ . The parameters of the interpolation are r = 0.64 and  $\beta = -1.25$ , close to the values reported in Longo [13] for steep waves (r = 0.62 and  $\beta = -1.60$ ). The data in the presence of counter-current (not shown) appear too disperse (also as a consequence of an almost null value of  $(c - c_0)$ ), and no general conclusions can be drawn for this condition.

# 439 4. Wave grouping

Although sea waves may look random, the analysis of wave records reveals that high waves appear in group rather than individually. The grouping of high waves has practical implications of great interest since it can influence, e.g. (i) the effective number of consecutive waves necessary to produce resonance in structures, (ii) the stability blocks of sloping breakwaters, and (iii)
the efficiency of seawalls against the wave overtopping (see, e.g., Goda [55]).
For small waves, grouping is relevant since long wave-groups can easily be
reflected raising the level of vertical mixing. We expect that grouping is still
present for wind waves and currents coexisting and interacting.

Low-grazing-angle radar imaging of wind waves have suggested group-449 ing effects for a developing sea in deep water, with groups modulating the 450 occurrence of wave breaking [56]. Experiments have also shown that wind-451 wave energy is strongly suppressed in presence of a modulated wave train 452 [57]. Benjamin-Feir instabilities lead to groups, hence the analysis of the 453 groups gives hints on the statistics of the free surface elevation, on breaking 454 processes, on wind waves growth. The effects of wave grouping is also rele-455 vant in triggering breaking, which partly destroys the groups and transfers 456 irreversible energy to low frequencies. 457

The main purpose of the following analysis is to understand how the presence of co- or counter-currents affects the grouping in the initial phases of the wind waves generation. Observing Figures 4–5 it is quite evident that grouping is present with well different characteristics depending on the velocity of the current and also on the speed of the wind.

Starting from the zero-crossing analysis, we can define a run as a group of consecutive waves exceeding a threshold value (see the insert in Figure 16*a*). The number of waves belonging to the group is the length of the run, *j*. The repetition length of waves is the number of waves between two starting waves of subsequent groups. Such a repetition of wave heights can be defined as a *total run*.

Longo [13] introduced new time and length scales that are related to the length of the run (which can be easily transformed in the period of the run and length of the group), and similar scales can be defined with reference to the total run length. Such scales can be important (i) for the analysis of the interaction between the air flow field and the water waves, and (ii) for any practical applications where the groups of waves represents a non-negligible forcing of the system, like reflection and vertical mixing.

Following Goda [55], the probability of a run with length j for uncorrelated waves is

$$P_u(j) = p_0^{j-1}(1-p_0), \tag{10}$$

where  $p_0$  is the occurrence probability that  $H > H_t$  ( $H_t$  is the threshold wave



Figure 16: Groups properties. a) Distribution of the length of runs of high waves exceeding  $H_{\text{med}}$  and  $H_{1/3}$ , respectively, for tests without current.  $H \ge H_{\text{med}}$ :  $-\phi-$  test 22, HWS,  $-\phi-$  test 21, LWS, - theory (correlated), -. - theory (uncorrelated).  $H \ge H_{1/3}$ :  $-\phi-$  test 22, HWS,  $-\phi-$  test 21, LWS. b) Mean length of runs of high waves exceeding  $H_{\text{med}}$  as a function of the current speed.

height), usually assumed of the Rayleigh form. Real waves are correlated and the previous equation underestimates the grouping. Hence, following Kimura [58] if we define  $p_{22}$  as the probability that  $H_2$  exceeds  $H_t$  under the condition that the previous wave  $H_1$  has already exceeded the threshold, the probability distribution of a run with length j for correlated waves is

$$P_c(j) = p_{22}^{j-1} \left(1 - p_{22}\right). \tag{11}$$

Again,  $p_{22}$  is usually computed by assuming a Rayleigh distribution of the wave height. Figure 16*a* shows the good agreement between experimental frequencies and theory for correlated waves, whilst the theoretical frequency of uncorrelated waves is an underestimation. Two different thresholds were chosen and compared, namely the median wave height  $H_{\rm med}$  and  $H_{1/3}$ , and groups up to 11 waves are present with a threshold equal to  $H_{\rm med}$ .

<sup>490</sup> For the correlated waves, the expected mean length of the run is

$$\overline{j} = \frac{1}{1 - p_{22}}.$$
(12)

The experimental mean length of the runs are shown in Figure 16b. We no-491 tice that a co-current does not significantly change the value of  $\overline{j}$  with respect 492 to the no-current. Vice versa, a counter-current induces an initial reduction 493 of the mean length and then favours a fast growth. The explanation partly 494 relies in the strong modifications of the spectra due to a counter-current, al-495 though the power spectral density itself is a weak tool to predict correctly the 496 mean length of runs of waves exceeding a threshold (see Elgar *et al.* [59]). 497 The reduction of the mean length of the groups for weak counter-current, 498 and the increment for stronger counter-current, is an indirect indication that 490 instabilities are initially suppressed and then enhanced by the opposite cur-500 rent; the co-currents have negligible effects if they are weak, becoming more 501 effective if they are strong, favouring a slight reduction of the mean length 502 of runs. 503

Figure 17 shows the time and space evolution of the wave profiles for test 8 and 10, bothin counter-current, corresponding to high wave-steepness (panel *a*) and low wave-steepness (panel *b*), respectively. The groups destruction starting from US1 is evident for test 8, with small waves between high waves and with a disordered appearance. The groups structure is evident for test 10, with a progressive increment on the run length.



Figure 17: Example of the evolution of wave profiles. a) Test 08 with  $u_c/c_g = -0.11$ , HWS; b) Test 10 with  $u_c/c_g = -0.26$ , HWS.

## 510 5. Conclusions

A series of experiments conducted in a wind-wave tunnel with currents have revealed some peculiar aspects of the complex flow field. The complexity arises (i) from the non homogeneity, with energy progressively transferred by the wind, (ii) the shear action of the current, (iii) breaking, (iv) grouping and a mix of scales governing the process.

A co-current reduces the wave height growth with respect to the absence 516 of current, with effects proportional to the current speed. It is a conse-517 quence of the reduction of the relative velocity (between air and water) with 518 a reduction of the friction factor and of the efficiency of energy transfer. A 519 counter-current generally breaks the monotonic growth of waves with fetch 520 length, although the wave height is higher (in a given section and wind speed) 521 than for an equal speed co-current. Part of the wave energy is dissipated by 522 breaking (a micro-breaking is always expected at high wind speed), but the 523 energy transfer from the wind is facilitated, hence the energy balance is still 524 positive. The limited range of measurements prevents a clear-cut evidence, 525 but we infer that the fetch section where wave height drop occurs is a function 526 of the wind speed and of the current speed. 527

The wave steepness presents a maximum for weak counter-currents, de-528 creasing both when co-current are present and when the counter-current 529 becomes more intense. While in co-current the explanation is intuitive, since 530 a decreasing wave height is accompanied by an increasing wave length, for 531 counter-currents the interpretation relies on a wave length increasing faster 532 than the wave height. Hence, an unexpected stabilization effect occurs in 533 the latter configuration, which favours transferring of energy towards longer 534 waves. This energy transfer is also evident in the spectral form, whose evo-535 lution is affected by both the energy input from the wind action and of the 536 counter-current presence. A double-peak spectrum develops even for small 537 values of  $u_c/c_g$  in counter-current. 538

Phase celerity is strongly influenced by the co-current presence, the stronger 539 the current, the stronger the effects, whilst a counter-current does not have 540 appreciable effects. The co-current condition always induces a strong in-541 crement of the phase celerity even with respect to theoretical models which 542 include the current presence. We suspect that the discrepancy can be ad-543 dressed to the continuous input of energy due to the blowing wind. We 544 remind that the present experiments are in strong non homogeneous condi-545 tions and that increasing fetch length means higher energy transferred to the 546

547 Waves.

Group celerity also experiences a strong variation with respect to the ab-548 sence of current. We first notice that in absence of current, the group celerity 549 of the wind waves increases faster than the phase celerity (increments are 550 computed with respect to the group and phase celerity for the equivalent 551 swell), with a ratio  $(c_q - c_{q0})/(c - c_0) > 1.2$ . The current acts in reducing 552 this value, with a smooth decrease for co-current conditions and with dis-553 persed data for counter-current conditions. The counter-current significantly 554 reduces the flux of energy along the path, with a consequent fast increase of 555 the wave height. In this respect the counter-current has a shoaling effect. 556

Grouping analysis reveals that the mean length of the group is almost unaffected by a co-current (unless the current itself is very strong), and is subject to non monotonic variations in presence of a counter-current. A minimum value of the length is observed in the counter-current domain, where a significant change in the wave field takes place. Larger speed of the counter-current favours longer wave groups.

Due to the complex and sometime unexpected phenomena, the overall 563 scenario is sufficient to justify further tests aiming to a generalization of 564 the present results. We bear in mind the small scale of the experiments, 565 where, e.g., the Weber number influence is neglected since tension surface 566 effects are considered as negligible. Also, the finite size of the channel induces 567 some extra-circulation which is included in bulk in the analysis, without a 568 detailed separation of the wind drift, imposed current and secondary circu-569 lation. However, the results are clear cutting with respect to the profound 570 difference between a co- and a counter-current. 571

# 572 Appendix A. Dimensional analysis for wind waves and currents 573 and scaling

<sup>574</sup> We consider the process of wave generation due to wind action, in the <sup>575</sup> presence of a current. The general function can be written as

$$f(H_{rms}, T_p, u_*, F, t_d, g, u_c, h) = 0,$$
(A.1)

where  $H_{rms}$  is the root mean square wave height,  $T_p$  is the peak period,  $u_*$ is the friction velocity, F is the fetch length,  $t_d$  is the wind duration, g is the gravitational acceleration and  $u_c$  is a velocity scale of the current, h is the local depth. We are neglecting tension surface effects. The problem is <sup>580</sup> purely kinematic with a dimension of two, and upon selection of g and  $u_*$ <sup>581</sup> as fundamental variables, dimensional analysis suggests a maximum of six <sup>582</sup> non-dimensional groups, and eq.(A.1) reduces to

$$f\left(\frac{gH_{rms}}{u_*^2}, \frac{gT_p}{u_*}, \frac{u_c}{u_*}, \frac{gF}{u_*^2}, \frac{gt_d}{u_*}, \frac{gh}{u_*^2}\right) = 0.$$
(A.2)

Although friction velocity is considered a correct scale for growing waves characteristics [see, e.g., 60], the group celerity of the waves  $c_g$  seems more appropriate for the current effects, with the group  $u_c/u_*$  substituted by  $u_c/c_g$ . This last group can be introduced by mean of the dispersion relation for linear waves, which can be expressed as  $f(c_g/u_*, gh/u_*^2, gT_p/u_*) = 0$ . As a consequence of the different choice of the velocity scale, the general function (A.2) becomes

$$f\left(\frac{gH_{rms}}{u_*^2}, \frac{gT_p}{u_*}, \frac{u_c}{c_g}, \frac{gF}{u_*^2}, \frac{gt_d}{u_*}, \frac{gh}{u_*^2}\right) = 0.$$
(A.3)

As long as the waves are in deep water (the present experiments meet this condition), the group  $gh/u_*$  can be eliminated. In a similar way, if the duration of the wind is enough to saturate the given fetch, we are in stationary generation condition and also the group  $gt_d/u_*$  is not relevant. Overall, the general function in deep water and in stationary condition can be written as

$$f\left(\frac{gH_{rms}}{u_*^2}, \frac{gT_p}{u_*}, \frac{u_c}{c_g}, \frac{gF}{u_*^2}\right) = 0.$$
(A.4)

A relevant issue is related to the scaling between the experiments in the 596 laboratory and the field. The approximate similarity is based on the Froude 597 number, which forces a velocity and a time scale equal to  $\lambda^{1/2}$ , being  $\lambda$  the 598 geometric scale. At the same time the Reynolds number, which is relevant 599 mainly for the air flow, scales as  $\lambda^{3/2}$  and assumes a smaller value in the 600 laboratory than in the field, since  $\lambda < 1$ . It is a classical problem of scale 601 effects, with air flow in the laboratory in a transition regime whereas is in a 602 turbulent or fully turbulent regime in the field. For the wave flow, a Reynolds 603 number based on the amplitude and on the orbital velocity of the waves [61] 604 is 605

$$Re_w = \frac{aV}{\nu_w} = \frac{a^2\omega}{\nu_w},\tag{A.5}$$

where *a* is the amplitude,  $V = \omega a$  is the orbital velocity,  $\omega$  is the pulsation,  $\nu_w$  is the kinematic viscosity of water. Upon substitution of the dispersion relation, yields

$$Re_w = \sqrt{2g\pi} \frac{a^2}{\nu_w \sqrt{L}},\tag{A.6}$$

where L is the local wave-length. The critical Reynolds number is  $Re_{w,cr} \approx$ 609 3000 and since the amplitude motion decays exponentially with depth, a 610 similar decay is expected for  $Re_w$ , with a possibly turbulent flow near the 611 free surface and a laminar flow beneath. This effect can be highly distorted in 612 the laboratory, where the critical condition for turbulence is seldom reached 613 also near the free surface, whereas it is a quite common condition in the field 614 near the free surface and for a significant fraction of the water column. Note 615 that this kind of turbulence is not related to wave breaking or to water drops 616 accelerated by the wind before impacting the free surface [15]. Turbulence, 617 once generated is diffused downwards by several other phenomena, and in 618 the presence of currents can be also generated by the shear well beneath the 619 free surface. 620

As for the air side, a relevant Reynolds number is based on a roughness length scale  $z_0$ :

$$Re_a = \frac{z_0 u_*}{\nu_a},\tag{A.7}$$

where  $z_0$  is defined as [62]  $z_0 = \alpha u_*^2/g$ , with  $\alpha = 0.01 - 0.02$  the Charnock's parameter. The flow regime is considered aerodynamically rough (fully turbulent and not depending on air viscosity) if  $Re_a > \approx 2.5$ , and smooth if  $Re_a < \approx 0.13$  [see, e.g., 63]. It is a matter of evidence that a reduction of the Reynolds number for the air in the laboratory can have the consequence of reproducing a transitional or even a smooth air flow, instead of a turbulent one.

All these information are a caveat for a correct extension of the laboratory results to the field. In particular, we expect that the laboratory experiments give an underestimation of the turbulence levels for the air and for the water, with a consequent underestimation of diffusivity of chemicals, gases, heat, with a limited spray generation, possibly with a generation of currents with velocity scaling not proportional to  $\sqrt{\lambda}$  and with a different profile in the vertical.

In the present experiments  $Re_w = 700 - 7000$  (see Table 1), with 10 tests (most in low wind speed - LWS - condition) in the transition regime;

the Reynolds number for the air side is  $Re_a = 20 - 67$ , always in turbulent regime. We expect that by extrapolating the laboratory results to field data with a geometric scale  $\lambda \ll 1$ , a scale effect is present for the water flow field.

## 642 **References**

- [1] M. Sclavo, A. Benetazzo, S. Carniel, A. Bergamasco, F. M. Falcieri,
  D. Bonaldo, Wave-current interaction effect on sediment dispersal in a
  shallow semi-enclosed basin, Journal of Coastal Research 65 (sp2) (2013)
  1587–1592.
- [2] L. Chiapponi, S. Longo, E. Palmisani, C. De Piccoli, B. Matticchio,
  Wave-current interaction in the Porto di Lido entrance of the Venice
  Lagoon, in: Proceedings of the XXII TELEMAC-MASCARET Technical User Conference October 15-16, 2026, 2015, pp. 148–153.
- [3] L. Melito, M. Postacchini, A. Sheremet, J. Calantoni, G. Zitti,
  G. Darvini, M. Brocchini, Wave-Current Interactions and Infragravity
  Wave Propagation at a Microtidal Inlet, in: Multidisciplinary Digital
  Publishing Institute Proceedings, Vol. 2(11), 2018, p. 628.
- <sup>655</sup> [4] O. M. Phillips, On the generation of waves by turbulent wind, Journal <sup>656</sup> of Fluid Mechanics 2 (5) (1957) 417–445.
- [5] J. W. Miles, On the generation of surface waves by shear flows, Journal
   of Fluid Mechanics 3 (2) (1957) 185–204.
- [6] J. W. Miles, On the generation of surface waves by shear flows. part 4,
   Journal of Fluid Mechanics 13 (3) (1962) 433-448.
- [7] O. M. Phillips, The dynamics of the upper ocean, Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- [8] P. A. E. M. Janssen, Quasi-linear theory of wind-wave generation applied
   to wave forecasting, Journal of Physical Oceanography 21 (11) (1991)
   1631–1642.
- [9] J. W. Miles, Surface-wave generation revisited, Journal of Fluid Mechanics 256 (1993) 427–441.

- [10] T. S. Hristov, S. D. Miller, C. A. Friehe, Dynamical coupling of wind and
  ocean waves through wave-induced air flow, Nature 422 (6927) (2003)
  55.
- [11] L. Grare, L. Lenain, W. K. Melville, Wave-coherent airflow and critical layers over ocean waves, Journal of Physical Oceanography 43 (10) (2013) 2156–2172.
- <sup>674</sup> [12] D. Liberzon, L. Shemer, Experimental study of the initial stages of wind <sup>675</sup> waves' spatial evolution, Journal of Fluid Mechanics 681 (2011) 462–498.
- [13] S. Longo, Wind-generated water waves in a wind tunnel: Free surface
  statistics, wind friction and mean air flow properties, Coastal Engineering 61 (1) (2012) 27–41. doi:10.1016/j.coastaleng.2011.11.008.
- [14] S. Longo, D. Liang, L. Chiapponi, L. Aguilera Jimenez. 679 flow Turbulent structure in experimental laboratory wind-680 generated gravity waves, Coastal Engineering 64 (2012) 1 - 15. 681 doi:10.1016/j.coastaleng.2012.02.006. 682
- [15] S. Longo, L. Chiapponi, M. Clavero, T. Mäkelä, D. Liang, Study of
   the turbulence in the air-side and water-side boundary layers in experi mental laboratory wind induced surface waves, Coastal Engineering 69
   (2012) 67–81.
- [16] J. D. A. Van Hoften, S. Karaki, Interaction of waves and a turbulent
   current, in: Proceedings of Coastal Engineering 1976, ASCE, 1977, pp.
   404–422.
- [17] W. D. Grant, O. S. Madsen, Combined wave and current interaction
  with a rough bottom, Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans 84 (C4)
  (1979) 1797–1808.
- [18] P. H. Kemp, R. R. Simons, The interaction between waves and a turbulent current: waves propagating with the current, Journal of Fluid
  Mechanics 116 (1982) 227–250.
- [19] P. H. Kemp, R. R. Simons, The interaction of waves and a turbulent current: waves propagating against the current, Journal of Fluid Mechanics 130 (1983) 73–89.

- [20] J. Groeneweg, G. Klopman, Changes of the mean velocity profiles in
  the combined wave-current motion described in a GLM formulation,
  Journal of Fluid Mechanics 370 (1998) 271–296.
- [21] J. F. A. Sleath, Velocities and shear stresses in wave-current flows, Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans 96 (C8) (1991) 15237–15244.
- [22] G. Klopman, Vertical structure of the flow due to waves and currents laser-doppler flow measurements for waves following or opposing a cur rent, WL report H840-30, part II, for Rijkswaterstaat.
- [23] G. Klopman, Secondary circulation of the flow due to waves-laser doppler flow measurements following or opposing a current, WL rapport
   Z2249 for Rijkswaterstaat.
- [24] M. Umeyama, Reynolds stresses and velocity distributions in a wavecurrent coexisting environment, Journal of Waterway, Port, Coastal, and Ocean Engineering 131 (5) (2005) 203–212.
- [25] J. A. Smith, Wave-current interactions in finite depth, Journal of Physical Oceanography 36 (7) (2006) 1403–1419.
- [26] S. Roy, K. Debnath, B. S. Mazumder, Distribution of eddy scales for
  wave current combined flow, Applied Ocean Research 63 (2017) 170–
  183.
- [27] A. Chawla, J. T. Kirby, Experimental study of wave breaking and blocking on opposing currents, in: Proceedings of Coastal Engineering 1998,
  ASCE, 1999, pp. 759–772.
- [28] A. Chawla, J. T. Kirby, Monochromatic and random wave breaking
  at blocking points, Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans 107 (C7)
  (2002) 4–1.
- [29] I. K. Suastika, M. P. C. d. Jong, J. A. Battjes, Experimental study
  of wave blocking, in: Proceedings of Coastal Engineering 2000, ASCE,
  2001, pp. 227–240.
- [30] Y. Ma, G. Dong, M. Perlin, X. Ma, G. Wang, J. Xu, Laboratory observations of wave evolution, modulation and blocking due to spatially
  varying opposing currents, Journal of Fluid Mechanics 661 (2010) 108–
  129.

- [31] S. R. Long, N. E. Huang, Observations of wind-generated waves on
  variable current, Journal of Physical Oceanography 6 (6) (1976) 962–
  968.
- [32] Q. Zou, H. Chen, Wind and current effects on extreme wave formation
  and breaking, Journal of Physical Oceanography 47 (7) (2017) 1817–
  1841.
- [33] M. Onorato, D. Proment, A. Toffoli, Triggering rogue waves in opposing currents, Physical Review Letters 107 (18) (2011) 184502.
- [34] T. Waseda, T. Kinoshita, L. Cavaleri, A. Toffoli, Third-order resonant
  wave interactions under the influence of background current fields, Journal of Fluid Mechanics 784 (2015) 51–73.
- [35] A. Toffoli, L. Cavaleri, A. Babanin, M. Benoit, E. Bitner-Gregersen,
  J. Monbaliu, M. Onorato, A. R. Osborne, C. Stansberg, Occurrence of
  extreme waves in three-dimensional mechanically generated wave fields
  propagating over an oblique current, Natural Hazards and Earth System
  Sciences 11 (3) (2011) 895–903.
- [36] Y. Ma, X. Ma, M. Perlin, G. Dong, Extreme waves generated by modulational instability on adverse currents, Physics of Fluids 25 (11) (2013) 114109.
- [37] A. Toffoli, T. Waseda, H. Houtani, T. Kinoshita, K. Collins, D. Proment, M. Onorato, Excitation of rogue waves in a variable medium:
  An experimental study on the interaction of water waves and currents, Physical Review E 87 (5) (2013) 051201.
- [38] A. Toffoli, T. Waseda, H. Houtani, L. Cavaleri, D. Greaves, M. Onorato,
  Rogue waves in opposing currents: an experimental study on deterministic and stochastic wave trains, Journal of Fluid Mechanics 769 (2015)
  277–297.
- [39] G. Rousseaux, C. Mathis, P. Maïssa, T. G. Philbin, U. Leonhardt, Observation of negative-frequency waves in a water tank: a classical analogue to the Hawking effect?, New Journal of Physics 10 (5) (2008)
  053015.

- [40] K. F. Lambrakos, Wave-current interaction effects on water velocity and
   surface wave spectra, Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans 86 (C11)
   (1981) 10955–10960.
- [41] J. Wolf, D. Prandle, Some observations of wave-current interaction,
   Coastal Engineering 37 (3-4) (1999) 471–485.
- [42] A. J. van der Westhuysen, Spectral modeling of wave dissipation on
   negative current gradients, Coastal Engineering 68 (2012) 17–30.
- [43] M. Viitak, I. Maljutenko, V. Alari, Ü. Suursaar, S. Rikka, P. Lagemaa,
  The impact of surface currents and sea level on the wave field evolution
  during St. Jude storm in the eastern Baltic Sea, Oceanologia 58 (3)
  (2016) 176–186.
- [44] Z. Wei, R. A. Dalrymple, M. Xu, R. Garnier, M. Derakhti, Short-crested
  waves in the surf zone, Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans 122 (5)
  (2017) 4143–4162.
- [45] T. S. Hedges, R. G. Tickell, J. Akrigg, Interaction of short-crested random waves and large-scale currents, Coastal Engineering 19 (3-4) (1993)
  207–221.
- [46] L. Cavaleri, J.-H. Alves, F. Ardhuin, A. Babanin, M. Banner, K. Belibassakis, M. Benoit, M. Donelan, J. Groeneweg, T. Herbers, P. Hwang,
  P. Janssen, T. Janssen, I. Lavrenov, R. Magne, J. Monbaliu, M. Onorato, V. Polnikov, D. Resio, W. Rogers, A. Sheremet, J. M. Smith,
  H. Tolman, G. van Vledder, J. Wolf, I. Young, Wave modelling The
  state of the art, Progress in Oceanography 75 (4) (2007) 603 674.
  doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pocean.2007.05.005.
- [47] K. Hasselmann, T. P. Barnett, E. Bouws, H. Carlson, D. E. Cartwright,
  K. Enke, J. A. Ewing, H. Gienapp, D. E. Hasselmann, P. Kruseman,
  A. Meerburg, P. Mullar, D. J. Olbers, K. Richter, W. Sell, H. Walden,
  Measurements of wind-wave growth and swell decay during the Joint
  North Sea Wave Project (JONSWAP), Ergänzungsheft 8-12.
- [48] M. S. Longuet-Higgins, R. W. Stewart, The changes in amplitude of
  short gravity waves on steady non-uniform currents, Journal of Fluid
  Mechanics 10 (4) (1961) 529–549.

- [49] M. P. Tulin, T. Waseda, Laboratory observations of wave group evolution, including breaking effects, Journal of Fluid Mechanics 378 (1999) 197–232.
- <sup>797</sup> [50] V. Zakharov, N. Filonenko, Energy spectrum for stochastic oscillations
  <sup>798</sup> of the surface of a liquid, in: Soviet Physics Doklady, Vol. 11, 1967, p.
  <sup>799</sup> 881.
- <sup>800</sup> [51] P. Denissenko, S. Lukaschuk, S. Nazarenko, Gravity wave turbulence in
  <sup>801</sup> a laboratory flume, Physical review letters 99 (1) (2007) 014501.
- <sup>802</sup> [52] L. Deike, B. Miquel, P. Gutiérrez, T. Jamin, B. Semin, M. Berhanu,
  <sup>803</sup> E. Falcon, F. Bonnefoy, Role of the basin boundary conditions in gravity
  <sup>804</sup> wave turbulence, Journal of Fluid Mechanics 781 (2015) 196–225.
- [53] A. Toffoli, D. Proment, H. Salman, J. Monbaliu, F. Frascoli, M. Dafilis,
  E. Stramignoni, R. Forza, M. Manfrin, M. Onorato, Wind generated
  rogue waves in an annular wave flume, Physical Review Letters 118 (14)
  (2017) 144503.
- <sup>809</sup> [54] J. S. Bendat, A. Piersol, Random Data Analysis and Measurement Pro-<sup>810</sup> cedures, Wiley, 2000.
- [55] Y. Goda, Random seas and design of maritime structures, Vol. 33, World
   Scientific Publishing Company, 2010.
- [56] M. Smith, E. Poulter, J. McGregor, Doppler radar measurements of
  wave groups and breaking waves, Journal of Geophysical Research:
  Oceans 101 (C6) (1996) 14269–14282.
- <sup>816</sup> [57] T. Waseda, M. P. Tulin, Experimental study of the stability of deep<sup>817</sup> water wave trains including wind effects, Journal of Fluid Mechanics
  <sup>818</sup> 401 (1999) 55–84.
- <sup>819</sup> [58] A. Kimura, Statistical properties of random wave groups, in: Proceed-<sup>820</sup> ings of Coastal Engineering 1980, ASCE, 1980, pp. 2955–2973.
- [59] S. Elgar, R. T. Guza, R. J. Seymour, Groups of waves in shallow water,
  Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans 89 (C3) (1984) 3623–3634.
- <sup>823</sup> [60] P. Janssen, G. Komen, W. De Voogt, Friction velocity scaling in wind <sup>824</sup> wave generation, Boundary-Layer Meteorology 38 (1-2) (1987) 29–35.

- <sup>825</sup> [61] A. V. Babanin, On a wave-induced turbulence and a wave-mixed upper ocean layer, Geophysical Research Letters 33 (20).
- [62] H. Charnock, Wind stress on a water surface, Quarterly Journal of the
  Royal Meteorological Society 81 (350) (1955) 639–640.
- E. B. Kraus, J. A. Businger, Atmosphere-ocean interaction, Vol. 27,
   Oxford University Press, 1994.