On another concept of Hasselmann equation source terms

An exploration of tuning - free models

Vladimir Zakharov, Donal Resio, Andrei Pushkarev

Waves and Solitons LLC

University of Arizona

University of North Florida

Novosibirsk State University

Lebedev Physical Institute RAS

Klaus Hasselmann (1962)

$$\frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \omega_k}{\partial \vec{k}} \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial \vec{r}} = S_{nl} + S_{in} + S_{diss}$$

$$0 + 0 = S_{nl} + 0 + 0 \Rightarrow \varepsilon = C_K \frac{P^{1/3}}{\omega^4}$$

S_{nl} –derived from free surface Euler equations

S_{in} –multiple versions, differences up to 500%

S_{diss} –multiple LF and HF versions

Detailed discussion in Pushkarev, Zakharov 2016

Motivation :

Build S_{in} *consistent with mathematical properties of Hasselmann equation and requiring minimal tuning of the model*

Field Experiments	Theory	Numerics
$\varepsilon \sim \omega^{-4}$ $\varepsilon \sim \chi^{p}$, $\langle \omega \rangle \sim \chi^{-q}$ $0.74 < p < 1$ $0.2 < q < 0.3$ *Badulin, Babanin, Resio, Zakharov 2008*	$S_{nl} = 0 \Rightarrow \varepsilon = C_K \frac{P^{1/3}}{\omega^4}$ *Zakharov, Filonenko 1968* $\varepsilon \sim \chi^{p}$, $\langle \omega \rangle \sim \chi^{-q}$ $p = 1$, $q = 0.3$ *Zakharov 2005* *Zakharov, Resio, Pushkarev 2012*	$\varepsilon \sim \omega^{-4}$ $\varepsilon \sim \chi^{p}$, $\langle \omega \rangle \sim \chi^{-q}$ $p \approx 1$, $q \approx 0.3$ *Pushkarev, Resio, Zakharov 2003* *Badulin, Pushkarev, Resio, Zakharov 2005*

Experiment	p	q
Black Sea (Babanin & Soloviev 1998b)	0.89	0.275
Walsh et al. (1989) US coast	1.0	0.29
Kahma & Calkoen (1992) unstable	0.94	0.28
Kahma & Calkoen (1992) stable	0.76	0.24
Kahma & Pettersson (1994)	0.93	0.28
JONSWAP by Davidan (1980)	1.0	0.28
JONSWAP by Phillips (1977)	1.0	0.25
Kahma & Calkoen (1992) composite	0.9	0.27
Kahma (1981, 1986) rapid growth	1.0	0.33
Kahma (1986) average growth	1.0	0.33
Donelan et al. (1992) St Claire	1.0	0.33
Ross (1978), Atlantic, stable	1.1	0.27
Liu & Ross (1980), Michigan, unstable	1.1	0.27
JONSWAP (Hasselmann et al. 1973)	1.0	0.33
Mitsuyasu et al. (1971)	1.008	0.33
ZRP numerics	1.0	0.3

Exponents of wind-wave growth in fetch-limited experiments. Adapted from Badulin, Babanin, Zakharov, Resio 2007

Theoretical approach

Fetch limited case: $$\frac{\partial \omega_k}{\partial \vec{k}} \frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial \vec{r}} = S_{nl} + S_{in}$$

Duration limited case: $$\frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial t} = S_{nl} + S_{in}$$

$$S_{in} \sim \varepsilon \, \omega^{s+1}$$

Existence of self-similar solutions is no guarantee of their realization!

Example – wave collapse in NLS

Duration Limited Case	Fetch Limited Case
$\varepsilon = t^{p+q} F(\omega t^{q})$	$\varepsilon = \chi^{p+q} G(\omega \chi^{q})$
$\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0 t^{p} \quad \langle \omega \rangle = \omega_0 t^{-q}$	$\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0 \chi^{p} \quad \langle \omega \rangle = \omega_0 \chi^{-q}$
$9q - 2p = 1$	$10q - 2p = 1$
$s = s(p, q)$	$s = s(p, q)$

Experimental approach

Resio-Long 2004-2007 regression line

$$F(k)=\beta k^{-5/2} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \varepsilon=C_K \frac{P^{1/3}}{\omega^4}$$



$$\beta=\frac{1}{2}\alpha_4[(u_\lambda^2 c_p)^{1/3}-u_0]g^{-1/2}$$

Duration Limited Case	Fetch Limited Case
$p = 10/7 \quad q = 3/7$	$p = 1 \quad q = 3/10$
$s = 4/3$	$s = 4/3$

ZRP wind input term:

$$S_{in}(\omega,\theta)=A\cdot\frac{\rho_{air}}{\rho_{water}}\,\omega\left(\frac{\omega}{\omega_0}\right)^{4/3}f(\theta)\ \varepsilon(\omega,\theta)$$

$$f(\theta)=\begin{cases}\cos^2(\theta),\ \ for\ \ -\pi/4<\theta<\pi/4\\ 0,\ \ otherwise\end{cases}$$

$$\omega_0=\frac{g}{U_{10}}$$

Numerical approach

The model still misses 2 features:

- *the coefficient in front of ZRP* S_{in}

- *dissipation function* S_{diss}

$\sim f^{-5}$ *“implicit dissipation” for* $f \geqslant 1.1\,Hz$

Low-pass filter



WAM3 dissipation

Duration limited case

Wind speed 10 m/sec



Dimensionless energy versus dimensionless solid line.
Self-similar solution - dashed line.



Total energy index as the function of dimensionless time - solid line. Self-similar index p = 10/7 - dashed line.



Dimensionless frequency versus dimensionless - solid line, self-similar solution - dashed line.



Mean frequency index versus dimensionless time - solid line.
Self-similar index $q = -3/7$ - dashed line



"Magic number" 9q − 2p versus dimensionless time – solid line.
Self-similar target - dashed line.



Decimal logarithm of the angle averaged spectrum versus decimal logarithm of the frequency - solid line. Spectrum f^{-4} *- dashed line, spectrum* f^{-5} *- dash-dotted line.*



Compensated spectrum versus frequency f.



Angle averaged wind input function (dotted line) and angle averaged spectrum (solid line) versus frequency f.



Experimental (dotted line), theoretical (dashed line) and numerical (diamonds) 1000β versus specific velocity for wind speed 10 m/sec.

Duration limited case



Limited fetch case

Wind speed 5 and 10 m/sec



Total energy versus fetch: wind speed 10 m/sec - solid line, 5 m/sec - dash-dotted line. Self-similar solution - dashed line



Local energy index versus fetch.



Mean frequency versus the fetch for wind speed 10 m/sec (solid line) and 5 m/sec (dashed line). Self-similar dependence - dash-dotted line.



Local mean frequency exponent −q = dln<ω> dlnx as the function of dimensionless fetch xg/U2 for fetch limited case. Wind speed 10 m/sec - solid line, wind speed 5 m/sec - dashed line. Horizontal dashed line - target value of the self-similar exponent -q = -0.3.



Magic number" 10q – 2p versus the fetch. Wind speed 10 m/sec - solid line, wind speed 5 m/sec - dash-dotted line. Self-similar target 1 – dashed line.



Decimal logarithm of the angle averaged spectrum versus decimal logarithm of the frequency - solid line. Spectrum f^{-4} *- dashed line, spectrum* f^{-5} *- dash-dotted line.*



Angle averaged wind input function (dotted line) and angle averaged spectrum (solid line) versus frequency f.



Compensated spectrum versus frequency f.



Experimental (dotted line), theoretical (dashed line) and numerical (diamonds) 1000β versus specific velocity for wind speed 10 m/sec.



Energy versus fetch, adapted from Young 1999



Frequency versus fetch, adapted from Young 1999



Limited fetch case
Fetch = 20.08 km
Max = 0.065
0.4
0.2
0.0
-0.2
-0.4
-0.4
-0.2
0.0
0.2
0.4
f (Hz)
f (Hz)


Fetch = 20.08km
Time= 8.02h
0.12
0.10
0.08
0.06
0.04
0.02
0.00
E/E_{tot}
-3
-2
-1
0
1
2
θ

CONCLUSIONS:

1. **New set of source terms:**

- ➔ *XNL*
- ➔ *self-similarity*
- ➔ *experiments*
- ➔ *“implicit” dissipation*

2. **Conceptual difference with WAM3:**

- ➔ *HF vs spectral peak dissipation*
- ➔ *no wind input and dissipation overlapping*

3. **Physically based model:**

- ➔ *reproduction of HE theoretical properties*
- ➔ *reproduction of field experiments*

4. **No tuning for wind speed change**

What we call long-wave, or spectral peak dissipation?



Is our simulation trustworthy?



Komen, S. Hasselmann, K. Hasselmann JPO (1984)