

# **Technical and numerical doc** *Release 1.2*

**S.Jullien, M.Caillaud, R. Benshila, L. Bordois , G. Cambon, F. Dufois, F. Dumas, J. Gula , M. Le Corre, S. Le Gentil, F. Lemarié , P. Marchesiello, G. Morvan, and S. Theetten**

**Dec 05, 2022**

# **CONTENTS**





### Related CPP options:



### *Preselected options:*



### Presentation

By default (#undef NBQ), CROCO solves the primitive equations as in ROMS, from which it inherited the robustness and efficiency of its time-splitting implementation (Shchepetkin & McWilliams, 2005; Debreu et al., 2012) and the NBQ option proposes an extension for nonhydrostatic applications. In CROCO's time-splitting algorithm, the "slow mode" is similar to ROMS internal (baroclinic) mode described in Shchepetkin & McWilliams (2005), whereas, the "fast mode" can include, in addition to the external (barotropic) mode, the pseudo-acoustic mode that allows computation of the nonhydrostatic pressure within a non-Boussinesq approach (Auclair et al., 2018). In this case, the slow internal mode is also augmented by a prognostic equation of vertical velocity, replacing the hydrostatic equation. Another option (CROCO\_QH) extends the PE equations to form the quasi-hydrostatic equations, relaxing the hypothesis of weak horizontal Coriolis force (Marshall et al., 1997), thus adding a nonhydrostatic pressure component that is solved diagnostically. Then another option (MRL\_WCI) treats the waveaveraged equations (McWilliams et al., 2004) with wave-current interaction terms that are both conservative and non-conservative (needing parametrizations).

# **PRIMITIVE EQUATIONS**

<span id="page-6-0"></span>At resolutions larger than 1 km (more marginally above 100 m), The ocean is a fluid that can be described to a good approximation by the primitive equations. The PE equations are simplifications from the Navier-Stokes equations made from scale considerations, along with a nonlinear equation of state, which couples the two active tracers (temperature and salinity):

- Hydrostatic hypothesis: the vertical momentum equation is reduced to a balance between the vertical pressure gradient and the buoyancy force (nonhydrostatic processes such as convection must be parametrized)
- Boussinesq hypothesis: density variations are neglected except in their contribution to the buoyancy force
- Incompressibility hypothesis (steming from the former): the three dimensional divergence of the velocity vector is assumed to be zero.
- Spherical earth approximation: the geopotential surfaces are assumed to be spheres so that gravity (local vertical) is parallel to the earth's radius
- Thin-shell approximation: the ocean depth is neglected compared to the earth's radius
- Turbulent closure hypothesis: the turbulent fluxes (which represent the effect of small scale processes on the large-scale) are expressed in terms of large-scale features

By default (#undef NBQ), CROCO solves the primitive equations. But it has also the ability to relax the first 3 hypothesis (#define NBQ). When SOLV3D is not activated, CROCO can be used as a classical shallow water model.

## <span id="page-6-1"></span>**1.1 Equations in Cartesian coordinates**

• The momentum balance in zonal x and meridional y directions, written in terms of grid-scale (resolved) and subgrid-scale velocity components:

$$
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \vec{\nabla} \cdot (\vec{\mathbf{v}}u) - fv = -\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} + \mathcal{F}_u + \mathcal{D}_u
$$

$$
\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + \vec{\nabla} \cdot (\vec{\mathbf{v}}v) + fu = -\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y} + \mathcal{F}_v + \mathcal{D}_v
$$

Turbulent closure schemes are applied to parametrized subgrid-scale vertical fluxes.

• The time evolution of a scalar concentration field,  $C(x, y, z, t)$  (e.g. salinity, temperature, or nutrients), is governed by the advective-diffusive equation :

$$
\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} + \vec{\nabla} \cdot (\vec{\mathbf{v}}C) = \mathcal{F}_C + \mathcal{D}_C
$$

• The equation of state is given by :

$$
\rho = \rho(T, S, P)
$$

• In the Boussinesq approximation, density variations are neglected in the momentum equations except in their contribution to the buoyancy force in the vertical momentum equation. Under the hydrostatic approximation, it is further assumed that the vertical pressure gradient balances the buoyancy force :

$$
\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z}=-\frac{\rho g}{\rho_0}
$$

• The final equation expresses the continuity equation. For an incompressible fluid (Boussinesq approximation):

$$
\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{\mathbf{v}} = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial w}{\partial z} = 0
$$

The variables used are :

 $\mathcal{D}_u, \mathcal{D}_v, \mathcal{D}_C$ : diffusive terms

 $\mathcal{F}_u, \mathcal{F}_v, \mathcal{F}_C$ : forcing terms

 $f(x, y)$ : Traditional Coriolis parameter  $2\Omega sin\phi$ 

 $g$ : acceleration of gravity

 $\phi(x, y, z, t)$ : dynamic pressure  $\phi = P/\rho_0$ , with P the total pressure

 $\rho_0 + \rho(x, y, z, t)$ : total in situ density

 $u, v, w$ : the (x,y,z) components of vector velocity  $\vec{v}$ 

# <span id="page-7-0"></span>**1.2 Equations in terrain following coordinates**

We first introduce a generalized stretched vertical coordinate system  $(s)$ , which sets the variable bottom flat at  $z = -h(x, y)$ . *s* spans the range from -1 (bottom) to 0 (surface) and the transformation rules are:

$$
\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)_z = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)_s - \left(\frac{1}{H_z}\right)\left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial x}\right)_s \frac{\partial}{\partial s}
$$

$$
\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\right)_z = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\right)_s - \left(\frac{1}{H_z}\right)\left(\frac{\partial z}{\partial y}\right)_s \frac{\partial}{\partial s}
$$

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial z} = \left(\frac{\partial s}{\partial z}\right)\frac{\partial}{\partial s} = \frac{1}{H_z}\frac{\partial}{\partial s}
$$
where  $H_z \equiv \frac{\partial z}{\partial s}$ 

The vertical velocity in  $s$  coordinate is:

$$
\Omega(x, y, s, t) = \frac{1}{H_z} \left[ w - (1 + s) \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial t} - u \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} - v \frac{\partial z}{\partial y} \right]
$$

$$
w = \frac{\partial z}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial z}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial z}{\partial y} + \Omega H_z
$$

 $\Omega = 0$  at both surface and bottom.

Next, the requirement for a laterally variable grid resolution can also be met, for suitably smooth domains, by introducing an appropriate orthogonal coordinate transformation in the horizontal. Let the new coordinates be  $\xi(x, y)$  and  $\eta(x, y)$  where the relationship of horizontal arc length to the differential distance is given by:

$$
(ds)_{\xi} = \left(\frac{1}{m}\right) d\xi
$$

$$
(ds)_{\eta} = \left(\frac{1}{n}\right) d\eta
$$

Here  $m(\xi, \eta)$  and  $n(\xi, \eta)$  are the scale factors which relate the differential distances  $(\Delta \xi, \Delta \eta)$  to the actual (physical) arc lengths.

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \frac{H_z u}{mn} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \left( \frac{H_z u^2}{n} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \left( \frac{H_z u v}{m} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \left( \frac{H_z u \Omega}{mn} \right) \n- \left\{ \left( \frac{f}{mn} \right) + v \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \left( \frac{1}{n} \right) - u \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \left( \frac{1}{m} \right) \right\} H_z v = \n- \left( \frac{H_z}{n} \right) \left( \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \xi} + \frac{g \rho}{\rho_o} \frac{\partial z}{\partial \xi} + g \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial \xi} \right) + \frac{H_z}{mn} \left( \mathcal{F}_u + \mathcal{D}_u \right) \n\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \frac{H_z v}{mn} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \left( \frac{H_z u v}{n} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \left( \frac{H_z v^2}{m} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \left( \frac{H_z v \Omega}{mn} \right) \n+ \left\{ \left( \frac{f}{mn} \right) + v \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \left( \frac{1}{n} \right) - u \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \left( \frac{1}{m} \right) \right\} H_z u = \n- \left( \frac{H_z}{m} \right) \left( \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \eta} + \frac{g \rho}{\rho_o} \frac{\partial z}{\partial \eta} + g \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial \eta} \right) + \frac{H_z}{mn} \left( \mathcal{F}_v + \mathcal{D}_v \right) \n\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \frac{H_z T}{mn} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \left( \frac{H_z u T}{n} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \left( \frac{H_z v T}{m} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \left( \frac{H_z \Omega T}{mn} \right) = \frac{H_z}{mn} \left( \mathcal{F}_T + \mathcal{D}_T \right) \n\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left( \frac{H_z S}{mn} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\
$$

# **QUASI-HYDROSTATIC EQUATIONS**

<span id="page-10-0"></span>In oceanography, traditional approximation (TA) takes the Coriolis force only partially into account by neglecting the components proportional to the cosine of latitude:  $\tilde{f} = 2\Omega cos\phi$  (see Gerkema et al., 2008, for a review). The justification for the TA is in the hypothesis that the depth of the oceans is very thin compared to the radius of the Earth. The vertical motions must then be much weaker than the horizontal ones, rendering the non-tradiional (NT) Coriolis terms (with  $\tilde{f}$ ) insignificant compared to the traditional terms (with f) and rendering the pressure field nearly hydrostatic. Similarly, strong vertical stratification in density, which suppresses vertical motions, also diminishes the role of NT terms. However, this argument becomes weak near the equator  $({\tilde{f}} >> f)$ , or in motions with a strong vertical component (e.g., convection).

Note also that the QH momentum equations are shown to be more dynamically consistent than PE hydrostatic equations and that they correctly imply conservation laws for energy, angular momentum, and potential vorticity

## <span id="page-10-1"></span>**2.1 Equations in Cartesian coordinate**

• The momentum balance in x and y directions is extended to include  $\tilde{f}$  terms (zonal u component):

$$
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \vec{\nabla} \cdot (\vec{v}u) - fv + \tilde{f}w = -\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x} + \mathcal{F}_u + \mathcal{D}_u
$$

$$
\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + \vec{\nabla} \cdot (\vec{v}v) + fu = -\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y} + \mathcal{F}_v + \mathcal{D}_v
$$

• Under the QH approximation, the quasi-hydrostatic balance is used for the vertical momentum equation, where the zonal flow partially balances the pressure gradient :

$$
\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z} = -\frac{\rho g}{\rho_0} + \tilde{f}u
$$

In practice, the non-traditional term  $\tilde{f}u$  is introduce as a correction to density (in the density computation subroutine rho\_eos).

The variables used are :

 $\mathcal{D}_u, \mathcal{D}_v$ : diffusive terms

 $\mathcal{F}_u, \mathcal{F}_v$ : forcing terms

 $f(x, y)$ : Traditional Coriolis parameter  $2\Omega sin\phi$ 

 $\hat{f}(x, y)$ : Non-traditional Coriolis parameter 2 $\Omega cos \phi$ 

: acceleration of gravity

 $\phi(x, y, z, t)$ : dynamic pressure  $\phi = P/\rho_0$ , with P the total pressure

 $\rho_0 + \rho(x, y, z, t)$ : total in situ density

 $u, v, w$ : the (x,y,z) components of vector velocity  $\vec{v}$ 

# **WAVE-AVERAGED EQUATIONS**

<span id="page-12-0"></span>

*Preselected options:*

# define STOKES\_DRIFT

A vortex-force formalism for the interaction of surface gravity waves and currents is implemented in CROCO (Marchesiello et al., 2015; Uchiyama et al., 2010). Eulerian wave-averaged current equations for mass, momentum, and tracers are included based on an asymptotic theory by McWilliams et al. (2004) plus non-conservative wave effects due to wave breaking, associated surface roller waves, bottom streaming, and wave-enhanced vertical mixing and bottom drag especially for coastal and nearshore applications. The wave information is provided by either a spectrum-peak WKB wave-refraction model that includes the effect of currents on waves, or, alternatively, a spectrum-resolving wave model (e.g., WAVEWATCH3) can be used. In nearshore applications, the currents' cross-shore and vertical structure is shaped by the wave effects of near-surface breaker acceleration, vertical component of vortex force, and wave-enhanced pressure force and bottom drag.

# <span id="page-12-1"></span>**3.1 Equations in Cartesian coordinates**

In the Eulerian wave-averaged current equations, terms for the wave effect on currents (WEC) are added to the primitive equations. Three new variables are defined:

$$
\xi^{c} = \xi + \hat{\xi}
$$

$$
\phi^{c} = \phi + \hat{\phi}
$$

$$
\vec{v}_{L} = \vec{v} + \vec{v}_{S}
$$

where  $\xi^c$  is a composite sea level,  $\phi^c$  absorbs the Bernoulli head  $\hat{\phi}$ ,  $\vec{v_L}$  is the wave-averaged Lagrangian velocity, sum of Eulerian velocity and Stokes drift  $\vec{v_S}$ . The 3D Stokes velocity is non-divergent and defined for a monochromatic wave field (amplitude A, wavenumber vector  $\vec{\bf k} = (k_x, k_y)$ , and frequency  $\sigma$ ) by:

$$
u_S = \frac{A^2 \sigma}{2 \sinh^2 (kD)} \cosh(2k(z+h)) k_x
$$

$$
v_S = \frac{A^2 \sigma}{2 \sinh^2 (kD)} \cosh(2k(z+h)) k_y
$$

$$
w_S = -\int_{-h}^{z} \left(\frac{\partial u_S}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v_S}{\partial y}\right) dz'
$$

Where  $D = h + \xi^c$ . The quasi-static sea level and Bernouilli head are:

$$
\begin{aligned} \hat{\xi} &= -\frac{A^2 k}{2\sinh\left(2kD\right)}\\ \hat{\phi} &= \frac{A^2 \sigma}{4k\sinh^2\left(kD\right)} \int_{-h}^z \frac{\partial^2 \vec{\mathbf{k}}.\vec{\mathbf{v}}}{\partial z'^2} \sinh\left(2k(z-z')\right) \; dz' \end{aligned}
$$

The primitive equations become (after re-organizing advection and vortex force terms):

$$
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \vec{\nabla} \cdot (\vec{v}_L u) - f v_L = -\frac{\partial \phi^c}{\partial x} + \left( u_S \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} + v_S \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} \right) + \mathcal{F}_u + \mathcal{D}_u + \mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{W}} u
$$

$$
\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + \vec{\nabla} \cdot (\vec{v}_L v) + fu_L = -\frac{\partial \phi^c}{\partial y} + \left( u_S \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} + v_S \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} \right) + \mathcal{F}_v + \mathcal{D}_v + \mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{W}} v
$$

$$
\frac{\partial \phi^c}{\partial z} + \frac{\rho g}{\rho_0} = \vec{v}_S \cdot \frac{\partial \vec{v}}{\partial z}
$$

$$
\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} + \vec{\nabla} \cdot (\vec{v}_L C) = \mathcal{F}_C + \mathcal{D}_C + \mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{W}} c
$$

$$
\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{v}_L = 0
$$

$$
\rho = \rho(T, S, P)
$$

The variables used are :

 $\mathcal{D}_u, \mathcal{D}_v, \mathcal{D}_C$ : diffusive terms (including wave-enhaced bottom drag and mixing)  $\mathcal{F}_u, \mathcal{F}_v, \mathcal{F}_C$ : forcing terms

 ${\cal F}^{\cal W}_u, {\cal F}^{\cal W}_v, {\cal F}^{\cal W}_c$ : wave forcing terms (bottom streaming, breaking acceleration)

 $f(x, y)$ : Traditional Coriolis parameter  $2\Omega sin\phi$ 

 $g$ : acceleration of gravity

 $\phi(x, y, z, t)$ : dynamic pressure  $\phi = P/\rho_0$ , with P the total pressure

 $\rho_0 + \rho(x, y, z, t)$ : total in situ density

 $u, v, w$ : the (x,y,z) components of vector velocity  $\vec{v}$ 

## <span id="page-13-0"></span>**3.2 Embedded wave model**



*Preselected options:*

```
ifdef MRL CEW
  undef WKB KZ FILTER
# undef WKB_TIME_FILTER
# endif
 define WKB_ADD_DIFF
 # if defined SHOREFACE || defined SANDBAR || (defined RIP && !defined BISCA)
  define ANA BRY WKB
 endif
```
A WKB wave model for monochromatic waves is embedded in CROCO following Uchiyama et al. (2010). It is based on the conservation of wave action  $A = E/\sigma$  and wavenumber **k** – wave crest conservation – and is particularly suitable for nearshore beach applications, allowing refraction from bathymetry and currents (but no diffraction or reflection), with parametrizations for wave breaking and bottom drag:

$$
\frac{\partial \mathcal{A}}{\partial t} + \vec{\nabla} \cdot \mathcal{A} \vec{\mathbf{c}}_g = -\frac{\epsilon^w}{\sigma}
$$

$$
\frac{\partial \vec{\mathbf{k}}}{\partial t} + \vec{\mathbf{c}}_g \cdot \nabla \vec{\mathbf{k}} = -\vec{\mathbf{k}} \cdot \nabla \vec{\mathbf{V}} - \frac{k\sigma}{\sinh 2kD} \nabla D
$$

 $\vec{V}$  is the depth-averaged velocity vector and  $\sigma$  is the intrinsic frequency defined by the linear dispersion relation  $\sigma^2 = g k \tanh kD$ . Current effects on waves are noticeable in the groupe velocity  $c_g$  which gets two components: the doppler shift due to currents on waves and the groupe velocity of the primary carrier waves :

$$
\vec{\mathbf{c}}_g = \vec{\mathbf{V}} + \frac{\sigma}{2k^2} \left( 1 + \frac{2kD}{\sinh 2kD} \right) \vec{\mathbf{k}}
$$

The currents may need filtering before entering the wave model equations because the current field should evolve slowly with respect to waves in the asymptotic regime described by McWilliams et al. (2004). By default, this filtering is turned off (WKB\_KZ\_FILTER, WKB\_TIME\_FILTER).

 $\epsilon^w$  is the depth-integrated rate of wave energy dissipation due to depth-induced breaking  $\epsilon^b$  (including white capping) and bottom friction  $\epsilon^{wd}$ , both of which must be parameterized (in WKB, WW3 or CROCO if defined WAVE\_OFFLINE):

$$
\epsilon^w=\epsilon^b+\epsilon^{wd}
$$

## <span id="page-14-0"></span>**3.3 Breaking acceleration and bottom streaming**

A formulation for  $\epsilon^b$  is needed in both the wave model (dissipation term) and the circulation model (acceleration term). In the wave-averaged momentum equations of the circulation model, the breaking acceleration enters as a body force through  $\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{W}}$ :

$$
\vec{\mathbf{F}}^{\mathbf{b}} = \frac{\epsilon^b}{\rho \sigma} \vec{\mathbf{k}} \; f_b(z)
$$

where  $f_h(z)$  is a normalized vertical distribution function representing vertical penetration of momentum associated with breaking waves from the surface. The penetration depth is controlled by a vertical length-scale taken as  $H_{rms}.$ 

The wave model can also include a roller model with dissipation  $\epsilon^r$ . In this case:

$$
\vec{\mathbf{F}}^{\mathbf{b}} = \frac{(1 - \alpha_r)\epsilon^b + \epsilon^r}{\rho \sigma} \vec{\mathbf{k}} \, f_b(z)
$$

The idea is that some fraction  $\alpha_r$  of wave energy is converted into rollers that propagate toward the shoreline before dissipating, while the remaining fraction  $1-\alpha_r$  causes local dissipation (hence current acceleration). It can be useful for correcting  $\epsilon^b$  with some flexibility to depict different breaking wave and beach forms (e.g., spilling or

plunging breakers, barred or plane beaches), although the parameter  $B<sub>b</sub>$  can also be used for that. See Uchiyama et al. (2010) for the roller equation and  $\epsilon^r$  formulation.

Wave-enhanced bottom dissipation enters in the momentum equations through a combined wave-current drag formulation (see parametrizations) and bottom streaming. The latter is due to dissipation of wave energy in the wave boundary layer that causes the instantaneous, oscillatory wave bottom orbital velocities to be slightly in phase from quadrature; this causes a wave stress (bottom streaming) in the wave bottom boundary layer along the direction of wave propagation (Longuet-Higgins, 1953). The effect of bottom streaming in momentum balance is accounted for by using the wave dissipation due to bottom friction with an upward decaying vertical distribution:

$$
\vec{\mathbf{F}^{\mathbf{st}}} = \frac{\epsilon^{wd}}{\rho \sigma} \vec{\mathbf{k}} \, f_{st}(z)
$$

where  $f_{st}(z)$  is a vertical distribution function.

# <span id="page-15-0"></span>**3.4 Formulation of wave energy dissipation**



*Preselected options:*

```
define WAVE_BREAK_CT93
# undef WAVE_BREAK_TG86
 undef WAVE SFC BREAK
```
While a few formulations for  $\epsilon^b$  are implemented in CROCO, the one by Church and Thornton (1993) is generally successful for nearshore beach applications:

$$
\epsilon^b = \frac{3}{16}\sqrt{\pi}\rho g B_b^3 \frac{H_{rms}^3}{D} \left\{1+\tanh\left[8\left(\frac{H_{rms}}{\gamma_b D}-1\right)\right]\right\} \left\{1-\left[1+\left(\frac{H_{rms}}{\gamma_b D}\right)^2\right]^{-2.5}\right\}
$$

where  $B_b$  and  $\gamma_b$  are empirical parameters related to wave breaking.  $\gamma_b$  represents the wave height-to-depth ratio for which all waves are assumed to be breaking and  $B<sub>b</sub>$  is the fraction of foam on the face, accounting for the type of breaker.  $H_{rms}$  is the RMS wave height. For the DUCK94 experiment, Uchiyama et al. (2010) suggest  $\gamma_b = 0.4$  and  $B_b = 0.8$ , while for Biscarrosse Beach, Marchesiello et al. (2015) use  $\gamma_b = 0.3$  and  $B_b = 1.3$  from calibration with video cameras.

For  $\epsilon^{wd}$ , the dissipation caused by bottom viscous drag on the primary waves, we use a parameterization for the realistic regime of a turbulent wave boundary layer, consistent with the WKB spectrum-peak wave modeling:

$$
\epsilon^{wd} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \rho f_w u_{orb}^3
$$

where  $u_{orb}$  is the wave orbital velocity magnitude and  $f_w$  is a wave friction factor, function of roughness length  $z_0$ :

$$
u_{orb} = \frac{\sigma H_{rms}}{2 \sinh kD}
$$

$$
f_w = 1.39 \left(\frac{\sigma z_0}{u_{orb}}\right)^{0.52}
$$

### **References**

Marchesiello, P.; Benshila, R.; Almar, R.; Uchiyama, Y.; McWilliams, J.C., and Shchepetkin, A., 2015. On tridimensional rip current modeling. Ocean Model., 96, 36-48.

McWilliams, J.C., Restrepo, J.M., and Lane, M.R., 2004. An asymptotic theory for the interaction of waves and currents in coastal waters. J. Fluid Mech., 511, 135–178.

Thornton, E.B. & R.T. Guza, 1983: Transformation of wave height distribution, J. Geophys. Res. 88, 5925-5938.

Uchiyama, Y., McWilliams, J., Shchepetkin, A., 2010. Wave-current interaction in an oceanic circulation model with a vortex-force formalism: application to the surf zone. Ocean Modell. 34, 16–35.

Weir, B., Uchiyama, Y., Lane, E. M., Restrepo, J. M., & McWilliams, J. C. (2011). A vortex force analysis of the interaction of rip currents and surface gravity waves. Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans, 116(C5).

## <span id="page-18-0"></span>**NON-HYDROSTATIC, NON-BOUSSINESQ EQUATIONS**

The full set of Navier-Stokes equations for a free-surface ocean is explicitly integrated in the non-hydrostatic, non-Boussinesq version of CROCO (#define NBQ). In this approach, acoustic waves are solved explicitly to avoid Boussinesq-degeneracy, which inevitably leads to a 3D Poisson-system in non-hydrostatic Boussinesq methods – detrimental to computational costs and difficult to implement within a split-explicit barotropic/baroclinic model.

NBQ equations include the momentum and continuity equations, the surface kinematic relation (for free surface), temperature, salinity – or other tracer  $C$  – and the equation of state, which reads in Cartesian coordinates:

$$
\frac{\partial \rho u}{\partial t} + \vec{\nabla} \cdot (\rho \vec{v} u) - \rho f v - \rho \tilde{f} w = -\frac{\partial P}{\partial x} + \lambda \frac{\partial \vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{v}}{\partial x} + \mathcal{F}_u + \mathcal{D}_u
$$

$$
\frac{\partial \rho v}{\partial t} + \vec{\nabla} \cdot (\rho \vec{v} v) + \rho f u = -\frac{\partial P}{\partial y} + \lambda \frac{\partial \vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{v}}{\partial y} + \mathcal{F}_v + \mathcal{D}_v
$$

$$
\frac{\partial \rho w}{\partial t} + \vec{\nabla} \cdot (\rho \vec{v} w) - \rho \tilde{f} u = -\frac{\partial P}{\partial z} - \rho g + \lambda \frac{\partial (\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{v})}{\partial z} + \mathcal{F}_w + \mathcal{D}_w
$$

$$
\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = -\vec{\nabla} \cdot (\rho \vec{v})
$$

$$
\frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t} = w_f|_{z=\xi} - \vec{v}|_{z=\xi} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \xi
$$

$$
\frac{\partial \rho C}{\partial t} = -\vec{\nabla} \cdot (\rho \vec{v} C) + \mathcal{F}_C + \mathcal{D}_C
$$

 $\lambda$  is the second (bulk) viscosity, associated with compressibility (it can be used to damp acoustic waves).

A relation between  $\rho$  and  $P$  is now required. To that end, and as part of a time-splitting approach, density is decomposed into slow and fast components based on a first-order decomposition with respect to total pressure. In the following,  $s$  and  $f$  subscripts refer to slow and fast-mode components respectively:

$$
\rho = \rho_s(T, S, P) + \frac{\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial P}}{\frac{\partial P}{\partial P}} \Big|_{T, S} \delta P + O(\delta P^2)
$$

$$
P = \underbrace{P_{atm} + \int_z^{\xi} (\rho_s - \rho_0) g \, dz'}_{SLOW} + \underbrace{\rho_0 g(\xi - z) + \delta P}_{FAST}
$$

 $c_s$  is the speed of sound and  $\delta P = P_f$  is the nonhydrostatic pressure.

The Navier-Stokes equations are then integrated with two different time-steps within the time-splitting approach. The slow mode is identical to ROMS whereas the fast mode (in the NBQ equations) is 3D and the fast time step includes the integration of the compressible terms of the momentum and continuity equations. In vector form:

$$
\frac{\partial \rho \vec{v}}{\partial t} = -\vec{\nabla} \cdot (\rho \vec{v} \otimes \vec{v}) - 2\rho \vec{\Omega} \times \vec{v} - \vec{\nabla} \left( \int_z^{\xi_f} (\rho_s - \rho_0) g \, dz' \right) + \vec{\mathcal{F}}_{\vec{v}} + \vec{\mathcal{D}}_{\vec{v}}
$$
\n
$$
\frac{-\rho_0 g \vec{\nabla} \xi_f - \vec{\nabla} P_f + \rho \vec{g} + \lambda \vec{\nabla} (\vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{v})}{\vec{F} \cdot \vec{B} \cdot \vec{v}}
$$
\n
$$
\frac{\partial \rho_f}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial \rho_s}{\partial t} - \vec{\nabla} \cdot (\rho \vec{v})
$$
\n
$$
P_f = c_s^2 \rho_f
$$
\n
$$
\frac{\partial \xi_f}{\partial t} = w_f|_{z=\xi} - \vec{v}_f|_{z=\xi} \cdot \vec{\nabla} \xi_f
$$
\n
$$
\frac{\partial \rho C_s}{\partial t} = -\vec{\nabla} \cdot (\rho \vec{v} C_s) + \mathcal{F}_C + \mathcal{D}_C
$$
\n
$$
\rho_s = \rho (T_s, S_s, \xi_f)
$$
\n
$$
\rho = \rho_s + \rho_f
$$

The momentum is integrated both in slow and fast modes but the right-hand-side of the equation is split in two parts: a slow part, made of slowly varying terms (advection, Coriolis force, baroclinic pressure force and viscous dissipation), and a fast part, made of fast-varying terms (the surface-induced and compressible pressure force, the weight and the dissipation associated with bulk-viscosity). This momentum equation is numerically integrated twice, once with a large time-step keeping the fast part constant, and once with a smaller time-step keeping the slow part constant. This is much more computationally efficient than integrating the whole set of equations at the same fast time step. More details can be found in Auclair et al. (2018).

Note that the solved acoustic waves can become pseudo-acoustic if their phase speed  $c_s$  is artificially slowed down (it is a model input). In this case, high-frequency processes associated with bulk compressibility may be unphysical, but a coherent solution for slow non-hydrostatic dynamics is preserved, while the CFL constraint is relaxed.

# **MODEL VARIABLES**

<span id="page-20-0"></span>Model variables are defined in .h Fortran 77 files :

# <span id="page-20-1"></span>**5.1 Domain variables (***grid.h***)**

grid.h : Environmental two-dimensional arrays associated with curvilinear horizontal coordinate system

h : Model topography (bottom depth [m] at RHO-points.) dh : Topograhy increment in case of moving bathymetry f : Coriolis parameter [1/s]. fomn : Compound term, f/[pm\*pn] at RHO points.

angler : Angle [radians] between XI-axis and the direction to the EAST at RHO-points.

latr : Latitude (degrees\_north) at RHO-, U-, and V-points. latu latv lonr : Longitude (degrees east) at RHO-, U-, and V-points. lonu lonv

xp : XI-coordinates [m] at PSI-points. xr : XI-coordinates (m] at RHO-points. yp : ETA-coordinates [m] at PSI-points.

yr : ETA-coordinates [m] at RHO-points.

pm : Coordinate transformation metric "m" [1/meters] associated with the differential distances in XI. pn : Coordinate transformation metric "n" [1/meters]associated with the differential distances in ETA. om\_u : Grid spacing [meters] in the XI -direction at U-points. om\_v : Grid spacing [meters] in the XI -direction at V-points. on\_u : Grid spacing [meters] in the ETA-direction at U-points. on\_v : Grid spacing [meters] in the ETA-direction at V-points.

dmde : ETA-derivative of inverse metric factor "m", d(1/M)/d(ETA). dndx : XI-derivative of inverse metric factor "n", d(1/N)/d(XI).

pmon\_p : Compound term, pm/pn at PSI-points.

pmon\_r : Compound term, pm/pn at RHO-points.

pmon\_u : Compound term, pm/pn at U-points.

pnom  $p$  : Compound term, pn/pm at PSI-points.

pnom\_r : Compound term, pn/pm at RHO-points.

pnom\_v : Compound term, pn/pm at V-points.

rmask : Land-sea masking arrays at RHO-,U-,V- and PSI-points (rmask,umask,vmask) = (0=Land, 1=Sea) umask

vmask

pmask : pmask=(0=Land, 1=Sea, 1-gamma2 =boundary).

reducu : reduction coefficient along x-axis for rivers sections reducv : reduction coefficient along y-axis for rivers sections

# <span id="page-21-0"></span>**5.2 Barotropic variables (***ocean2d.h***)**

ocean2d.h : 2D dynamical variables for fast mode

zeta,rzeta : Free surface elevation [m] and its time tendency; ubar,rubar : Vertically integrated 2D velocity components in vbar,rvbar : XI- and ETA-directions and their time tendencies;

# <span id="page-21-1"></span>**5.3 Tri-dimensionnal variables (***ocean3d.h***)**

ocean2d.h : 3D tracers dynamical variables for baroclinic mode

u,v : 3D velocity components in XI- and ETA-directions t : tracer array (temperature, salinity, passive tracers, sediment) Hz : level thickness z\_r : depth at rho point z\_w : depth at w point Huon : transport a U point Hvon : transport at V point We, Wi : vertical velocity (explicit, implicit) rho : density anomaly rho1 : potential density at 1 atm

# <span id="page-22-0"></span>**5.4 Surface forcing (forces.h)**

### forces.h :

*Surface momemtum flux (wind stress) :*

sustr : XI- and ETA-components of kinematic surface momentum flux svstr : wind stresses) defined at horizontal U- and V-points.dimensioned as  $[m^2/s^2]$ .

*Bottom mometum flux :*

bustr : XI- and ETA-components of kinematic bottom momentum flux bvstr : (drag) defined at horizontal U- and V-points [m^2/s^2].!

*Surface tracers fluxes :*

stflx : Kinematic surface fluxes of tracer type variables at horizontal RHO-points. Physical dimensions [degC m/s] - temperature; [PSU m/s] - salinity. dqdt : Kinematic surface net heat flux sensitivity to SST [m/s]. sst : Current sea surface temperature [degree Celsius]. dqdtg : Two-time-level grided data for net surface heat flux sstg : sensitivity to SST grided data [Watts/m^2/Celsius] and sea surface temperature [degree Celsius]. dqdtp : Two-time-level point data for net surface heat flux sstp : sensitivity to SST grided data [Watts/m<sup>^2</sup>/Celsius] and sea surface temperature [degree Celsius]. tsst : Time of sea surface temperature data. sss : Current sea surface salinity [PSU]. tair : surface air temperature at 2m [degree Celsius]. wsp : wind speed at 10m [degree Celsius]. rhum : surface air relative humidity 2m [fraction] prate : surface precipitation rate [cm day-1] radlw : net terrestrial longwave radiation [Watts meter-2] radsw : net solar shortwave radiation [Watts meter-2] patm2d : atmospheric pressure above mean seal level paref : reference pressure to compute inverse barometer effect srflx : Kinematic surface shortwave solar radiation flux [degC m/s] at horizontal RHO-points *Wind induced waves everything is defined at rho-point :*

wfrq : wind-induced wave frequency [rad/s]

uorb : xi-component of wave-induced bed orbital velocity [m/s]

vorb : eta-component of wave-induced bed orbital velocity [m/s]

wdrx : cosine of wave direction [non dimension]

wdre : sine of wave direction [non dimension]

whrm : (RMS) wave height (twice the wave amplitude) [m]

wepb : breaking dissipation rate (epsilon\_b term) [m3/s3]

wepd : frictional dissipation rate (epsilon\_d term) [m3/s3]

wepr : roller dissipation rate (epsilon r term) [m3/s3]

wbst : frictional dissipation stress (e\_d k/sigma) [m2/s2]

### *Wave averaged quantities :*

brk2dx : xi-direciton 2D breaking dissipation (rho) brk2de : eta-direction 2D breaking dissipation (rho) frc2dx : xi-direciton 2D frictional dissipation (rho) frc2de : eta-direction 2D frictional dissipation (rho) ust2d : xi-direciton Stokes transport (u-point) vst2d : eta-direciton Stokes transport (v-point) sup : quasi-static wave set-up (rho-point) calP : pressure correction term (rho-point) Kapsrf : Bernoulli head terrm at the surface (rho-point) brk3dx : xi-direciton 3D breaking dissipation (rho) brk3de : eta-direction 3D breaking dissipation (rho) ust : xi-direciton 3D Stokes drift velocity (u-point) vst : eta-direciton 3D Stokes drift velocity (v-point) wst : vertical 3D Stokes drift velocity (rho-point) Kappa : 3D Bernoulli head term (rho-point) kvf : vertical vortex force term (K term, 3D, rho-point) Akb : breaking-wave-induced additional diffusivity (w-point) Akw : wave-induced additional diffusivity (rho-point) E\_pre : previous time-step value for Akw estimation (rho) frc3dx : xi-direciton 3D frictional dissipation (rho) frc3de : eta-direction 3D frictional dissipation (rho)

## **CHAPTER**

## **SIX**

# **GRID AND COORDINATES**

### <span id="page-24-0"></span>Related CPP options:



### *Preselected options:*

```
# define CURVGRID
# define SPHERICAL
# define MASKING
# undef WET_DRY
# undef NEW_S_COORD
```
# <span id="page-24-1"></span>**6.1 Vertical Grid parameters**

Two vertical transformation are available for the generalized vertical terrain following vertical system : By default, we have :

$$
z(x, y, \sigma, t) = z_0(x, y, \sigma) + \zeta(x, y, t) \left[ 1 + \frac{z_0(x, y, \sigma)}{h(x, y)} \right]
$$
(6.1)

$$
z_0(x, y, \sigma) = h_c \sigma + [h(x, y) - h_c] Cs(\sigma)
$$
\n(6.2)

When activated the cpp key NEW\_S\_COORD, we have :

$$
z(x, y, \sigma, t) = \zeta(x, y, \sigma) + [\zeta(x, y, t) + h(x, y)] z_0(x, y, \sigma)
$$
\n(6.3)

$$
z_0(x, y, \sigma) = \frac{h_c \sigma + h(x, y)Cs(\sigma)}{h_c + h(x, y)}
$$
(6.4)

with :

- $z_0(x, y, \sigma)$  a nonlinear vertical transformation
- $\zeta(x, y, \sigma)$  the free-surface
- $h(x, y)$  the ocean bottom
- $\sigma$  afractional vertical stretching coordinate,  $-1 \leq \sigma \leq 0$
- $\bullet$   $h_c$  a positive thickness controlling the stretching
- $Cs(\sigma)$  a nondimensional, monotonic, vertical stretching,  $-1 \leq (C\sigma) \leq 0$

Vertical grid stretching is controlled by the following parameters, that have to be set similarly in croco.in, and crocotools\_param.m:



Then we have, with  $N$  the number of vertical levels:

• with the old transformation :

$$
Cs(\sigma) = (1 - \theta_b) \frac{\sinh(\theta_s \sigma)}{N} + \theta_b \left[ \frac{0.5 \tanh((\sigma + 0.5) \theta_s)}{\tanh(0.5 \theta_s)} - 0.5 \right]
$$

• with NEW\_S\_COORD defined :

$$
sc = \frac{\sigma - N}{N} \tag{6.5}
$$

$$
csf = \frac{1. - \cosh(\theta_s sc)}{\cosh(\theta_s) - 1} \quad \text{if } \theta_b > 0, \quad csf = -sc^2 \quad \text{otherwise} \tag{6.6}
$$

$$
Cs(\sigma) = \frac{e^{\theta_b cs f} - 1}{1 - e^{-\theta_b}} \quad \text{if } \theta_s > 0, \quad Cs(\sigma) = cs f \quad \text{otherwise}
$$
\n(6.7)

Other parameters have to be set to prepare the grid file in crocotools\_param.m:



The effects of theta\_s, theta\_b, hc, and N can be tested using the Matlab script : croco\_tools/ Preprocessing\_tools/test\_vgrid.m

Below are some examples of different vertical choices (Courtesy of [ROMS-RUTGERS](https://myroms.org/) team) :



# <span id="page-27-0"></span>**6.2 Wetting-Drying**

The Wetting-Drying scheme is derived from John Warner's code (Rutgers ROMS) and adapted to the time stepping scheme of CROCO. The main idea is to cancel the outgoing momentum flux (not the incoming) from a grid cell if its total depth is below a threshold value (critical depth Dcrit between 5 and 20 cm according to local slope; Dcrit min and max adjustable in param.h). This scheme is tested in the Thacker case producing oscillations in a rotating bowl for which an analytical solution is known.

# **CHAPTER SEVEN**

# **NUMERICS**

# <span id="page-28-1"></span><span id="page-28-0"></span>**7.1 Overview**

CROCO solves the primitive equations in an Earth-centered rotating environment. It is discretized in coastline- and terrain-following curvilinear coordinates using high-order numerical methods. It is a split-explicit, free-surface ocean model, where short time steps are used to advance the surface elevation and barotropic momentum, with a much larger time step used for temperature, salinity, and baroclinic momentum.

The complete time stepping algorithm is described in Shchepetkin and McWilliams (2005); see also Soufflet et al. (2016). The model has a 2-way time-averaging procedure for the barotropic mode, which satisfies the 3D continuity equation. The specially designed 3rd order predictor-corrector time step algorithm allows a substantial increase in the permissible time-step size.

Combined with the 3rd order time-stepping, a 3rd- or 5th-order, upstream-biased horizontal advection scheme (alternatively WENO or TVD for monotonicity preservation) allows the generation of steep gradients, enhancing the effective resolution of the solution for a given grid size (Shchepetkin and McWilliams, 1998; Soufflet et al., 2016; Menesguen et al., 2018, Borges et al., 2008). Because of the implicit diffusion in upstream advection schemes, explicit lateral viscosity is not needed in CROCO for damping numerical dispersion errors.

For vertical advection, SPLINE or WENO5 schemes are proposed (besides lower-order schemes). For SPLINES (default), an option for an adaptive, Courant-number-dependent implicit scheme is propose that has the advantage to render vertical advection unconditionally stable while maintaining good accuracy in locations with small Courant numbers (Shchepetkin, 2015). This is also available for tracers.

Tracers are treated similarly to momentum. A 3rd- or 5th-order upstream-biased horizontal advection scheme is implemented, but in regional configurations the diffusion part of this scheme is rotated along isopycnal surfaces to avoid spurious diapycnal mixing and loss of water masses (Marchesiello et al., 2009; Lemarié et al., 2012). For regional/coastal applications, a highly accurate pressure gradient scheme (Shchepetkin and McWilliams, 2003) limits the other type of errors (besides spurious diacpynal mixing) frequently associated with terrain-following coordinate models.

If a lateral boundary faces the open ocean, an active, implicit, upstream biased, radiation condition connects the model solution to the surroundings (Marchesiello et al., 2001). It comes with sponge layers for a better transition between interior and boundary solutions (explicit Laplacian diffusion and/or newtonian damping)

For nearshore problems, where waves becomes the dominant forcing of circulation, a vortex-force formalism for the interaction of surface gravity waves and currents is implemented in CROCO (Uchiyama et al., 2010).

CROCO can be used either as a Boussinesq/hystrostatic model, or a non-hydrostatic/non-Boussinesq model (NBQ; Auclair et al., 2018). The NBQ solver is relevant in problems from a few tens of meters to LES or DNS resolutions. It comes with shock-capturing advection schemes (WENO5, TVD) and fully 3D turbulent closure schemes (GLS, Smagorinsky).

CROCO includes a variety of additional features, e.g., 1D turbulent closure schemes (KPP, GLS) for surface and benthic boundary layers and interior mixing; wetting and drying; sediment and biological models; AGRIF interface for 2-way nesting; OASIS coupler for ocean-waves-atmosphere coupling. . .

# <span id="page-29-0"></span>**7.2 Time Stepping**

CROCO is discretized in time using a third-order predictor-corrector scheme (referred to as LFAM3) for tracers and baroclinic momentum. It is a split-explicit, free-surface ocean model, where short time steps are used to advance the surface elevation and barotropic momentum, with a much larger time step used for tracers, and baroclinic momentum. The model has a 2-way time-averaging procedure for the barotropic mode, which satisfies the 3D continuity equation. The specially designed 3rd order predictor-corrector time step algorithm is described in Shchepetkin and McWilliams (2005) and is summarized in this subsection.





### General structure of the time-stepping:

```
call prestep3D thread() ! Predictor step for 3D momentum and tracers
call step2d_thread() | Barotropic mode
call step3D_uv_thread() ! Corrector step for momentum
call step3D_t_thread() | ! Corrector step for tracers
```
## **7.2.1 3D momentum and tracers**

Predictor-corrector approach : Leapfrog (LF) predictor with 3rd-order Adams-Moulton (AM) interpolation (LFAM3 timestepping). This scheme is used to integrate 3D advection, the pressure gradient term, the continuity equation and the Coriolis term which are all contained in the RHS operator.



For a given quantity  $q$ 

$$
\begin{cases}\n q^{n+1,\star} = q^{n-1} + 2\Delta t \text{ RHS } \{q^n\} \\
 q^{n+\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{5}{12} q^{n+1,\star} + \frac{2}{3} q^n - \frac{1}{12} q^{n-1} \\
 q^{n+1} = q^n + \Delta t \text{ RHS } \{q^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\}\n\end{cases}
$$
\n(LF)\n  
\n(MN3)\n  
\n(corrector)

which can be rewritten in a compact way as used in the Croco code :

$$
q^{n+\frac{1}{2}} = \left(\frac{1}{2} - \gamma\right)q^{n-1} + \left(\frac{1}{2} + \gamma\right)q^n + (1 - \gamma)\Delta t \text{ RHS } \{q^n\}
$$
  

$$
q^{n+1} = q^n + \Delta t \text{ RHS } \{q^{n+\frac{1}{2}}\}
$$

with  $\gamma = \frac{1}{6}$ .

Physical parameterizations for vertical mixing, rotated diffusion and viscous/diffusion terms are computed once per time-step using an Euler step.

## **7.2.2 Tracers-momentum coupling**



The numerical integration of internal waves can be studied using the following subsystem of equations

$$
\label{eq:2.1} \left\{ \begin{array}{rcl} \partial_z w + \partial_x u &=& 0 \\ \partial_z p + \rho g &=& 0 \\ \partial_t u + \frac{1}{\rho_0} \partial_x p &=& 0 \\ \partial_t \rho + \partial_z (w \rho) &=& 0 \end{array} \right.
$$

Predictor step:

$$
\partial_x p^n = g \partial_x \left( \int_z^0 \rho^n dz \right) \qquad \to \qquad u^{n + \frac{1}{2}} = \left( \frac{1}{2} - \gamma \right) u^{n - 1} + \left( \frac{1}{2} + \gamma \right) u^n + (1 - \gamma) \frac{\Delta t}{\rho_0} \left( \partial_x p^n \right)
$$

$$
w^n = - \int_{-H}^z \partial_x u^n dz' \qquad \to \qquad \rho^{n + \frac{1}{2}} = \left( \frac{1}{2} - \gamma \right) \rho^{n - 1} + \left( \frac{1}{2} + \gamma \right) \rho^n + (1 - \gamma) \Delta t \partial_x (w^n \rho^n)
$$

Corrector step:

$$
\partial_x p^{n+\frac{1}{2}} = g \partial_x \left( \int_z^0 \rho^{n+\frac{1}{2}} dz \right) \qquad \to \qquad u^{n+1} = u^n + \frac{\Delta t}{\rho_0} \left( \partial_x p^{n+\frac{1}{2}} \right)
$$

$$
w^{n+\frac{1}{2}} = -\int_{-H}^z \partial_x \left\{ \frac{3u^{n+\frac{1}{2}}}{4} + \frac{u^n + u^{n+1}}{8} \right\} dz' \qquad \to \qquad \rho^{n+1} = \rho^n + \Delta t \partial_z (w^{n+\frac{1}{2}} \rho^{n+\frac{1}{2}})
$$

Consequences:

- 3D-momentum integrated before the tracers in the corrector
- 2 evaluations of the pressure gradient per time-step
- 3 evaluations of the continuity equation per time-step

## **7.2.3 Barotropic mode**



### Generalized forward-backward (predictor-corrector)

1. AB3-type extrapolation

$$
D^{m+\frac{1}{2}} = H + \left(\frac{3}{2} + \beta\right)\zeta^m - \left(\frac{1}{2} + 2\beta\right)\zeta^{m-1} + \beta\zeta^{m-2}
$$

$$
\overline{u}^{m+\frac{1}{2}} = \left(\frac{3}{2} + \beta\right)\overline{u}^m - \left(\frac{1}{2} + 2\beta\right)\overline{u}^{m-1} + \beta\overline{u}^{m-2}
$$

2. Integration of  $\zeta$ 

$$
\zeta^{m+1} = \zeta^m - \Delta \tau \ \partial_x (D^{m+\frac{1}{2}} \overline{u}^{m+\frac{1}{2}})
$$

3. AM4 interpolation

$$
\zeta^{\star}=\left(\frac{1}{2}+\gamma+2\varepsilon\right)\zeta^{m+1}+\left(\frac{1}{2}-2\gamma-3\varepsilon\right)\zeta^m+\gamma\zeta^{m-1}+\varepsilon\zeta^{m-2}
$$

4. Integration of  $\bar{u}$ 

$$
\overline{u}^{m+1} = \frac{1}{D^{m+1}} \left[ D^m \overline{u}^m + \Delta \tau \text{ RHS2D}(D^{m+\frac{1}{2}}, \overline{u}^{m+\frac{1}{2}}, \zeta^{\star}) \right]
$$

where the parameter values are  $(\beta, \gamma, \varepsilon) = (0.281105, 0.088, 0.013)$  except when the filter\_none option is activated (see below).

## **7.2.4 Baroclinic-barotropic coupling**



Slow forcing term of the barotrope by the barocline is extrapolated

$$
\mathcal{F}_{3D}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} = \left\{ \int \text{rhs}(u, v) dz - \text{rhs2D}(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \right\}^{n+\frac{1}{2}} = \text{Extrap}(\mathcal{F}_{3D}^n, \mathcal{F}_{3D}^{n-1}, \mathcal{F}_{3D}^{n-2})
$$

### **M2\_FILTER\_POWER option**

Barotropic integration from *n* to  $n + M^* \Delta \tau$  ( $M^* \le 1.5M$ )



Because of predictor-corrector integration two barotropic filters are needed

- $\langle \zeta \rangle^{n+1} \to$  update of the vertical grid
- $\bullet$   $\langle U \rangle^{n+1} \rightarrow$  correction of baroclinic velocities at time  $n+1$
- $\langle \langle U \rangle \rangle^{n+\frac{1}{2}} \to$  correction of baroclinic velocities at time  $n+\frac{1}{2}$



### **M2\_FILTER\_NONE option**

Motivation: averaging filters can lead to excessive dissipation in the barotropic mode

Objective: put the minimum amount of dissipation to stabilize the splitting

Diffusion is introduced within the barotropic time-stepping rather than averaging filters by adapting the parameters in the generalized forward-backward scheme

 $(\beta, \gamma, \varepsilon) = (0.281105, 0.08344500 - 0.51358400\alpha_d, 0.00976186 - 0.13451357\alpha_d)$ 

with  $\alpha_d \approx 0.5$ .

Remarks:

- This option may require to increase NDTFAST =  $\Delta t_{\text{3D}}/\Delta t_{\text{2D}}$  because the stability constraint of the modified generalized forward-backward scheme is less than the one of the original generalized forwardbackward scheme.
- The filter none approach is systematically more efficient than averaging filters

### **7.2.5 Stability constraints**

• Barotropic mode (note that considering an Arakawa C-grid divides the theoretical stability limit by a factor of 2)

$$
\Delta t \sqrt{gH\left(\frac{1}{\Delta x^2} + \frac{1}{\Delta y^2}\right)} \le 0.89
$$

• 3D advection

$$
\alpha_{\text{adv}}^{x}+\alpha_{\text{adv}}^{y}+\beta\alpha_{\text{adv}}^{z}\leq\alpha_{\text{horiz}}^{\star}
$$

where  $\alpha_{\text{adv}}^x$ ,  $\alpha_{\text{adv}}^y$ , and  $\alpha_{\text{adv}}^z$  are the Courant numbers in each direction and  $\beta = \alpha_{\text{horiz}}^{\star}/\alpha_{\text{vert}}^{\star}$  a coefficient arising from the fact that different advection schemes with different stability criteria may be used in the horizontal and vertical directions. Typical CFL values for  $\alpha_{\text{horiz}}^{\star}$  and  $\alpha_{\text{vert}}^{\star}$  with Croco time-stepping algorithm are



• Internal waves

$$
\Delta t c_1 \sqrt{\frac{1}{\Delta x^2} + \frac{1}{\Delta y^2}} \leq 0.843686
$$

where  $c_1$  the phase speed associated with the first (fastest) baroclinic mode.

• Coriolis

 $f \Delta t \leq 1.58$ 

# <span id="page-33-0"></span>**7.3 Advection Schemes**

## **7.3.1 Lateral Momentum Advection**

### Related CPP options:



*Preselected options:*

```
# define UV_HADV_UP3
# undef UV_HADV_UP5
# undef UV_HADV_C2
# undef UV_HADV_C4
# undef UV_HADV_C6
# undef UV_HADV_WENO5
 undef UV HADV TVD
```
These options are set in set global definitions.h as the default UV\_HADV\_UP3 is the only one recommended for standard users.

## **7.3.2 Lateral Tracer advection**

### Related CPP options:



### *Preselected options:*

# undef TS\_HADV\_UP3 # define TS\_HADV\_RSUP3 # undef TS\_HADV\_UP5 # undef TS\_HADV\_RSUP5 # undef TS\_HADV\_C4 # undef TS\_HADV\_C6 # undef TS\_HADV\_WENO5 # if defined PASSIVE\_TRACER || defined BIOLOGY || defined SEDIMENT define BIO\_HADV\_WENO5 # endif

TS\_HADV\_RSUP3 is recommended for realistic applications with variable bottom topography as it strongly reduces diapycnal mixing. It splits the UP3 scheme into 4th-order centered advection and rotated bilaplacian diffusion with grid-dependent diffusivity. It calls for CPP options in set\_global\_definitions.h for the explicit treatment of bilaplacian diffusion (see below). TS\_HADV\_RSUP3 is expensive in terms of computational cost and requires more than 30 sigma levels to perform properly. Therefore, for small domains dominated by open boundary fluxes, TS\_HADV\_UP5 may present a cheaper alternative and good compromise. TS\_HADV\_RSUP5 is still experimental but allows a decrease in numerical diffusivity compared to TS\_HADV\_RSUP3 by using 6th order rather than 4th-order centered advection (it resembles in spirit a split-rotated UP5 scheme but the use of bilaplacian rather than trilaplacian diffusion keeps it 3rd order). TS\_HADV\_C4 has no implicit diffusion and is thus accompanied by rotated Smagorinsky diffusion defined in set\_global\_definitions.h; it is not recommended for usual applications. For RSUP family, by default the diffusive part is oriented along geopotential.

## **7.3.3 Vertical Momentum advection**

### Related CPP options:



*Preselected options:*

```
#ifdef UV_VADV_SPLINES
#elif defined UV_VADV_WENO5
#elif defined UV_VADV_C2
#elif defined UV_VADV_TVD
#else
# define UV_VADV_SPLINES
# undef UV_VADV_WENO5
# undef UV_VADV_C2
# undef UV_VADV_TVD
#endif
```
## **7.3.4 Vertical Tracer advection**

### Related CPP options:



### *Preselected options:*

```
#ifdef TS_VADV_SPLINES
#elif defined TS_VADV_AKIMA
#elif defined TS_VADV_WENO5
#elif defined TS_VADV_C2
#else
# undef TS_VADV_SPLINES
# define TS_VADV_AKIMA
# undef TS_VADV_WENO5
# undef TS_VADV_C2
#endif
```
## **7.3.5 Adaptively implicit vertical advection**

### Related CPP options:



*Preselected options:*


## **7.3.6 Numerical details on advection schemes**



Fig. 2: Fig: variable location on an Arakawa C-grid. Tracer values are cell centered while velocities are defined on interfaces.

$$
\partial_x (uq)|_{x=x_i}=\frac{1}{\varDelta x_i}\left\{u_{i+\frac{1}{2}}\widetilde{q}_{i+\frac{1}{2}}-u_{i-\frac{1}{2}}\widetilde{q}_{i-\frac{1}{2}}\right\}
$$

### **Linear advection schemes**

$$
\tilde{q}_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{C2} = \frac{q_i + q_{i-1}}{2} \tag{7.1}
$$

$$
\tilde{q}_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{C4} = \left(\frac{7}{6}\right) \tilde{q}_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{C2} - \left(\frac{1}{12}\right) (q_{i+1} + q_{i-2}) \tag{7.2}
$$

$$
\tilde{q}_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{\text{UP3}} = \tilde{q}_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{\text{C4}} + \text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{12}, u_{i-\frac{1}{2}}\right) (q_{i+1} - 3q_i + 3q_{i-1} - q_{i-2}) \tag{7.3}
$$

$$
\tilde{q}_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{C6} = \left(\frac{8}{5}\right) \tilde{q}_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{C4} - \left(\frac{19}{60}\right) \tilde{q}_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{C2} + \left(\frac{1}{60}\right) (q_{i+2} + q_{i-3}) \tag{7.4}
$$

$$
\tilde{q}_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{\text{UP5}} = \tilde{q}_{i-\frac{1}{2}}^{\text{C6}} - \text{sign}\left(\frac{1}{60}, u_{i-\frac{1}{2}}\right) \left(q_{i+2} - 5q_{i+1} + 10q_i - 10q_{i-1} + 5q_{i-2} - q_{i-3}\right) \tag{7.5}
$$

#### **Split upwind schemes**

Because odd-ordered advection schemes can be formulated as the sum of the next higher-order (centered) advection scheme with a dissipation term it is possible to split the purely centered and dissipative parts of UP3 and UP5 schemes. In this case the centered part is treated within the predictor-corrector framework while the flow-dependent dissipative part is treated with a one-step Euler scheme. Such splitting has two advantages:

- 1. It allows better stability for SUP3 and SUP5 schemes comapared to UP3 and UP5 schemes.
- 2. Isolating the dissipative part allows to rotate it in the neutral direction to reduce spurious diapycnal mixing (RSUP3 scheme).



Fig. 3: Fig: amplification errors (left) and phase errors (right) for linear advection of order 2 to 6.

#### **Splines reconstruction and Akima 4th-order schemes**

Similar to a 4th-order compact scheme, the interfacial values for the splines reconstruction scheme are obtained as a solution of a tridiagonal problem

$$
\text{Hz}_{k+1}\widetilde{q}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}+2(\text{Hz}_{k}+\text{Hz}_{k+1})\widetilde{q}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}+\text{Hz}_{k}\widetilde{q}_{k+\frac{3}{2}}=3(\text{Hz}_{k}\overline{q}_{k+1}+\text{Hz}_{k+1}\overline{q}_{k})
$$

where  $\overline{q}_k$  values should be understood in a finite-volume sense (i.e. as an average over a control volume).



Fig. 4: Fig: amplification errors (left) and phase errors (right) for linear advection of order 5 and 6 and for Splines reconstruction.

The AKIMA scheme corresponds to a 4th-order accurate scheme where an harmonic averaging of the slopes is used instead of the algebraic average used for a standard C4 scheme

$$
\widetilde{q}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}=\frac{q_{k+1}+q_k}{2}-\frac{\overline{\delta q}_{k+1}-\overline{\delta q}_k}{6}\qquad \overline{\delta q}_k=\left\{\begin{array}{cc} 2\frac{\delta q_{k+\frac{1}{2}}\delta q_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}{\delta q_{k+\frac{1}{2}}+\delta q_{k-\frac{1}{2}}}, & \text{if } \delta q_{k+\frac{1}{2}}\delta q_{k-\frac{1}{2}}>0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{array}\right.
$$

#### **Adaptively implicit vertical advection**

Idea: the vertical velocity  $\Omega$  is split between an explicit and implicit contribution depending on the local Courant number

$$
\Omega = \Omega^{(\mathbf{e})} + \Omega^{(\mathbf{i})}, \qquad \Omega^{(\mathbf{e})} = \frac{\Omega}{f(\alpha_{\mathrm{adv}}^z, \alpha_{\mathrm{max}})}, \quad f(\alpha_{\mathrm{adv}}^z, \alpha_{\mathrm{max}}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \alpha_{\mathrm{adv}}^z \le \alpha_{\mathrm{max}} \\ \alpha/\alpha_{\mathrm{max}}, & \alpha_{\mathrm{adv}}^z > \alpha_{\mathrm{max}} \end{cases}
$$

- $\Omega^{(e)}$  is integrated with an explicit scheme with CFL  $\alpha_{\text{max}}$ .
- $\Omega^{(i)}$  is integrated with an implicit upwind Euler scheme.
- $f(\alpha_{\text{adv}}^z, \alpha_{\text{max}})$  is a function responsible for the splitting of  $\Omega$  between an explicit and an implicit part.

This approach has the advantage to render vertical advection unconditionally stable and to maintain good accuracy in locations with small Courant numbers. The current implementation is based on the SPLINES scheme for the explicit part.

#### **Total variation bounded scheme (WENO5)**



Fig. 5: Fig: different stencils used to evaluate the interfacial value  $\widetilde{q}_{k+\frac{1}{2}}$  with WENO5 scheme

Nonlinear weighting between 3 evaluations of interfacial values based on 3 different stencils

$$
\widetilde{q}_{k-\frac{1}{2}} = w_0 \widetilde{q}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(0)} + w_1 \widetilde{q}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)} + w_2 \widetilde{q}_{k-\frac{1}{2}}^{(2)}
$$

where the weights are subject to the following constraints:

- 1. Convexity  $\sum_{j=0}^{2} w_j = 1$ .
- 2. ENO property (Essentially non oscillatory).
- 3. 5th-order if  $q(x)$  is smooth.

The resulting scheme is not monotonicity-preserving but instead it is Total Variation Bounded (TVB).

### **Total variation diminishing scheme**

#### **Upwinding of nonlinear terms**

In CROCO the nonlinear advection terms are formulated as in Lilly (1965) :

- $\partial_t(Hzu) + \partial_x((Hz u)u) + \partial_y((Hz v) u) + ...$  (7.6)
- $\partial_t(\text{Hz}v) + \partial_x((\text{Hz} u)v) + \partial_y((\text{Hz} v) v) + ...$  (7.7)

which are discretised with third order accuracy as

$$
\left( (\widetilde{\text{Hz } u}) u \right)_{i,j} = (\widetilde{\text{Hz } u})_{i,j}^{\text{C4}} \widetilde{u}_{i,j}^{\text{UP3}} \tag{7.8}
$$

$$
\left( (\widetilde{Hz \ v})u \right)_{i+\frac{1}{2},j+\frac{1}{2}} = (\widetilde{Hz \ v})_{i+\frac{1}{2},j+\frac{1}{2}}^{C4} \widetilde{u}_{i+\frac{1}{2},j+\frac{1}{2}}^{UP3}
$$
\n(7.9)

where the direction for upwinding is selected considering

$$
u_{i,j}^{\textrm{upw}} = u_{i+\frac{1}{2},j} + u_{i-\frac{1}{2},j}, \qquad v_{i+\frac{1}{2},j+\frac{1}{2}}^{\textrm{upw}} = (\textrm{Hz } v)_{i,j+\frac{1}{2}} + (\textrm{Hz } v)_{i+1,j+\frac{1}{2}}
$$

# **7.4 Pressure gradient**

This section is still under redaction. Meanwhile, please refer to Shchepetkin (2003)

Shchepetkin, A.F., McWilliams, J.C., 2003: A method for computing horizontal pressure-gradient force in an oceanic model with a non-aligned vertical coordinate. J. Geophys. Res. 108 (C3), 3090.

# **7.5 Equation of State**

### Related CPP options:



*Preselected options:*



The density is obtained from temperature and salinity (if SALINITY defined) via a choice of linear  $\rho(T)$  or nonlinear  $\rho(T, S, P)$  equation of state (EOS) described in Shchepetkin and McWilliams (2003). The nonlinear EOS corresponds to the UNESCO formulation as derived by Jackett and McDougall (1995) that computes in situ density as a function of potential temperature, salinity and pressure.

To reduce errors of pressure-gradient scheme associated with nonlinearity of compressibility effects, Shchepetkin and McWilliams (2003) introduced a Taylor expansion of this EOS that splits it into an adiabatic and a linearized compressible part (SPLIT\_EOS):

$$
\rho = \rho_0 + \rho_1(T, S) + q_1(T, S) |z|
$$

where  $\rho_1(T, S)$  is the sea-water density perturbation at the standard pressure of 1 Atm (sea surface),  $q_1$  is the compressibility coefficient, and |z| is absolute depth, i.e. the distance from free-surface to the point at which density is computed. This splitting of the EOS into two separate contributions allows for the representation of spatial derivatives of density as the sum of adiabatic derivatives and the compressible part. This makes it straightforward to remove pressure effects so as to reduce pressure gradient errors, compute neutral directions, enforce stable stratification, compute Brunt-Väisäla frequency etc.

The Brunt-Väisäla frequency N (at horizontal  $\rho$  and vertical w points) is defined by:

$$
N^2 = -\frac{g}{\rho_0} \frac{\partial \rho_\theta}{\partial z}
$$

where  $\rho_{\theta}$  is potential density, .i.e., the density that a parcel would acquire if adiabatically brought to depth  $z_n$ .

Shchepetkin, A.F., McWilliams, J.C., 2003: A method for computing horizontal pressure-gradient force in an oceanic model with a non-aligned vertical coordinate. J. Geophys. Res. 108 (C3), 3090.

Shchepetkin, A.F., McWilliams, J.C., 2011. Accurate Boussinesq oceanic modeling with a practical, "stiffened" equation of state. Ocean Modell. 38, 41–70.

# **7.6 Wetting and Drying**

The processes of wetting and drying have important physical and biological impacts on shallow water systems. Flooding and dewatering effects on coastal mud flats and beaches occur on various time scales ranging from storm surge, periodic rise and fall of the tide, to infragravity wave motions. To correctly simulate these physical processes with a numerical model requires the capability of the computational cells to become flooded and dewatered. Warner et al. (2013) proposed a method for wetting and drying based on an approach consistent with a cell-face blocking algorithm. The method allows water to always flow into any cell, but prevents outflow from a cell when the total depth in that cell is less than a user defined critical value. See Warner et al. (2013) for details.

The Wetting-Drying scheme is derived from John Warner's code (Rutgers ROMS) and adapted to the time stepping scheme of CROCO. The main idea is to cancel the outgoing momentum flux (not the incoming) from a grid cell if its total depth is below a threshold value (critical depth Dcrit between 5 and 20 cm according to local slope; Dcrit min and max adjustable in param.h). This scheme is tested in the Thacker case producing oscillations in a rotating bowl for which an analytical solution is known.

# **7.7 Non-Boussinesq Solver**

CROCO can be used in a Boussinesq hystrostatic mode, or a non-hydrostatic, non-boussinesq mode (NBQ). The Non-Hydrostatic approach is based on the relaxation of the Boussinesq approximation instead of solving a Poisson system. It replaces the barotropic mode solver by a fully 3D fast mode solver, resolving all waves down to acoustic waves. The barotropic mode is part of the fast mode in this case. Depending on the physical problem, the sound speed can be decreased to the maximum wave velocity one wants to solve. The NH solver can be used in problems from a few tens of meters to LES or DNS resolutions. It comes with monotonicity preserving advection schemes (WENO5, TVD) and fully 3D turbulent closure schemes.

*Related CPP options (for users):*

NBQ Activates Non-hysrostatic, non-Boussinesq solver

# **PARAMETRIZATIONS**

# **8.1 Vertical mixing parametrizations**

CROCO contains a variety of methods for setting the vertical viscous and diffusive coefficients. The choices range from simply choosing fixed values to the KPP and the generic lengthscale (GLS) turbulence closure schemes. See Large (1998) for a review of surface ocean mixing schemes. Many schemes have a background molecular value which is used when the turbulent processes are assumed to be small (such as in the interior).

### Related CPP options:



#### *Preselected options:*

NONE : default **is** no mixing scheme

## **8.1.1 Analytical definition**

#### Related CPP options:

 $ANA_VMIX$  Analytical definition

#### *Preselected options:*

NONE

A profile for mixing coeefficient  $K_{m,s}(z)$  can be set in ana\_vmix routine for variables Akv (viscosity) and Akt (diffusivity), which is called at each time step. In this case, background coeeficients read in croco.in can be used.

## **8.1.2 BVF mixing**

Related CPP options:

BVF\_MIXING | Brunt-Vaisala frequency based

*Preselected options:*

NONE

It computes diffusivity using a Brunt-Vaisala frequency based vertical mixing scheme. Viscosity is set to its background. In static unstable regime, diffusivity is enhanced.

• If 
$$
N^2(z) < 0
$$
:

$$
K_{m,s}(z) = 0.1 \; \mathrm{m^2 \; s^{-1}}
$$

• If  $N^2(z) > 0$ :

$$
K_{m,s}(z) = 10^{-7} / \sqrt{N^2(z)}, \qquad K_{m,s}^{\min} \le K_{m,s}(z) \le K_{m,s}^{\max}
$$

Default bounds are quite restrictive :

$$
K_{m,s}^{\min} = 3 \times 10^{-5} \, \text{m}^2 \, \text{s}^{-1}, \qquad K_{m,s}^{\max} = 4 \times 10^{-4} \, \text{m}^2 \, \text{s}^{-1}
$$

## **8.1.3 K-profile parametrization**

Large, W., J. McWilliams, and S. Doney, Oceanic vertical mixing: A review and a model with nonlocal boundary layer parameterization, Rev. Geophys., 32, 363-403, 1994.

#### Related CPP options:

KPP-related options :



### *Preselected options:*

```
# ifdef LMD_MIXING
 define LMD_SKPP
  define LMD_BKPP
  define LMD_RIMIX
  define LMD_CONVEC
# undef LMD_DDMIX
# define LMD_NONLOCAL
# undef LMD_LANGMUIR
# endif
```
#if defined LMD\_SKPP # define LMD\_SKPP2005 #endif #ifdef LMD\_BKPP # undef LMD\_BKPP2005 #endif

## Surface boundary layer

- LMD SKPP (Large et al, 1994)
	- Step 1 : Compute boundary layer depth  $h_{bl}(z_r \rightarrow z_N)$

$$
\text{Ri}_b(z) = \frac{g(z_r - z) (\rho(z) - \rho_r) / \rho_0}{|\mathbf{u}(z) - (\mathbf{u}_h)_r|^2 + V_t^2(z)}, \qquad \text{Ri}_b(-h_{bl}) = \text{Ri}_{cr}
$$

– Step 2 : In the stable case math:: $(B f > 0)$  : h<sub>1</sub>  $\{bl\} = min(h_{\{b\}}, h_{\{ek\}}, h_{\{m0\}})$ 

$$
h_{ek} = 0.7u_{\star}/f, \qquad h_{mo} = u_{\star}^3/(\kappa B_f).
$$

– step 3 : Compute turbulent viscosity and diffusivity

$$
K_{m,s}(z) = w_{m,s} \ h_{bl} \ G(z/h_{bl}), \qquad w_{m,s} = \kappa \ u_{\star} \ \psi_{m,s}(zB_f/u_{\star}^3)
$$

Choice of the critical Richardson number  $\text{Ri}_{cr}$ :  $\text{Ri}_{cr} \in [0.15, 0.45]$ 

- LMD\_SKPP2005 (Shchepetkin et al, 2005)
	- Criteria for  $h_{bl}$ : integral layer where production of turbulence by shear balances dissipation by the stratification

$$
\operatorname{Cr}(z) = \int_z^{\zeta} \mathcal{K}(z') \left\{ |\partial_{z'} \mathbf{u}_h|^2 - \frac{N^2}{\text{Ri}_{cr}} - C_{Ek} f^2 \right\} dz' + \frac{V_t^2(z)}{(\zeta - z)}, \ \text{Cr}(-h_{bl}) = 0
$$

– Consistent with the original KPP

$$
\operatorname{Cr}(-h_{bl}) = 0 \Rightarrow \frac{(\zeta - z) \int_z^{\zeta} \mathcal{K}(z') N^2(z') dz'}{(\zeta - z) \int_z^{\zeta} \mathcal{K}(z') \left\{ |\partial_z \mathbf{u}_h|^2 - C_{Ek} f^2 \right\} dz' + V_t^2(z)} = \operatorname{Ri}_{cr}
$$

Advantages :

-> consistent with Ekman problem

-> tends to give deeper boundary layers :  $(\zeta - z) \int_z^{\zeta} |\partial_{z'} \mathbf{u}_h|^2 dz' \geq |\mathbf{u}_h(z) - \mathbf{u}_h(\zeta)|^2$ .

#### • cpp key LMD\_LANGMUIR (McWilliams & Sullivan, 2000)

Following the work of McWilliams and Sullivan (2000), we introduce in KPP an enhancement factor E to the turbulent velocity scale as a function of the turbulent Langmuir number  $La_t = \sqrt{u_x/u_{Stokes}}$ , but this function is taken as in Van Roekel et al. (2012) which gives good results in Li et al. (2016) – still assuming that Stokes drift is aligned with the surface wind stress:

$$
w_{m,s} = \frac{\kappa u_\star}{\phi_{m,s}} E, \qquad E = \sqrt{1 + 0.104 L a_t^{-2} + 0.034 L a_t^{-4}}
$$

Interior scheme

$$
K_{m,s}(z) = K_{m,s}^{\text{sh}}(z) + K_{m,s}^{\text{iw}}(z) + K_{m,s}^{\text{dd}}(z)
$$

• cpp key LMD\_RIMIX, RI\_(H-V)SMOOTH (Large et al., 1994)

$$
\mathrm{Ri}_{g} = N^{2} / \left[ (\partial_{z} u)^{2} + (\partial_{z} v)^{2} \right]
$$
\n
$$
K_{m,s}^{\mathrm{sh}}(z) = \begin{cases} K_{0,c} & \mathrm{Ri}_{g} < 0 \ \leftarrow \left[ \mathrm{LMD\_CONVEC} \right] \\ K_{0} \left[ 1 - (\frac{\mathrm{Ri}_{g}}{\mathrm{Ri}_{0}})^{3} \right] & 0 < \mathrm{Ri}_{g} < \mathrm{Ri}_{0} \\ 0 & \mathrm{Ri}_{0} < \mathrm{Ri}_{g} \end{cases}
$$
\n
$$
K_{0} = 5 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{m}^{2} \mathrm{s}^{-1}, \mathrm{Ri}_{0} = 0.7
$$

• cpp key LMD\_NUW\_GARGETT (Gargett & Holloway)

$$
K^{\text{iw}}_m(z) = \frac{10^{-6}}{\sqrt{\max(N^2(z), 10^{-7})}}, \qquad K^{\text{iw}}_s(z) = \frac{10^{-7}}{\sqrt{\max(N^2(z), 10^{-7})}}
$$

• cpp key LMD\_DDMIX (cf Large et al., 1994, eqns (31))

#### Bottom boundary layer

• cpp key LMD\_BOTEK : Bottom Ekman layer

$$
h_{\text{Ek}} = \min \left\{ \frac{0.3u_{\star,b}}{|f|}, h \right\}
$$
  
\n
$$
\sigma_{k+\frac{1}{2}} = (z_{k+\frac{1}{2}} - h)/h_{\text{Ek}}
$$
  
\n
$$
K_{k+\frac{1}{2}}^{\text{Ek}} = \max \{ 4 \kappa u_{\star,b} h_{\text{Ek}} \sigma (1 - \sigma), K_{\min} \}
$$
  
\n
$$
AKv_{k+\frac{1}{2}} = AKv_{k+\frac{1}{2}} + K_{k+\frac{1}{2}}^{\text{Ek}}
$$
  
\n
$$
AKt_{k+\frac{1}{2}} = AKt_{k+\frac{1}{2}} + K_{k+\frac{1}{2}}^{\text{Ek}}
$$

• cpp key LMD\_BKPP (Bottom KPP 1994)

Same rationale than surface KPP but this time we search for the critical value  $\text{Ri}_{\text{cr}} \approx 0.3$ ) starting from the bottom

$$
h_{\text{bbl}} = \min\left(h_{\text{bbl}}, \frac{0.7u_{\star,b}}{|f|}\right) K_{m,s}(z) = \kappa u_{\star,b} h_{\text{bbl}} G(\sigma), \qquad \sigma = \frac{(z-h)}{h_{\text{bbl}}}
$$

## **8.1.4 Generic length scale**

GLS-related options :

<b>GLS MIXING</b>	Activate Generic Length Scale scheme, default is k-epsilon (see below)
<b>GLS KOMEGA</b>	Activate K-OMEGA (OMEGA=frequency of TKE dissipation) originating from Kol-
	mogorov $(1942)$
<b>GLS KEPSILON</b>	Activate K-EPSILON (EPSILON=TKE dissipation) as in Jones and Launder (1972)
<b>GLS GEN</b>	Activate generic model of Umlauf and Burchard (2003)
<b>CANUTO A</b>	Option for CANUTO A stability function (default, see below)
GibLau 78	Option for Gibson & Launder, 1978 stability function
MelYam 82	Option for Mellor & Yamada, 1982 stability function
KanCla 94	Option for Kantha & Clayson, 1994 stability function
Luyten 96	Option for Luyten, 1996 stability function
<b>CANUTO B</b>	Option for CANUTO B stability function
Cheng $02$	Option for Cheng, 2002 stability function

*Preselected options for GLS:*

```
#ifdef GLS_MIXING
# if defined GLS_KOMEGA
# elif defined GLS_KEPSILON
# elif defined GLS_GEN
# else
# define GLS_KEPSILON
# endif
```
(continues on next page)

(continued from previous page)



The objective of this section is to describe the current implementation of a Generic Length Scale (GLS) turbulence scheme in CROCO that computes the turbulent viscosity  $K_m$  and diffusivity  $K_s$ . First of all, as usually done in most implementations, the assumption of an horizontally homogeneous flow is made. Following Umlauf & Burchard (2003), the equations satisfied by the two prognostic variables  $k$  (the kinetic energy) and  $\psi$  (the generic length scale) are

$$
\begin{array}{rcl}\n\partial_t k & = & \partial_z (K_k \partial_z k) + P + B - \varepsilon, \\
\partial_t \psi & = & \partial_z (K_\psi \partial_z \psi) + \psi k^{-1} \left( \beta_1 P + \beta_3^{\pm} B - \beta_2 \varepsilon \right), \\
K_k & = & K_m / \text{Sc}_k\n\end{array}
$$

where the  $\beta_i$  (j=1,3) are constants to be defined, P represents the TKE production by vertical shear  $P =$  $K_m[(\partial_z u)^2 + (\partial_z v)^2]$  and B the TKE destruction by stratification  $B = -K_s N^2$  (with  $N^2$  the local Brunt-Vaisala frequency). The dissipation rate  $\varepsilon$  is related to the generic length scale  $\psi$  following

$$
\varepsilon = (c_{\mu}^{0})^{3+p/n} k^{3/2+m/n} \psi^{-1/n}, \qquad \psi = (c_{\mu}^{0})^{p} k^{m} l^{n}, \qquad l = (c_{\mu}^{0})^{3} k^{3/2} \varepsilon^{-1}
$$

with *l* a mixing length and  $c_{\mu}^{0}$  a constant (whose value is between 0.526 and 0.555) to be defined. Depending on the parameter values for the triplet  $(m, n, p)$  the GLS scheme will either correspond to a  $k - \varepsilon$ , a  $k - \omega$  or the so-called generic (Umlauf & Burchard, 2003) turbulence scheme (to simplify the code and because this scheme do not generally outperform other schemes, the possibility to use the so-called  $k$ - $kl$  scheme is not implemented in Croco). Since the equations for  $e$  and  $\psi$  bear lots of similarities, to avoid excessive code duplication, a unique equation is solved for a quantity  $\mathcal{T}_i$  encompassing k (when  $i = i_{\text{the}}$ ) and  $\psi$  (when  $i = i_{\text{gls}}$ ,  $i_{\text{gls}} = i_{\text{tke}} + 1$ ) such that

$$
\partial_t \mathcal{T}_i = \partial_z (K_{\mathcal{T}_i} \partial_z \mathcal{T}_i) + (c_i^1 P + c_i^{3,\pm} B - c_i^2 \varepsilon), \qquad K_{\mathcal{T}_i} = K_m / \text{Sc}_{\mathcal{T}_i}
$$

where

$$
\mathrm{Sc}_{\mathcal{T}_{i_{\mathrm{tke}}}} = \mathrm{Sc}_{k}, \qquad \mathrm{Sc}_{\mathcal{T}_{i_{\mathrm{gls}}}} = \mathrm{Sc}_{\psi}
$$

and

$$
c_i^1 = (i_{\text{gls}} - i) + (i - i_{\text{tke}})\beta_1 e^{-1} \psi
$$
  
\n
$$
c_i^2 = (i_{\text{gls}} - i) + (i - i_{\text{tke}})\beta_2 e^{-1} \psi
$$
  
\n
$$
c_i^{3,\pm} = (i_{\text{gls}} - i) + (i - i_{\text{tke}})\beta_3^{\pm} e^{-1} \psi
$$

In practice this explains why in the code the two prognostic quantities k and  $\psi$  are stored in a single array trb(i, j, k, ntime, ngls) avec ngls = 2,  $i_{\text{tke}} = 1$  and  $i_{\text{gls}} = 2$ . Once the quantities k and  $\psi$  (hence  $\varepsilon$ ) are known, the turbulent viscosity/diffusivity are given by

$$
K_m = c_\mu \left(\frac{k^2}{\varepsilon}\right) = \frac{c_\mu}{(c_\mu^0)^3} (l\sqrt{k}), \qquad K_s = c_\mu^{'} \left(\frac{k^2}{\varepsilon}\right) = \frac{c_\mu^{'}}{(c_\mu^0)^3} (l\sqrt{k}).
$$

where  $c_{\mu}$  and  $c_{\mu}^{'}$  are determined through so-called stability functions (see below).

#### Choice of parameter values and stability functions

A particular GLS occurence is defined by the following parameters :

- The exponents  $(m, n, p)$  in the definition of  $\varepsilon$
- The Schmidt numbers  $Sc_k$  and  $Sc_\psi$
- The coefficients  $\beta_i$  (j=1,3)
- The constant  $c_{\mu}^{0}$
- The stability functions which are generally function of

$$
\alpha_M = \left(\frac{k}{\varepsilon}\right)^2 \left[ (\partial_z u)^2 + (\partial_z v)^2 \right], \qquad \alpha_N = \left(\frac{k}{\varepsilon}\right)^2 N^2
$$

Where  $(m, n, p)$ , Sc<sub>k</sub>, Sc<sub> $\psi$ </sub>,  $\beta_j$  (j=1,3) are tied to a particular choice of GLS scheme (see table below) while  $c^0_\mu$ ,  $c_\mu$  and  $c'_\mu$  are tied to a particular choice of stability function. The formulation of numerous stability functions can be reconciled when written using the generic form

$$
c_{\mu} = \frac{n_0 + n_1 \alpha_N + n_2 \alpha_M}{d_0 + d_1 \alpha_N + d_2 \alpha_M + d_3 \alpha_N \alpha_M + d_4 \alpha_N^2 + d_5 \alpha_M^2}
$$
  

$$
c_{\mu}' = \frac{n_0' + n_1' \alpha_N + n_2' \alpha_M}{d_0 + d_1 \alpha_N + d_2 \alpha_M + d_3 \alpha_N \alpha_M + d_4 \alpha_N^2 + d_5 \alpha_M^2}
$$

where a given choice of stability function will define the parameter values for  $n_i$ ,  $d_j$ , and  $n'_k$ . In Croco, 7 options are available, these are referred to CANUTO-A, CANUTO-B, Gibson & Launder (1978), Mellor & Yamada (1982), Kantha & Clayson (1994), Luyten (1996), Cheng (2002).

model								
GLS model	m	$\boldsymbol{n}$		v2	$\omega_3$	レっ ۰J	Sc <sub>e</sub>	$OC_{\eta}$
	$0.5\,$	- 1		0.833	$-0.6$		0.5	
	ر. 1	-	.44	.92	-0.4			0.7692
Gen							ل که د	9345.

Table 1: Table: parameter values corresponding to each particular GLS model

The quantities  $\alpha_N$  and  $\alpha_M$  in the formulation of  $c_\mu$  and  $c_\mu^{'}$  must satisfy some constraints to guarantee the regularity of numerical solutions. In CROCO, the following steps are done:

1. Apply the Galperin (1988) limitation i.e.  $l \leq l_{\rm lim} = \beta_{\rm galp} \sqrt{2k/N^2}$  on  $\psi$  with  $\beta_{\rm galp} = 0.53$ . The first step is to use this mixing length  $l_{\rm lim}$  to compute  $\psi_{\rm min} = (c_{\mu}^0)^p k^m (l_{\rm lim})^n$  and to correct  $\psi$  to satisfy the constraint

$$
\psi = \max (\psi, \psi_{\min})
$$

here the max function is used since the exponent  $n$  is negative whatever the GLS scheme.

2. Compute the dissipation rate  $\varepsilon = (c_{\mu}^0)^{3+p/n} k^{3/2+m/n} \psi^{-1/n}$  and correct it

$$
\varepsilon = \max(\varepsilon, \varepsilon_{\min}), \qquad \varepsilon_{\min} = 10^{-12} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-3}
$$

3. Compute  $\alpha_N$  and  $\alpha_M$ , and apply "stability and realisability" constraints following Umlauf & Burchard (2003) (their Sec. 4). A first constraint applies on  $\alpha_N$  to ensure that  $-\partial_{\alpha_N}(c'_\mu/\alpha_N) > 0$  to prevent the occurence of oscillations in  $c'_\n\mu$ . This translates into the following limiter

$$
\alpha_N^{\min} = \frac{-(d_1 + n_0') + \sqrt{(d_1 + n_0')^2 - 4d_0(d_4 + n_1')}}{2(d_4 + n_1')}, \qquad \alpha_N = \min\left(\max(0.73\alpha_N^{\min}), 10^{10}\right)
$$

where the coefficient 0.73 is used to ensure the so-called realisability and has been empirically computed thanks to Table 3 in Umlauf & Burchard (2003) in order to satisfy their constraint (48). Then an upper limit is applied on  $\alpha_M$  to ensure that  $\partial_{\alpha_M}(c_{\mu} \sqrt{\alpha_M}) \ge 0$  which is also a prerequisite for stability reasons

$$
\alpha_M^{\max} = \frac{d_0 n_0 + (d_0 n_1 + d_1 n_0) \alpha_N + (d_1 n_1 + d_4 n_0) \alpha_N^2 + d_4 n_1 \alpha_N^3}{d_2 n_0 + (d_2 n_1 + d_3 n_0) \alpha_N + (d_3 n_1) \alpha_N^2}, \qquad \alpha_M = \min(\alpha_M, \alpha_M^{\max})
$$

Once those quantities are computed, stability functions are evaluated as well as the turbulent viscosity/diffusivity.

#### Surface and bottom boundary conditions

In current version of Croco, both  $k$  and  $\psi$  are formulated with Neumann boundary conditions at the top and at the bottom. However the nature of those boundary conditions also requires the determination of bottom and surface values for  $k$  and  $\psi$ .

• For turbulent kinetic energy, the "diagnostic" surface and bottom values are given by

$$
k_{\rm sfc} = (u^s_{\star}/c^0_{\mu})^2
$$
,  $k_{\rm bot} = (u^b_{\star}/c^0_{\mu})^2$ 

and simple homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions are applied

$$
K_k \partial_z k|_{\text{sfc}} = 0, \qquad K_k \partial_z k|_{\text{bot}} = 0
$$

In practice, due to the placement of k and  $\psi$  on the computational grid, the Neumann boundary condition is not applied strictly at the surface (resp. at the bottom) but at  $z = z<sub>N</sub>$  (resp.  $z = z<sub>1</sub>$ ) whereas the surface (resp. bottom) is located at  $z = z_{N+1/2}$  (resp.  $z = z_{1/2}$ ) with N the number of vertical levels (i.e. the number of cells in the vertical).

• For the generic length scale, a roughness is defined as

$$
z_{0,s} = \max\left\{10^{-2} \text{ m}, \frac{C_{\text{ch}}}{g}(u^s_*)^2\right\}, \qquad C_{\text{ch}} = 1400
$$

at the surface and

$$
z_{0,b} = \max\left\{10^{-4} \text{ m}, \text{Zob}\right\}
$$

at the bottom with Zob a user defined roughness length (usually Zob =  $10^{-2}$  m). Again, the boundary conditions are applied at the center of the shallowest and deepest grid cells and not at their interfaces which means that the relevant length scales are

$$
L_{\rm sfc} = \kappa \left( \frac{\Delta z_N}{2} + z_{0,s} \right), \qquad L_{\rm bot} = \kappa \left( \frac{\Delta z_1}{2} + z_{0,b} \right)
$$

with  $\kappa$  the von Karman constant. Moreover TKE values are interpolated at  $z = z_N$  and  $z = z_1$ 

$$
\widetilde{k}_{\text{sfc}} = \frac{1}{2} \left( k_{\text{sfc}} + k_{\text{N}-1/2} \right), \qquad \widetilde{k}_{\text{bot}} = \frac{1}{2} \left( k_{\text{bot}} + k_{3/2} \right)
$$

where  $k_{\text{sfc}}$  and  $k_{\text{bot}}$  are the diagnostic values given above. The "diagnostic" surface and bottom values for  $\psi$  are thus given by

$$
\psi_{\rm sfc} = (c^0_\mu)^p (L_{\rm sfc})^n (\widetilde{k}_{\rm sfc})^m, \qquad \psi_{\rm bot} = (c^0_\mu)^p (L_{\rm bot})^n (\widetilde{k}_{\rm bot})^m
$$

Then the surface and bottom flux are defined as

$$
\mathcal{F}_{\psi}^{\text{sfc}} = K_{\psi} \partial_z \psi \vert_{\text{sfc}} = -n(c_{\mu}^0)^{p+1} \frac{\kappa}{\text{Sc}_{\psi}} (\tilde{k}_{\text{sfc}})^{m+1/2} (L_{\text{sfc}})^n
$$

$$
\mathcal{F}_{\psi}^{\text{bot}} = K_{\psi} \partial_z \psi \vert_{\text{bot}} = -n(c_{\mu}^0)^{p+1} \frac{\kappa}{\text{Sc}_{\psi}} (\tilde{k}_{\text{bot}})^{m+1/2} (L_{\text{bot}})^n
$$

which correspond to the Neumann boundary conditions applied in the code.

# **8.2 Horizontal diffusion**

## **8.2.1 Lateral Momentum Mixing**

Related CPP options:



*Preslected options:*

```
# ifdef UV_VIS2
 define UV MIX S
# define UV_VIS_SMAGO
# endif
#ifdef UV_VIS_SMAGO
# define VIS_COEF_3D
#endif
# ifdef UV_MIX_S
# elif defined UV_MIX_GEO
# else
# define UV_MIX_S /* Default*/
# endif# undef UV_HADV_TVD
```
Explicit lateral momentum mixing may be only useful when implicit dissipation in UV\_HADV\_UP3 is not large enough to account for subgrid-scale turbulence resulting from large shear currents (for example in the case of western boundary currents). In this case, Smagorinsky parametrization is recommended (define UV\_VIS2 below).

# **8.2.2 Lateral Tracer Mixing**

Related CPP options:



*Preslected options:*

```
#ifdef TS_HADV_RSUP3 /* Rotated-Split 3rd-order scheme is: */
# define TS_HADV_C4 /* 4th-order centered advection */
# define TS_DIF4 /* + Hyperdiffusion */
# define TS_MIX_GEO /* rotated along geopotential surfaces */
```
(continues on next page)

(continued from previous page)

```
# define TS_MIX_IMP /* with Semi-Implicit Time-Stepping */
# define DIF_COEF_3D
#endif
```
These options are preselected in set\_global\_definitions.h for compliance with Advection options.

# **8.3 Bottom friction**

Related CPP options:



Specification in croco.in:

```
bottom_drag: RDRG [m/s], RDRG2, Zob [m], Cdb_min, Cdb_max
             3.0d-04 0.d-3 0.d-3 1.d-4 1.d-1
```
• General form for 3D equations (cf get\_vbc.F) :

– If  $z_{0,b} \neq 0$   $\rightarrow$  quadratic friction with log-layer ( $C_{d,\min} \le C_d \le C_{d,\max}$ )

$$
\boldsymbol{\tau}_b = C_d ||\mathbf{u}_{k=1}||\mathbf{u}_{k=1}, \qquad C_d = \left(\frac{\kappa}{\ln\left(\left[z_1 - H\right]/z_{0,b}\right]}\right)^2
$$

– If  $r_{\text{drag2}} > 0 \rightarrow$  quadratic friction with  $C_d$  = constant}

$$
\boldsymbol{\tau}_b = r_{\text{drg2}} || \mathbf{u}_{k=1} || \mathbf{u}_{k=1},
$$

 $-$  Otherwise  $\rightarrow$  linear friction

$$
\boldsymbol{\tau}_b = r_{\text{drag}} \mathbf{u}_{k=1},
$$

• In the barotropic mode (cf step2D.F) :

$$
\boldsymbol{\tau}_{b}^{\text{2d}} = (r_{\text{dry}} + r_{\text{drag}} \|\mathbf{\bar{u}}\|) \mathbf{\bar{u}}
$$

to be continued here for BSTRESS\_FAST and BBL . . .

BBL parametrization is detailed in the *Sediment and Biology models* section of the Doc.

# **CHAPTER**

# **NINE**

# **PARALLELISATION**

CROCO has been designed to be optimized on both shared and distributed memory parallel computer architectures. Parallelization is done by two dimensional sub-domains partitioning. Multiple sub-domains can be assigned to each processor in order to optimize the use of processor cache memory. This allow super-linear scaling when performance growth even faster than the number of CPUs.

### Related CPP options:



*Preselected options:*

# undef MPI # undef OPENMP # undef MPI\_NOLAND # undef AUTOTILING # undef PARALLEL\_FILES # undef NC4\_PAR undef XIOS

# **9.1 Parallel strategy overview**

Two kind of parallelism are currently supported by CROCO : MPI (distributed memory) and OpenMP (shared memory). COROC doesn't currently support hybrid parallelisation : use of cpp keys MPI or OPENMP is exclusive.

# **9.1.1 OpenMP (#define OPENMP)**



## Variables in param.h:

- NPP : number of threads
- NSUB\_X : number of tiles in XI direction
- NSUB\_E : number of threads in ETA direction

NSUB\_X x NSUB\_E has to be a multiple of NPP. Most of the time, we set NPP=NSUB\_X x NSUB\_E

## Example 1:

One node with 8 cores: NPP=8, NSUB\_X=2, NSUB\_ETA=4



Each thread computes one sub-domain.

## Example 2:

Still one node with 8 cores: NPP=8, NSUB\_X=2, NSUB\_E=8



Each thread computes two sub-domains.

## Code structure

- OpenMP is NOT implemented at loop level
- but uses a domain decomposition (similar to MPI) with parallel region
- use of *First touch initialisation* so working arrays are attached to the same thread
- working arrays have the size of the sub-domain only



Fig. 1: Example of a parallel region

```
Do tile=my_first, my_last ! Loop on the tiles computed
                            ! by the current thread
      Call compute 1(tile) ! No Synchronisation needed
     Call compute 2(tile) ! by these procedures
   Enddo
C$OMP BARRIER ! synchronisation
   Do tile=my_first, my_last ! Loop on the tiles computed
                            ! by the current thread
      Call compute 3(tile) ! No Synchronisation needed
      Call compute 4(tile) !
   Enddo
C$OMP BARRIER ! synchronisation
```
Fig. 2: Inside a parallel region

Here Compute\_1 and Compute2 can't write on the same index of a global array.

# **9.1.2 MPI (#define MPI)**

## Variables in param.h:

- NP\_XI : decompostion in XI direction
- NP\_ETA : decomposition in ETA direction
- NNODES : number of cores (=NP\_XI x NP\_ETA, except with MPI\_NOLAND)
- NPP  $= 1$
- NSUB\_X and NSUB\_ETA, number of sub-tiles (almost always =1)



## Example 1:

8 cores:

- NP\_XI=2, NP\_ETA=4, NNODES=8
- NPP=1, NSUB\_X=1, NSUB\_ETA=1



Example 2:

8 cores:

- NP\_XI=2, NP\_ETA=4, NNODES=8
- NPP=1, NSUB\_X=1, NSUB\_ETA=2



# **9.2 Loops and indexes**

## Parallel/sequential correspondance:

#### Decomposition:

Example : 2 MPI domains, with 2 sub-domains (OpenMP or not) by domain MPI



Istr, Iend are the limits of the sub-domains (without overlap). There are calculated dynamically.



Fig. 3: Decomposition on 2 sub-domain (up), total (sequential) domain (bottom)



Fig. 4: Computation of Istr, Iend and use of working arrays

# **9.3 Exchanges**



CROCO makes use 2 or 3 ghost cells depending on the numerical schemes chosen.

In the example above (2 ghosts cells), for correct exchanges, after computation:

- $\eta$  has to be valid on (1:Iend)
- $u$  has to be valid on (1:Iend) except on the left domain (2:Iend)



IstrU is the limit of validity at U point



Fig. 5: Compuation of auxiliary indexes

# **9.4 Dealing with outputs**

By default, with MPI activated input and output files are treated in a pseudo-sequential way, and one NetCDFfile corresponds to the whole domain. This has drawbacks when using a large number of computational cores, since each core is writing its part of the domain sequentially, the time dedicated to outputs increase with the number of cores. Three alternatives are implemented within CROCO.

## Splited files (#define PARALLEL\_FILES)

In this case, each core is writing its part only of the domain in separated files (one per MPI domain). This writing is performed concurrently. One other advantage is to avoid the creation of huge output files. The domain related output files can be recombined using ncjoin utility (in fortran) compiled in the same time than CROCO. Note that in this case, input files have to be splited as well, using partit utility.

## Parallel NetCDF(#define NC4\_FILES)

This option requires NetcDF4 verion, installed with parallel capabilities. All cores are writing concurrently but in the same time.

## IO server (#define XIOS)

XIOS is an external IO server interfaced with CROCO. Informations about use and installation can be found there [https://forge.ipsl.jussieu.fr/ioserver.](https://forge.ipsl.jussieu.fr/ioserver) In this case, output variables are defined in .xml files. See also the Diagnostics chapter.

# **ATMOSPHERIC SURFACE BOUNDARY LAYER**

## Related CPP options:



By default COARE3p0 parametrization is used with GUSTINESS effects. To change bulk parametrization you have to define one the following cpp keys (not additional) :

- define BULK\_ECUMEV0 to use ECUME\_v0 parametrization
- define BULK\_ECUMEV6 to use ECUME\_v6 parametrization
- define BULK\_WASP to use WASP parametrization

Warning : it is possible to add GUSTINESS effects for all parametrizations by defining BULK\_GUSTINESS cpp key

### ONLINE CPP options:

ONLINE option is an alternative to pre-processing of surface forcing data, that can be useful for long-term simulations, especially if handling multiple configurations. ONLINE option calls for CUBIC\_INTERP in set\_global\_definitions.h.



*Preselected options (cppdefs.h):*

	# undef BULK FLUX
	# ifdef BULK FLUX
#	undef BULK ECUMEVO
#	undef BULK ECUMEV6
$\#$	undef BULK WASP
$\#$	define BULK GUSTINESS
$\#$	define BULK_LW
$\#$	undef SST SKIN
$\#$	undef ANA DIURNAL SW
$\#$	undef ONLINE
$\#$	<i>ifdef ONLINE</i>
$\#$	undef AROME
$\#$	undef ERA ECMWF
$\#$	endif
$\#$	undef READ PATM
$\#$	<i>ifdef READ PATM</i>
$\#$	define OBC_PATM
#	endif
	# else
#	define OCORRECTION
$\#$	define SFLX CORR
#	undef SFLX_CORR_COEF
#	define ANA_DIURNAL_SW
	# endif
	# undef SFLUX_CFB
	# undef SEA_ICE_NOFLUX

*Preselected options (cppdefs\_dev.h):*

#ifdef BULK\_FLUX # ifdef ONLINE # define CUBIC\_INTERP # endif # ifdef BULK\_ECUMEV0 # define BULK\_GUSTINESS # elif defined BULK\_ECUMEV6 # define BULK\_GUSTINESS # elif defined BULK\_WASP # define BULK\_GUSTINESS # endif #endif

#ifdef SFLUX\_CFB # ifdef BULK\_FLUX # define CFB\_STRESS # define CFB\_WIND\_TRA # else # undef CFB\_STRESS # undef CFB\_WIND\_TRA # endif #endif

# **OPEN BOUNDARIES CONDITIONS**

If a lateral boundary faces the open ocean, robust open boundary conditions (OBCs) are needed (Marchesiello et al., 2001). Forcing of tracer and baroclinic flow is applied via an adaptive radiation condition, which helps perturbations to leave the domain with only a small effect on the interior solution. The same method can be applied to the depth-averaged flow, but (for tidal forcing in particular) we generally prefer the incoming characteristic of the shallow water system as in Flather-type conditions (Marchesiello et al., 2001; Blayo and Debreu, 2005). This allows long-wave data to be forced in, while those generated inside the domain can leave it, which also guarantees the quasi-conservation of mass and energy across the open boundary. A Sponge layer is added near the open boundaries to limit small-scale effects and ease the transition between the interior solution and the boundary data. The boundary data can be applied only at the boundary (see BRY strategy below) or in a nudging layer (CLIMATOLOGY strategy).

This set of OBCs are given as default if no other choice is made. They have performed well in most applications, from the deep ocean to the coastal areas. For details, refer to Marchesiello et al. (2001) and Blayo and Debreu (2005):

- Marchesiello, P., J.C. McWilliams, and A. Shchepetkin, 2001: Open boundary conditions for long-term integration of regional oceanic models. Ocean Modelling, 3, 1-20.
- Blayo E. anb L. Debreu, 2005: Revisiting open boundary conditions from the point of view of characteristic variables. Ocean Modelling, 9, 231-252.

# **11.1 OBC**

#### Related CPP options:



## Related CPP options:



For non-tidal forcing, the combination of OBC\_M2ORLANSKI and OBC\_VOLCONS often provides the best performances in terms of transparency of barotropic flow at the open boundaries. However, OBC\_M2CHARACT is near as good and also provides the best conditions for tidal forcing. It is therefore set as default in cppdefs dev.h.

*Preselected options (in cppdefs\_dev.h but set your own choice in cppdefs.h if needed):*

```
# undef OBC_M2SPECIFIED
# define OBC_M2CHARACT
# undef OBC_M2ORLANSKI
# ifdef OBC_M2ORLANSKI
# define OBC_VOLCONS
# endif
# define OBC_M3ORLANSKI
# define OBC_TORLANSKI
# undef OBC_M3SPECIFIED
# undef OBC_TSPECIFIED
```
# **11.2 Sponge Layer**

SPONGE is preselected in cppdefs.h and calls for SPONGE\_GRID in cppdefs\_dev.h. SPONGE\_GRID selects the sponge layer extension (10 points with cosine shape function) and viscosity and diffusivity values according to the horizontal resolution (limited by the CFL stability conditions).

#### Related CPP options:



# **11.3 Nudging layers**

The nudging layer has the same extension as the sponge layer. In nudging layers, tracer and momentum fields are nudged towards climatological values at a time scale Tau\_out (possibly different for momentum and tracers) that is given in namelist croco.in

#### Related CPP options:



# **11.4 Lateral forcing**

## **11.4.1 CLIMATOLOGY strategy**

Related CPP options:



# **11.4.2 BRY strategy**

FRC\_BRY is useful for inter-annual forcing on high-resolution domains.^FRC\_BRY is compatible with CLIMA-TOLOGY that can still be used for nudging layers.

## Related CPP options:



*Preselected options (cppdefs.h):*



# **CHAPTER TWELVE**

# **RIVERS**

## Related CPP options:



ANA\_PSOURCE gives the vertical distribution of point source outflow. The default shape is an uniform distribution along the vertical. The vertical shape can be customized in subroutine *ana\_psource* in *analytical.F*

An example of runoff file is given below

```
netcdf croco_runoff {
dimensions:
     qbar_time = 28193;
     n_qbar = 9;
     runoffname_StrLen = 30 ;
     two = 2;
     temp\_src\_time = 10690;
      salt_src_time = 10690 ;
variables:
     double qbar_time(qbar_time) ;
              qbar_time:long_name = "runoff time" ;
              qbar_time:units = "days" ;
              qbar_time:cycle_length = 0. ;
              qbar_time:long_units = "days since 1900-01-01";
      char runoff_name(n_qbar, runoffname_StrLen) ;
             runoff_name:long_name = "runoff name" ;
      double runoff_position(n_qbar, two) ;
              runoff_position:long_name = "position of the runoff (by line) in the
˓→CROCO grid" ;
      double runoff_direction(n_qbar, two) ;
              runoff_direction:long_name = "direction/sense of the runoff (by_
˓→line) in the CROCO grid" ;
     double Qbar(n_qbar, qbar_time) ;
              Qbar:long_name = "runoff discharge" ;
              Qbar:units = ^{\mathsf{m}}m3.s-1";
      double temp_src_time(temp_src_time) ;
              temp_src_time:cycle_length = 0. ;
              temp_src_time:long_units = "days since 1900-01-01" ;
      double salt_src_time(salt_src_time) ;
              salt_src_time:cycle_length = 0. ;
              salt_src_time:long_units = "days since 1900-01-01" ;
```
(continues on next page)

(continued from previous page)

```
double temp_src(n_qbar, temp_src_time) ;
       temp_src:long_name = "runoff temperature" ;
       temp_src:units = "Degrees Celcius" ;
double salt_src(n_qbar, temp_src_time) ;
       salt_src:long_name = "runoff salinity" ;
        salt\_src:units = "psu" ;
        }
```
When using PSOURCE, Isrc and Jsrc refer to the i,j index of the u-face or v-face the flow crosses - NOT the i,j index of the rho cell it flows into. The i,j values must follow ROMS Fortran numbering convention for the appropriate u-point or v-point on the ROMS staggered grid.

This numbering convention is shown in the figure below (Courtesy of [ROMS-RUTGERS](https://myroms.org/) team) for flow crossing a u-face into a cell from either the left or the right. This makes it more obvious why the index of the u-face must be specified, because to give the i,j indices of the receiving rho-cell would be ambiguous.

The u-face or v-face should be a land/sea mask boundary (i.e. a coastline). If the cell face is placed wholly in the land you get nothing because there is no wet cell for the flow to enter. If the face is in the middle of open water you have a situation where the flow at that cell face computed by the advection algorithm is 'REPLACED, not augmented, by the source.

It is very easy to misconfigure source/sink locations so caution and careful checking is required.



# **CHAPTER THIRTEEN**

# **TIDES**

## Related CPP options:



### *Preselected options:*


# **CHAPTER FOURTEEN**

# **NESTING CAPABILITIES**

To address the challenge of bridging the gap between near-shore and offshore dynamics, a nesting capability has been added to CROCO and tested for the California Upwelling System (Debreu et al., 2012; Penven et al., 2006). The method chosen for embedded griding takes advantage of the AGRIF (Adaptive Grid Refinement in Fortran) package (Debreu and Blayo, 2003, 2008; Blayo and Debreu, 1999; Debreu and Vouland, 2003; Debreu, 2000). AGRIF is a Fortran 95 package for the inclusion of adaptive mesh refinement features within a finite difference numerical model. One of the major advantages of AGRIF in static-grid embedding is the ability to manage an arbitrary number of fixed grids and an arbitrary number of embedding levels.



A recursive integration procedure manages the time evolution for the child grids during the time step of the parent grids (Fig. 2). In order to preserve the CFL criterion, for a typical coefficient of refinement (say, a factor of 3 for a 5 km resolution grid embedded in a 15 km grid), for each parent time step the child must be advanced using a time step divided by the coefficient of refinement as many time as necessary to reach the time of the parent (Fig. 2). For simple 2-level embedding, the procedure is as follows:

- 1. Advance the parent grid by one parent time step.
- 2. Interpolate the relevant parent variables in space and time to get the boundary conditions for the child grid.
- 3. Advance the child grid by as much child time steps as necessary to reach the new parent model time.
- 4. Update point by point the parent model by averaging the more accurate values of the child model (in case of 2-way nesting).

The recursive approach used in AGRIF allows the specification of any number of nesting levels. Additional CPP options are related to AGRIF, they are in set\_global\_definitions.h and set\_obc\_definitions.h files. These are default options intended for nesting developers and should not be edit by standard users.

For a better understanding of ROMS nesting capabilties using AGRIF, check the published articles on CROCO/ROMS nesting implementation and also the AGRIF project homepage:

- 1. CROCO/ROMS 1 way nesting : Evaluation and application of the ROMS 1-way, embedding procedure to the central california upwelling system, (Penven et al., 2006)
- 2. CROCO/ROMS 2 way nesting: Two-way nesting in split-explicit ocean models: algorithms, implementation and validation. (Debreu et al., 2012)
- 3. AGRIF homepage : <http://www-ljk.imag.fr/MOISE/AGRIF/>

### Related CPP options:



**CHAPTER FIFTEEN**

# **SEDIMENT AND BIOLOGY MODELS**

## **15.1 Bottom Boundary Layer model**

### Related CPP options:



*Preselected options:*

```
#ifdef BBL
# ifdef OW_COUPLING
# elif defined WAVE_OFFLINE
# elif defined WKB_WWAVE
# else
 define ANA_WWAVE
# endif
# ifdef SEDIMENT
# undef ANA_BSEDIM
# else
# define ANA_BSEDIM
# endif
# ifdef SEDIMENT
# define Z0_BL
# else
# undef Z0_BL
# endif
# ifdef Z0_BL
# define Z0_RIP
# endif
# undef Z0_BIO
#endif
```
### DESCRIPTION

Reynolds stresses, production and dissipation of turbulent kinetic energy, and gradients in velocity and suspendedsediment concentrations vary over short vertical distances, especially near the bed, and can be difficult to resolve with the vertical grid spacing used in regional-scale applications. CROCO provides algorithms to parameterize some of these subgrid-scale processes in the water column and in the bottom boundary layer (BBL). Treatment of the BBL is important for the circulation model solution because it determines the stress exerted on the flow by the bottom, which enters the Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes equations as a boundary conditions for momentum in

the x and y directions:

$$
K_m \frac{\partial u}{\partial s} = \tau_{bx}
$$

$$
K_m \frac{\partial v}{\partial s} = \tau_{by}
$$

Determination of the BBL is even more important for the sediment-transport formulations because bottom stress determines the transport rate for bedload and the resuspension rate for suspended sediment.

CROCO implements either of two methods for representing BBL processes: (1) simple drag-coefficient expressions or (2) more complex formulations that represent the interactions of wave and currents over a moveable bed. The drag-coefficient methods implement formulae for linear bottom friction, quadratic bottom friction, or a logarithmic profile. The other, more complex wave-current BBL model is described by Blaas et al. (2007) with an example of its use on the Southern California continental shelf. The method uses efficient wave-current BBL computations developed by Soulsby (1995) in combination with sediment and bedform roughness estimates of Grant and Madsen (1982), Nielsen (1986) and Li and Amos (2001).

#### Linear/quadratic drag

The linear and/or quadratic drag-coefficient methods depend only on velocity components u and v in the bottom grid cell and constant, spatially-uniform coefficients  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  specified as input:

$$
\tau_{bx} = (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 \sqrt{u^2 + v^2}) u
$$

$$
\tau_{by} = (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 \sqrt{u^2 + v^2}) v
$$

where  $\gamma_1$  is the linear drag coefficient and  $\gamma_2$  is the quadratic drag coefficient. The user can choose between linear or quadratic drag by setting one of these coefficients to zero. The bottom stresses computed from these formulae depend on the elevation of u and v (computed at the vertical mid-elevation of the bottom computational cell). Therefore, in this s-coordinate model, the same drag coefficient will be imposed throughout the domain even though the vertical location of the velocity is different.

#### **Logarithmic drag** (with roughness length  $z_0$ )

To prevent this problem, the quadratic drag  $\gamma_2$  can be computed assuming that flow in the BBL has the classic vertical logarithmic profile defined by a shear velocity  $u_*$  and bottom roughness length  $z_0$  (m) as:

$$
|u| = \frac{u_*}{\kappa} \ln\left(\frac{z}{z_0}\right)
$$

where  $|u| =$ √  $\sqrt{u^2 + v^2}$ , friction velocity  $u_* = \sqrt{\tau_b}$ , z is the elevation above the bottom (vertical mid-elevation point of the bottom cell),  $\kappa = 0.41$  is von Kármán's constant.  $z_0$  is an empirical parameter. It can be constant (default) or spatially varying. Kinematic stresses are calculated as`

$$
\tau_{bx} = \frac{\kappa^2}{\ln^2(z/z_0)} \sqrt{u^2 + v^2} u
$$

$$
\tau_{by} = \frac{\kappa^2}{\ln^2(z/z_0)} \sqrt{u^2 + v^2} v
$$

The advantage of this approach is that the velocity and the vertical elevation of that velocity are used in the equation. Because the vertical elevation of the velocity in the bottom computational cell will vary spatially and temporally, the inclusion of the elevation provides a more consistent formulation.

#### Combined wave-current drag (BBL)

To provide a more physically relevant value of  $z_0$ , especially when considering waves and mobile sediments, a more complex formulation is available (BBL).

The short (order 10-s) oscillatory shear of wave-induced motions in a thin (a few cm) wave-boundary layer produces turbulence and generates large instantaneous shear stresses. The turbulence enhances momentum transfer, effectively increasing the bottom-flow coupling and the frictional drag exerted on the wave-averaged flow. The large instantaneous shear stresses often dominate sediment resuspension and enhance bedload transport. Sediment transport can remold the bed into ripples and other bedforms, which present roughness elements to the flow. Bedload transport can also induce drag on the flow, because momentum is transferred to particles as they are removed from the bed and accelerated by the flow. Resuspended sediments can cause sediment-induced stratification and, at high concentrations, change the effective viscosity of the fluid.

The BBL parameterization implemented in CROCO requires inputs of velocities u and v at reference elevation z, representative wave-orbital velocity amplitude  $u<sub>b</sub>$ , wave period T, and wave propagation direction  $\theta$  (degrees, clockwise from north). The wave parameters may be the output of a wave model such as WKB or WW3 or simpler calculations based on specified surface wave parameters. Additionally the BBL models require bottom sediment characteristics (median grain diameter  $D_{50}$ , mean sediment density  $\rho_s$ , and representative settling velocity  $w_s$ ); these are constant (ANA\_BSEDIM) or based on the composition of the uppermost active layer of the bed sediment during the previous time step if the sediment model is used.

The wave-averaged, combined wave–current bottom stress is expressed as function of  $\tau_w$  and  $\tau_c$  (i.e., the stress due to waves in the absence of currents and due to currents in the absence of waves, respectively) according to Soulsby (1995):

$$
\bar{\tau}_{wc} = \tau_c \left( 1 + 1.2 \left( \frac{\tau_w}{\tau_w + \tau_c} \right)^{3.2} \right)
$$

The maximum wave–current shear stress within a wave cycle is obtained by adding  $\bar{\tau}_{wc}$  and  $\tau_w$  (with  $\phi$  the angle between current and waves):

$$
\tau_{wc} = \left( (\bar{\tau}_{wc} + \tau_w \cos \phi)^2 + (\tau_w \sin \phi)^2 \right)^{1/2}
$$

The stresses  $\tau_c$  and  $\tau_w$  are determined using:

$$
\tau_c = \frac{\kappa^2}{\ln^2(z/z_0)} |u|^2
$$

$$
\tau_w = 0.5 \rho f_w u_b^2
$$

 $u_b$ , the bottom orbital velocity, is determined from the significant wave height  $H_s$  and peak frequency  $\omega_p$  using the Airy wave theory:

$$
u_b = \omega_p \frac{H_s}{2\sinh kh}
$$

with h the local depth and k the local wave number from the dispersion relation. The wave-friction factor  $f_w$  is, according to Soulsby (1995):

$$
f_w = 1.39 (u_b/\omega_p z_0)^{-0.52}
$$

The wave–current interaction in the BBL is taken into account only if  $u_b > 1$  cm/s; otherwise, current-only conditions apply.

#### Shear stress for sediment resuspension and roughness length due to bed form

To determine the shear stress relevant for sediment resuspension and the roughness length due to bed forms, we follow the concept of Li and Amos (2001) briefly summarized here. First, the maximum wave–current skin friction  $\tau_s$  is computed from the equations above, using the Nikuradse roughness  $z_0 = D_{50}/12$ .

A bed-load layer develops as soon as the maximum wave–current skin friction  $\tau_s$  exceeds the critical stress  $\tau_{cr}$ . This layer affects the stress effective for ripple formation and sediment resuspension. Subsequently, for sandy locations, ripple height and length are computed, leading to a space- and time-dependent ripple roughness length  $z_0 = z_{\text{rin}}$ , which is used to compute the drag on the flow (instead of a constant value when BBL is not activated). This drag provides boundary conditions to the momentum and turbulence equations (KPP or GLS).

# **15.2 Sediment models**

There are two sediment models in CROCO: the USGS model derived from the UCLA/USGS ROMS community, and MUSTANG derived from the Ifremer SIAM/MARS community.

### **15.2.1 USGS Sediment Model**

This USGS sediment model is derived from the UCLA/USGS ROMS community. See Blaas et al. (2007), Warner et al. (2008) and Shafiei et al. (2021) for details.

Regarding the time and space resolution considered, the explicit solution generally refers to quantities averaged over wave periods, although the implementation of a nonhydrostatic solver in CROCO opens the way to a waveresolved approach. One of the crucial ingredients in the sediment transport model is a reliable representation of wave-averaged (or wave-resolved) hydrodynamics and turbulence.

In the wave-averaged approach, the wave boundary layer is not resolved explicitly, but the lower part of the velocity and sediment concentration profile in the current boundary layer is important for the calculation of the sediment transport rates. Similarly, an accurate assessment of the bottom boundary shear stress (including wave effects) is required since it determines the initiation of grain motion and settling and resuspension of suspended load (see BBL). Thus, the sediment concentration and current velocity profiles in the unresolved part of the nearbottom layer have to be parameterized. Characterization of the sediments (mainly density and grain size, making general assumptions about shape and cohesiveness) is done either as a time-dependent prescribed function at the point sources or at the sea bed as an initial (soon space-dependent) condition. Sediment concentration may be considered as passive with respect to the flow density or as active if concentration values require such (the latter is not implemented yet).

### **Sediment bed**

The sediment bed is represented by three-dimensional arrays with a fixed number of layers beneath each horizontal model cell. Each cell of each layer in the bed is initialized with a thickness, sediment-class distribution, porosity, and age. The mass of each sediment class in each cell can be determined from these values and the grain density. The bed framework also includes two-dimensional arrays that describe the evolving properties of the seabed, including bulk properties of the surface layer (active layer thickness, mean grain diameter, mean density, mean settling velocity, mean critical stress for erosion) and descriptions of the subgrid scale morphology (ripple height and wavelength). These properties are used to estimate bed roughness in the BBL formulations and feed into the bottom stress calculations. The bottom stresses are then used by the sediment routines to determine resuspension and transport, providing a feedback from the sediment dynamics to the hydrodynamics.

The bed layers are modified at each time step to account for erosion and deposition and track stratigraphy. At the beginning of each time step, an active layer thickness  $z_a$  is calculated (Harris and Wiberg, 1997).  $z_a$  is the minimum thickness of the top bed layer. If the top layer is thicker than  $z_a$ , no action is required. If the top layer is less than  $z_a$ , then the top layer thickness is increased by entraining sediment mass from deeper layers until the top layer thickness equals  $z_a$ . If sediment from deeper than the second layer is mixed into the top layer, the bottom layer is split to enforce a constant number of layers and conservation of sediment mass. Each sediment class can be transported by suspended-load and/or bedload (below). Suspended-load mass is exchanged vertically between the water column and the top bed layer. Mass of each sediment class available for transport is limited to the mass available in the active layer. Bedload mass is exchanged horizontally within the top layer of the bed. Mass of each sediment class available for transport is limited to the mass available in the top layer. Suspendedsediment that is deposited, or bedload that is transported into a computational cell, is added to the top bed layer. If continuous deposition results in a top layer thicker than a user-defined threshold, a new layer is provided to begin accumulation of depositing mass. The bottom two layers are then combined to conserve the number of layers. After erosion and deposition have been calculated, the active-layer thickness is recalculated and bed layers readjusted to accommodate it. This step mixes away any very thin layer (less than the active layer thickness) of newly deposited material. Finally the surficial sediment characteristics, such as D50, ripple geometry, etc., are updated and made available to the bottom stress calculations.

#### **Suspended-sediment transport**

The concentration of sediment suspended in the water column is transported, like other conservative tracers (e.g., temperature and salinity) by solving the advection–diffusion equation with a source/sink term for vertical settling and erosion:

$$
\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} = -\underbrace{\vec{\nabla}.\vec{v}C}_{ADVECTION} + \underbrace{\mathcal{D}_C}_{MIXING} - \underbrace{\frac{\partial w_s C}{\partial z}}_{SETTLING} + \underbrace{\frac{E}{\delta z_b}|_{z=z_b}}_{EROSION}
$$

 $C$  is the Reynolds-averaged, wave-averaged (unless used in wave-resolving mode) sediment concentration of a particular size class;  $\vec{v}$  is the flow velocity (it is the Lagrangian velocity  $\vec{v}$  in wave-averaged equations, comprising the Stokes drift  $\vec{v_S}$ ).

For each size class, the source or sink term represents the net of upward flux of eroded material E and downward settling, i.e., the deposition flux.  $w_s$  is the settling velocity, dependent on sediment grain size, but independent of flow conditions and concentrations. It is an input parameter of the model (WSED in sediment.in; see below). Settling is computed via a semi-Lagrangian advective flux algorithm, which is unconditionally stable (Durran, 2010). It uses a piece-wise parabolic vertical reconstruction of the suspended sediment for high-order interpolation, with WENO constraints to avoid oscillations.  $E$  is the erosion flux at the sea floor and is only applied to the first grid level of height  $z<sub>b</sub>$  and cell size  $\delta z<sub>b</sub>$ . The erosion flux for each class is given by:

$$
E = E_0(1 - p) \phi \left(\frac{\tau_s}{\tau_c} - 1\right) \text{ for } \tau_s > \tau_c
$$

 $E_0$  is an empirical erosion rate (ERATE parameter in sediment.in; see below); p is the sediment porosity;  $\phi$  is the volumetric fraction of sediment of the class considered;  $\tau_c$  is the critical shear stress; and  $\tau_s$  is the shear stress magnitude on the grains (skin stress due to wave-induced bed orbital velocities and mean bottom currents; see BBL). The critical shear stress is the threshold for the initiation of sediment motion.

Zero-flux boundary conditions are imposed at the surface and bottom in the vertical diffusion equation. Lateral open boundaries are treated as other tracers according to Marchesiello et al. (2001). A quasi-monotonic 5th-order advection scheme (WENO5-Z, Borges et al., 2008) can be used for horizontal and vertical advection of all tracers, including sediments.

#### **Bedload transport**

The bedload flux  $q<sub>b</sub>$ , which is considered unresolved by the model can be calculated using different bedload models implemented in CROCO. The formulation by Meyer-Peter Muller (Meyer-Peter and Muller, 1948) is suited to rivers or continental shelf problems, where nonlinear wave effects are small. For nearshore applications, where wave nonlinearity is important, the bedload transport formulation proposed by van der A et al. (2013) is implemented as in Shafiei et al. (2021) following Kalra et al. (2019) with some modifications.

Each formulation depends on the characteristics of individual sediment classes, including median size  $d_{50}$ , grain density  $\rho_s$ , specific density in water  $s = \rho/\rho_s$ , and critical shear stress  $\tau_c$ . Non-dimensional transport rates  $\Phi$  are calculated for each sediment class and converted to dimensional bedload transport rates  $q_b$  using:

$$
q_b = \Phi \sqrt{(s-1)gd_{50}^3 \rho_s}
$$

These are horizontal vector quantities with directions that correspond to the combined bed-stress vectors. Details on the computation of Φ differs in the Meyer-Peter Müeller or van der A formulations.

Slope effect: bedload fluxes are corrected to account for the avalanche process, i.e., the gravitational flow of sand occuring when the bottom slope exceeds the critical slope angle:

$$
q_{b, slope} = q_b \left( \frac{0.65}{(0.65 - \tan \beta) \cos \beta} \right),
$$

This correction considers the effect of the bed slope  $\beta = \tan^{-1}(dz_b/dx)$ . The value 0.65 is derived from the consideration of an angle of repose of 33<sup>∘</sup> .

Bedload numerics: bedload fluxes are computed at grid-cell centers and are limited by the availability of each sediment class in the top layer. Fluxes are then interpolated on cell faces using an upwind approach, either 1rstorder (e.g., Lesser et al., 2004) or 5th order, or even a WENO5 interpolation to avoid oscillations. Flux differences are then used to determine changes of sediment mass in the bed at each grid cell.

### **Meyer-Peter Müeller (1948) : Transport by currents**

$$
\Phi = \max \left[ 8(\theta_s - \theta_c)^{1.5}, 0 \right]
$$

where  $\Phi$  is the magnitude of the non-dimensional transport rate for each sediment class,  $\theta_s$  is the non-dimensional Shields parameter for skin stress:

$$
\theta_s = \frac{\tau_s}{(s-1)gd_{50}}
$$

 $\theta_c$  is the critical Shields parameter, and  $\tau_s$  the magnitude of total skin-friction component of bottom stress computed from:

$$
\tau_s = \sqrt{\tau_{sx}^2 + \tau_{sy}^2}
$$

where  $\tau_{sx}$  and  $\tau_{sy}$  are the skin-friction components of bed stress, from currents alone or the maximum wavecurrent combined stress, in the x and y directions. These are computed at cell faces (u and v locations) and then interpolated to cell centers ( $\rho$  points). The bedload transport vectors are partitioned into x and y components based on the magnitude of the bed shear stress as:

$$
q_{bx} = q_b \frac{\tau_{sx}}{\tau_s}
$$

$$
q_{by} = q_b \frac{\tau_{sy}}{\tau_s}
$$

#### **van der A (2013): Transport by nonlinear waves**

The SANTOSS bedload model is based on the half-wave cycle concept proposed by Dibajnia and Watanabe (1992) that captures asymmetric transport by non-linear waves and the effect of phase lag between mobilization and transport. CROCO contains an adapted version by Shafiei et al. (2021), based on the implementation of Kalra et al. (2019). In our formulation, the effect of wave-averaged currents is removed by default (assuming that the transport by currents is effectively performed by the suspended load model) and it thus only retains the nonlinear effects of waves. In the brief presentation below, we retain the current terms for completeness, but focus on wave effects.

The method to obtain bedload transport under asymmetric waves can be divided into three major steps (van der A, 2013; Kalra et al, 2019). In the first step, the asymmetric waveform based on the Ursell number is evaluated using wave statistics. The Shields parameter for each half cycle of the wave form is computed in the second step. Finally, a phase lag is estimated from the velocity and sediment concentrations that determine the amount of bedload transported in the half cycle following mobilization. The non-dimensional bedload transport rate  $\Phi$  is thus given by:

$$
\Phi = \frac{1}{T} \left[ \frac{\theta_c}{\left| \theta_c \right|^{1/2}} T_c \left( \Omega_{cc} + \frac{T_c}{2T_{cu}} \Omega_{tc} \right) + \frac{\theta_t}{\left| \theta_t \right|^{1/2}} T_t \left( \Omega_{tt} + \frac{T_t}{2T_{tu}} \Omega_{ct} \right) \right],
$$

where  $T, T_c, T_t, T_{cu}$  and  $T_{tu}$  are the wave period, duration of wave crest half cycle, duration of wave trough half cycle, duration of accelerating flow within the crest half cycle and duration of accelerating flow within the trough half cycle respectively,  $\theta_c$  and  $\theta_t$  represent the Shields numbers associated with the wave crest and trough half cycles. The sand load transported during the crest period is the combination of  $\Omega_{cc}$  (mobilized during the crest period) and  $\Omega_{tc}$  (mobilized during the trough period). Similarly,  $\Omega_{tt}$  and  $\Omega_{ct}$  are the sand load transported during the trough period (mobilized during the trough and crest periods respectively).

The sand load transported during each half-cycle is conventionally modeled according to a power law of Shields number:

$$
\Omega_i = \max\left(11\left(\left|\theta_i\right| - \theta_{cr}\right)^{1.2}, 0\right),\,
$$

where  $\theta_{cr}$  is the critical Shields number and, hereafter, the subscript "i" is either "c" for crest or "t" for trough half cycles. To determine  $\Omega_{ct}$  and  $\Omega_{tc}$ , i.e., the portion of the bedload remaining in suspension to be transported in the next half cycle, a phase lag parameter is evaluated.

Let's assume a two-dimensional  $(x, z)$  cross-shore problem for simplicity. The Shields number for the peak or trough ( $\theta_i = \theta_t$  or  $\theta_c$ ) is calculated according to:

$$
\theta_i = \frac{\frac{1}{2} f_{w\delta i} |u_{i,r}| u_{i,r}}{(s-1) g d_{50}}.
$$

 $u_{i,r}$  is the representative cross-shore combined wave-current velocity at trough or crest half cycles calculated as:

$$
u_{i,r} = \frac{\hat{u}_i}{\sqrt{2}} + |u_\delta|,
$$

where  $\hat{u}_i$  is the peak crest or trough orbital velocities,  $u_\delta$  is the steady current velocity at the top of the wave boundary layer.  $f_{w\delta i}$  is the linear wave-current friction factor at crest or trough calculated by Ribberink (1998}:

$$
f_{w\delta i} = \frac{\hat{u}}{u_{\delta} + \hat{u}} f_{wi} + \frac{u_{\delta}}{u_{\delta} + \hat{u}} f_{\delta}
$$

where  $\hat{u}$  is the representative orbital velocity amplitude for the whole flow cycle (given by  $\hat{u}$  = √  $(2u_{orb})$ .  $f_{\delta}$  is the current-related friction factor dependent on a current-related roughness  $k_{s\delta}$  and  $f_{wi}$  is the wave friction factor, calculated separately for the crest and trough half-cycles and depends on a wave-related roughness  $k_{sw}$ . If the representative orbital excursion amplitude  $\hat{a} = \hat{u}T/2\pi$  is large enough (i.e., greater than 1.587  $k_{sw}$ ):

$$
f_{wi} = 0.00251 e^{5.21 \left[ \left( \frac{2T_{iu}}{T_i} \right)^{2.6} \frac{\hat{a}}{k_{sw}} \right]^{-0.19}},
$$

otherwise,  $f_{wi} = 0.3$ .

If  $u_{\delta} = 0$   $(u_{i,r} = \hat{u}_i)$ √ 2 and  $f_{w\delta i} = f_{wi}$ ), the effect of currents is completely removed from the bedload transport calculation. This choice represents our default to avoid double counting the transport by wave-averaged currents.

Finally, following Kalra et al. (2019), after calculating  $\Phi$ , we apply to  $q_b$  a bedload factor  $f_{bld}$  (bedload<sub>c</sub>oeff in CROCO). This factor allows us to adjust the relative contribution to sediment transport of wave-induced bedload compared to the suspended load transported by mean currents. In this way, we have a better control of the antagonistic mechanisms that govern onshore and offshore transports respectively.

### **Morphology**

The bed evolution (variation in time of  $z<sub>b</sub>$ , the height of the bed), is calculated from the divergence of sediment fluxes (Exner equation), which results from the difference between erosion and sedimentation of suspended sediments. In wave-averaged equations, where residual wave effects need to be parametrized as bedload fluxes  $q<sub>b</sub>$ , the bed evolution also arises from the divergence of these fluxes.

$$
\frac{\partial z_b}{\partial t} = -\frac{f_{mor}}{1-p} \left( \frac{\partial q_b}{\partial x} - w_s \frac{\partial C}{\partial z} + E \right).
$$

This equation accounts for a morphological acceleration factor  $f_{mor}$  (morph<sub>f</sub>ac in CROCO). A value of 1 has no effect, and values greater than 1 accelerate the bed response. The concept of morphological acceleration is based on the fact that morphodynamic changes are slower than hydrodynamic ones (van Rijn, 1993). In this case, the bed evolution can be accelerated without affecting the hydro-morphological solution. The increased rate of morphological change can be useful for simulating evolution over long time periods. Strategies for morphological updating are described by Roelvink (2006) and implemented in CROCO following Warner et al. (2008). In our implementation, bedload fluxes, erosion, and deposition rates are multiplied by  $f_{mor}$ , while the magnitude of sediment concentrations in the water column is not modified – just the exchange rate to and from the bed. For

both bedload and suspended load, sediment is limited in availability, based on the true amount of sediment mass (not multiplied by the scale factor).

For dynamical consistency, the vertical velocity is modified (in omega.F) by the rate of change of vertical grid levels  $dz/dt$ , adjusting to the moving sea floor and free surface (grid "breathing" component; Shchepetkin and McWilliams, 2005). This method is mass conserving and retains tracer constancy preservation.

### **Sediment Density**

This is not implemented yet. Effects of suspended sediment on the density field can be included with terms for the weight of each sediment class in the equation of state for seawater density as:

$$
\rho = \rho_{water} + \sum_{m=1}^{Nsed} \frac{C_m}{\rho_{s,m}} (\rho_{s,m} - \rho_{water})
$$

This enables the model to simulate processes where sediment density influences hydrodynamics, such as density stratification and gravitationally driven flows.

### Related CPP options:



*Preselected options:*

```
#ifdef SEDIMENT
# undef MUSTANG
# define ANA_SEDIMENT
# define SPONGE_SED
# define Z0_BL
# define Z0_RIP
# ifdef BEDLOAD
# ifdef BEDLOAD_VANDERA /* default BEDLOAD scheme */
# elif defined BEDLOAD_MPM
# elif defined BEDLOAD_WULIN
# elif defined BEDLOAD_MARIEU
# else
# if (defined WAVE_OFFLINE || defined WKB_WWAVE ||\
      defined ANA WWAVE || defined OW COUPLING)
# define BEDLOAD_VANDERA
# else
# define BEDLOAD_MPM
# endif
# endif
# ifdef BEDLOAD_UP1 /* default INTERPOLATION */
  elif defined BEDLOAD_UP5
```
(continued from previous page)

```
# elif defined BEDLOAD_WENO5
# else
# define BEDLOAD_UP1
# endif
# ifdef SLOPE_LESSER /* default SLOPE scheme */
# elif defined SLOPE_NEMETH
# elif defined SLOPE_KIRWAN
# else
# define SLOPE_LESSER
# endif
# endif /* BEDLOAD */
#endif /* SEDIMENT */
```
### Parameters in sediment.in

```
1 Stitle (a80)
CROCO - Sediment - Test
2 Sd(1-NST), CSED, SRHO, WSED, ERATE, TAU_CE, TAU_CD, BED_FRAC(1:NLAY)
    0.125 9.9 2650. 9.4 25.0e-5 0.05 0.14 0.4 0.4
    0.050 0.0 2650. 1.6 4.0e-5 0.01 0.14 0.6 0.6
3 BTHK(1:NLAY)
    1. 10.
4 BPOR(1:NLAY)
   0.41 0.42
5 Hrip
   0.03
6 Lrip
    0.14
7 bedload_coeff
    \overline{0}.
8 morph_fac
   10.
9 transC
   0.03
10 transN
   0.2
11 tcr_min
   0.03
12 tcr_max
   5.5
13 tcr_slp
   0.3
14 tcr_off
    1.
15 tcr_tim
    28800.
```

```
16 L_ADS L_ASH L_COLLFRAG L_TESTCASE
  F T F F
17 F_DP0 F_NF F_DMAX F_NB_FRAG F_ALPHA F_BETA F_ATER F_ERO_
˓→FAC F_ERO_NBFRAG F_COLLFRAGPARAM F_CLIM F_ERO_IV
 0.000004 2. 0.0015 2. 0.35 0.15 0. 0.
                                                              \sim\rightarrow 2. 0.01 0.001 1
18 MUD_FRAC_EQ [1:NMUD]
 0.10 0.20 0.40 0.20 0.10 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
19 MUD_T_DFLOC
  200.
99 END of sediment input data
```
### GLOSSARY

### CARD 1: String with a maximum of eighty characters.

> Stitle : Sediment case title.

#### CARD 2: Sediment grain parameters & initial values (NST lines)

- > Sd : Diameter of grain size class [mm].
- > CSED : Initial concentration (spatially uniform) [kg/m3].
- > SRHO : Density of sediment material of size class [kg/m3].

Quartz: SRHO=2650  $kg/m<sup>3</sup>$ 

> WSED : Settling velocity of size class [mm/s].

Typically (Soulsby, 1997):

 $WSED = 10^3 (visc)$  $\sqrt{10.36^2 + 1.049D^3}$  – 10.36) /  $D_{50}$  [mm/s]

with  $D = D_{50}$   $(g~({\rm SRHO}/\rho_0-1)~/~(visc^2)~)^{0.33333}$ 

 $D_{50} = 10^{-3} Sd$  [m]

- $visc = 1.3 \cdot 10^{-3} / \rho_0$  [m2/s]
- > ERATE : Erosion rate of size class [kg/m2/s].

Typically:

ERATE =  $10^{-3}$   $\gamma_0$  WSED SRHO  $\left[\frac{kg}{m^2/s}\right]$ 

with  $\gamma_0 = 10^{-3} - 10^{-5}$  (Smith & McLean, 1977)

> TAU\_CE : Critical shear stress for sediment motion [N/m2]

(initiation of bedload for coarses, suspension for fines). Typically : TAU<sub>C</sub>E = 6.4 10<sup>-7</sup>  $\rho_0$  WSED<sup>2</sup> [N/m2]

- > TAU\_CD : Critical shear stress for deposition of cohesive sediments [N/m2]
- > BED\_FRAC : Volume fraction of each size class in each bed layer (NLAY columns)

[0<BED\_FRAC<1]

### CARD 3: Sediment bed thickness, 1st field is top layer ('delt\_a')

> BTHK : Initial thicknesses of bed layers [m]

(continued from previous page)

Bthk(1) active layer thickness, fixed in simulation unless  $SUM(Bthk(:)) < Bthk(1)$ 

#### CARD 4: Sediment bed porosity

> BPOR : Initial porosity of bed layers [m]

used in ana\_sediment ifdef ANA\_SEDIMENT (not in init.nc)

#### CARD 5: Bottom ripple height

> Hrip : Initial ripple height [m]

used in ana\_sediment ifdef ANA\_SEDIMENT (not in init.nc)

#### CARD 6: Bottom ripple length

> Lrip : Initial ripple length [m]

used in ana\_sediment ifdef ANA\_SEDIMENT (not in init.nc)

### CARD 7: Bedload coefficient

> bedload\_coeff : factor limiting the magnitude of bedload flux

0<br/>bedload\_coef<1

### CARD 8: Morphological acceleration factor

> morph\_fac : factor accelerating bed evolution

morph\_fac>=1

### Card 9 :

> transC : Cohesive transition- Under that value of total mud fraction

entire bed behaves as a non-cohesive bed

### Card 10 :

> transN : Noncohesive transition- Over that value of total mud fraction

entire bed behaves as a cohesive bed

#### Card 11 :

> tcr\_min : Minimum shear for erosion

### Card 12 :

> tcr\_max : Maximum shear for erosion

### Card 13 :

> tcr\_slp : Tau\_crit profile slope

### Card 14 :

> tcr\_off : Tau\_crit profile offset

### Card 15 :

> tcr\_tim : Tau\_crit consolidation rate

### Card 16 :

booleans for flocculation

- > L\_ADS : Boolean set to .true. if differential settling aggregation
- > L\_ASH : Boolean set to .true. if shear aggregation
- > L\_COLLFRAG : Boolean set to .true. if collision-induced fragmentation enable
- $> L_TESTCASE$ : If .TRUE. sets  $G(t)$  to values from Verney et al., 2011 lab experiment

### Card 17 :

flocculation Sediment Parameters.

- > F\_DP0 : Primary particle size (m), typically 4e-6 m
- > F\_NF : Floc fractal dimension, typically ranging from 1.6 to 2.6
- $>$  **F** DMAX : Maximum diameter (m)

### **References**

Blaas, M., Dong, C., Marchesiello, P., McWilliams, J.C., Stolzenbach, K.D., 2007. Sediment-transport modeling on southern californian shelves: A roms case study. Continental shelf research 27, 832–853.

Warner, J.C., Sherwood, C.R., Signell, R.P., Harris, C.K., Arango, H.G., 2008. Development of a three- dimensional, regional, coupled wave, current, and sediment-transport model. Computers & geosciences 34, 1284–1306.

Kalra, T., Sherwood, C., Warner, J., Rafati, Y., Hsu, T.J., 2019. Investigating bedload transport under asymmetrical waves using a coupled ocean-wave model. pp. 591–604.

Shafiei H., J. Chauchat, C. Bonamy, and P. Marchesiello, 2021: Numerical simulation of on-shore/off-shore sandbar migration using wave-cycle concept – application to a 3D wave-averaged oceanic model (CROCO), submitted to Ocean Modelling.

### **15.2.2 MUSTANG Sediment model**

### **MUSTANG user guide**

<https://mars3d.ifremer.fr/docs/docMustang.html>

MUSTANG has initially been developed for the MARS3D hydrodynamic model, and so is the user guide. Although most things in the user guide are valid for CROCO/MUSTANG, some could be specific to the MARS/MUSTANG coupling.

### **MUSTANG/CROCO**

1. The CROCO/MUSTANG coupling

The main MUSTANG routines and how it is coupled to CROCO and other ocean model is explained here: [https://mars3d.ifremer.fr/docs/doc\\_MUSTANG/doc.MUSTANG.organization.](https://mars3d.ifremer.fr/docs/doc_MUSTANG/doc.MUSTANG.organization.html) [html](https://mars3d.ifremer.fr/docs/doc_MUSTANG/doc.MUSTANG.organization.html)

Basically the main files are

```
comMUSTANG.F90 : declaration and allocation of all sediment variables
˓→shared by MUSTANG subroutines
initMUSTANG.F90 : initialization subroutines
coupler MUSTANG.F90 & coupler define MUSTANG.h : That is where
˓→variables are exchanged between CROCO & MUSTANG
plug_MUSTANG_CROCO.F90 : wrapper functions to call MUSTRANG
˓→subroutines inside CROCO within the MPI framework
sed_MUSTANG.F90 : MUSTANG's routines
sed_MUSTANG_CROCO.F90 : MUSTANG's routines that are specific to CROCO
˓→(e.g. computing skin stress)
t3dmix_tridiagonal_settling.h : this routine has been addded to CROCO.
˓→to deal with sediment settling. It uses an explicit scheme along the
˓→vertical, and respect a CFL criteria but using sub-time stepping.
```
Note: MUSTANG works in connexion with the SUBSTANCE module, composed of two routines comsubstance.F90 and substance.F90

Calls to MUSTANG routines are limited to a few CROCO locations. Roughly, after initialising everything in main.F once for all, all the MUSTANG calls are gathered in step.F. The schematic loop below is repeated at each time step:

```
call prestep3D_thread()
call step2d_thread()
call step3D_uv_thread()
call step3D_t_thread()
---> call MUSTANG_update ()
      --> call sed skinstress
    -----> call sed_MUSTANG_depflx
--------> CALL sed_MUSTANG_erosion
  -----------------> CALL MUSTANGV2_eval_bedload
----> call step3d_t
------------> # include "t3dmix_tridiagonal_chute.h"
----> CALL MUSTANG_deposition
----> CALL MUSTANG_morpho
----> call set_depth_morphodyn (to update the vertical grid using the
˓→bathymetric change (dh) given by MUSTANG)
```
### 2. The input files

The name and location of the MUSTANG and SUBSTANCE input files are defined in croco.in as follow:

```
sediments_mustang: input file
       MUSTANG_NAMELIST/parasubstance_MUSTANG_myconfig.txt
       MUSTANG_NAMELIST/paraMUSTANG_myconfig.txt
```
### 3. The SUBSTANCE input file

All the sediment variables are dealt with through the SUBSTANCE module.

[https://mars3d.ifremer.fr/docs/doc\\_MUSTANG/doc.module.substance.html](https://mars3d.ifremer.fr/docs/doc_MUSTANG/doc.module.substance.html)

This means that to activate MUSTANG the following CPP keys are needed:

define MUSTANG # define SUBSTANCE

The variables are defined in the parasubstance\_MUSTANG\*.txt file:

<https://mars3d.ifremer.fr/docs/doc.module.substance1.V10.html#definition-substance>

The SUBSTANCE input file can be created using the example file provided on the repository (parasubstance\_MUSTANG\_full\_example.txt).

The number of variables has to be defined first in param.h (*ntrc\_subs*). Then, the number of variables of each type is defined in the SUBSTANCE input file:

```
: nmlnbvar : nombres de substances de chaque type a definir (autre que,
\rightarrowT et S)
: : number of each type of substance to be defined (other
˓→than T & S)
: other variables can be created in addition with keys :
˓→contaminant, peptic, P_tracer, N_tracer
:----------------------------------------------------------------------
˓→-------
    : nv_dis : number of dissolved susbtances
: nv_ncp : number of Non Constitutive Particulate subtances
: nv_fix : number of fixed susbtances (not advected)
   : nv_bent : number of benthic susbtances
    nv grav : number of susbtances type GRAVELS (only if key sed
˓→MUSTANG)
    : nv_sand : number of susbtances type SAND (only if key_sed_MUSTANG)
    : nv_mud : number of susbtances type MUD (only if key_sed_MUSTANG)
    nv_sorb : number of particulate susbtances sorbed on an other_
˓→particule
:
&nmlnbvar
  nv_dis=0
  nv_ncp=0
  nv_fix=0
  nv_bent=0
  nv_grav=0
  nv_sand=2
  nv_mud=1
  nv_sorb=0 /
```
For each sediment type, the parameters have to be defined accordingly:

For gravel:

```
: Characterization of GRAVEL substances (used only if
˓→defined key_sed_MUSTANG)
: si nv_grav = 0 la namelist n est pas lue
    : If nv_grav = 0 this namelist is not read
:----------------------------------------------------------------------
˓→-------
: tocd_n() : critical stress of deposition
: ros_n() : density of particle
: diam_n() : diameter of particles
:
&nmlgravels
   name\_var_n(1) = 1'
     long_name\_var_n(1) = \cdot'
```
(continued from previous page)

```
standard_name_var_n(1)=''
unit\_var_n(1) = \squareflx\_atm_n(1)=0.0cv\_rain\_n(1)=0.0cini_wat_n(1)=0.0cobc_wait_n(1)=1.cini\_sed_n(1)=0.0cini\_air\_n(1)=0.0l\_out\_subs\_n(1) = . TRUE.
l_bedload_n(1)=.TRUE.
init_cv_name_n(1)='none'
obc_cv_name_n(1)='none'
tocd_n(1)=0.0ros_n(1)=0.0diam_n(1)=0.0 /
```
For sand:

```
:: nmlsands : Caracterisation des substances de type SABLE (utilise
˓→seulement si key_sed_MUSTANG)
: : Characterization of SAND substances (used only if
˓→defined key_sed_MUSTANG)
: si nv_sand = 0 la namelist n est pas lue
: If nv_sand = 0 this namelist is not read
:----------------------------------------------------------------------
˓→-------
   : tocd_n() : critical stress of deposition
: ros_n() : density of particle
: diam_n() : diameter of particles
    : l_sand2D() : TRUE if this sand variable is treated as 2D variable
˓→(used only if key_sand2D)
: l_outsandrouse() : TRUE if using reconstitution of a ROUSE
˓→profil for output in water column (used only if key_sand2D and l_
˓→sand2D is TRUE for this variable)
:
: ATTENTION si plusieurs sables : commencer par les sables les plus
˓→grossiers et continuer de plus en plus fins
: WARNING if several sands: start with the coarser sands and continue
˓→more and more finely
:
&nmlsands
   name\_var_n(1)='GRAV'
     long_name_var_n(1)='GRAV'
     standard_name_var_n(1)='GRAV'
     unit_var_n(1)='kg.m-3'
     flx atm n(1)=0.0cv\_rain\_n(1)=0.0cini_wat_n(1)=0.0cini_sed_n(1)=0.2cini_air_n(1)=0.0l\_out\_subs\_n(1) = . TRUE.
     l_bedload_n(1)=.FALSE.
     init_cv_name_n(1)='GRAV'
     obc_cv_name_n(1) = 'GRAV'
     tocd n(1) = 1000ros n(1)=2600.0diam_n(1)=0.008l_sand2D_n(1) = . TRUE.
     l_outsandrouse_n(1)=.TRUE.
     name_var_n(2)='SAND'
     long_name_var_n(2)='SAND'
```
(continued from previous page)

```
standard_name_var_n(2)='SAND'
unit\_var_n(2) = 'kg.m-3'flx\_atm_n(2)=0.0cv\_rain\_n(2)=0.0cini_wat_n(2)=0.0cini_sed_n(2)=0.4cini_air_n(2)=0.0l\_out\_subs\_n(2) = . TRUE.
l_bedload_n(2)=.FALSE.
init_cv_name_n(2)='SAND'
obc_cv_name_n(2)='SAND'
tocd_n(2)=1000
ros_n(2)=2600.0
diam_n(2)=0.000200
l\_sand2D_n(2) = \sqrt{s}TRUE.
l_outsandrouse_n(2)=.TRUE. /
```
For mud:

```
: nmlmuds : Caracterisation des substances de type VASE (utilise
˓→seulement si key_sed_MUSTANG)
: : Characterization of MUD substances (used only if
˓→defined key_sed_MUSTANG)
: si nv_mud = 0 la namelist n est pas lue
: If nv_mud = 0 this namelist is not read
:----------------------------------------------------------------------
˓→-------
   : tocd_n() : critical stress of deposition
: ros_n() : density of particle
: ws_free_opt_n() : choice of free settling formulation : 0.
˓→constant, 1 Van Leussen, 2 Winterwerp, 3 Wolanski
: ws_free_min_n() : minimum setling velocity (m/s)
: ws_free_max_n() : maximum setling velocity (m/s)
: ws_free_para_n(1:4,num substance) : 4 additional parameters
    ws\_hind\_opt_n() : choice of hindered settling formulation : 0 \text{ no}.
˓→hindered settling, 1 Scott, 2 Winterwerp, 3 Wolanski
    ws_hind_para_n(1:2,num substance) : 2 additional parameters
:
&nmlmuds
   name\_var_n(1)='MUD1'long_name_var_n(1)='MUD1'
     standard_name_var_n(1)='MUD1'
     unit var n(1)='kg.m-3'
     flx_atm_n(1)=0.0cv\_rain\_n(1)=0.0cini wat n(1)=0.0cobc\_wat\_n(1)=0.0cini_sed_n(1)=0.4cini_air_n(1)=0.0l_out_subs_n(1)=.TRUE.
     init_cv_name_n(1)='MUD1'
     obc_cv_name_n(1)='MUD1'
     tocd n(1) = 1000.
     ros n(1)=2600.0ws free opt n(1)=1ws free min n(1)=0.00002ws_free_{max_n}(1)=0.004ws\_free\_para\_n(1,1)=0.005, ws\_free\_para\_n(2,1)=0.7, ws\_free\_\rightarrowpara_n(3,1)=0.3, ws_free_para_n(4,1)=0.09
     ws\_hind\_opt\_n(1)=0ws\_hind\_para\_n(1,1)=0.0, ws\_hind\_para\_n(2,1)=0.0 /
```
### 4. The MUSTANG input file

The MUSTANG parameters are defined in the namelist file paraMUSTANG\_default.txt: [http:](http://www.ifremer.fr/docmars/html/doc_MUSTANG/doc.paraMUSTANG.html#doc-paramustang) [//www.ifremer.fr/docmars/html/doc\\_MUSTANG/doc.paraMUSTANG.html#doc-paramustang](http://www.ifremer.fr/docmars/html/doc_MUSTANG/doc.paraMUSTANG.html#doc-paramustang)

This default input files incorporates all the parameters that are needed for both V1 or V2 MUS-TANG versions, unlike with the MARS/MUSTANG coupling. Therefore, not all parameters are used, depending on the set of CPP keys or booleans included in the MUSTANG input file itself.

All the parameters in the paraMUSTANG\_default.txt are read first, before reading the userdefined input file defined in croco.in (e.g. paraMUSTANG\_myconfig.txt). The parameters defined in the user-defined namelist file will overwrite those defined in the default file. The userdefined input file can either be a full copy of the default input file, or only define the parameters that matter the most for a specific configuration. In the later case, even if the parameters are not mentionned, the namelist group section needs to be present in the file even if empty, e.g.:

```
:----------------------------------------------------------------------
˓→--------
 : namsedim_deposition : Namelist relative to sediment deposition
:----------------------------------------------------------------------
˓→--------
&namsedim_deposition
             /
:
```
### 5. CPP keys for MUSTANG

[https://mars3d.ifremer.fr/docs/doc\\_MUSTANG/clesCPP.MUSTANG.html](https://mars3d.ifremer.fr/docs/doc_MUSTANG/clesCPP.MUSTANG.html)



The compulsory CPP keys in CROCO

The optional CPP keys



The following CPP keys are not yet available with CROCO



### Specific CPP keys for CROCO/MUSTANG



### 6. The MUSTANG processes

[https://mars3d.ifremer.fr/docs/doc\\_MUSTANG/doc.MUSTANG.process.html](https://mars3d.ifremer.fr/docs/doc_MUSTANG/doc.MUSTANG.process.html)

Note: MUSTANG is controlled through both CPP keys and input files. For some processes it is needed to activate the options through a CPP key, and also through a flag (true or false) in the input files

7. A few words of caution - TIPS

#### Warning:

- Not everything has been tested with the CROCO/MUSTANG coupling. For instance the morphological factor (MF) has not. It should work, but not for sure.
- In sed\_MUSTANG\_CROCO.F90, there are a few subroutines that work for MARS3D only (e.g. bathy actu fromfile). We left them here as a record, if similar subroutines are needed for CROCO at some point.
- In MUSTANG V1, do not define your gravels as *GRAVEL*. It does not work, and this is not because of CROCO, it is a MUSTANG bug that has never been solved. The workaround is to declare them as SAND. They will not travel far anyway in suspension, but at least they will impact the sediment dynamics. If their diameter is greater than 2 mm, they will not impact the mean critical bed shear stress (i.e. common critical bed shear stress for all sediment classes in V1).
- Check out the other *warning* section below as well. . .
- 8. Reading wave files

### # define WAVE\_OFFLINE

Activates the reading of wave data (this is an existing CROCO CPP option). If combined with #define MUSTANG, it reads significant wave height, wave period, wave direction and bottom orbital velocity. Then the wave-induced bottom shear stress is computed in sed MUSTANG CROCO.F90. Note that the significant wave height (or wave amplitude) has to be given as for now but is not used to compute the bed shear stress.

Header of an example wave file:

```
dimensions:
www_time = UNLIMITED; // (2586 currently)
eta_rho = 623;
xi_rho = 821;
variables:
double wwv_time(wwv_time) ;
double hs(wwv_time, eta_rho, xi_rho) ;
       hs: FillValue = -32767. ;
double t01(wwv_time, eta_rho, xi_rho) ;
       t01: FillValue = -32767. ;
double dir(wwv_time, eta_rho, xi_rho) ;
       dir: FillValue = -32767. ;
double ubr(wwv_time, eta_rho, xi_rho) ;
       ubr: FillValue = -32767. ;
```
• Read netcdf files for solid discharge in river:

define PSOURCE\_NCFILE define PSOURCE\_NCFILE\_TS

It reads the concentration values in get\_psource\_ts.F

Header of an example source file:

```
dimensions:
qbar_time = 7676;
n\_qbar = 6;
runoffname_StrLen = 30 ;
temp_src_time = 8037 ;
salt_src_time = 8037 ;
```
(continued from previous page)

```
MUD1\_src\_time = 7676;
variables:
double qbar_time(qbar_time) ;
        qbar_time:long_name = "runoff time" ;
        qbar_time:units = "days" ;
        qbar_time:cycle_length = 0 ;
        qbar_time:long_units = "days since 1900-01-01" ;
double Qbar(n_qbar, qbar_time) ;
        Qbar:long_name = "runoff discharge" ;
        Qbar: units = ^{\mathsf{m}}m3.s-1";
char runoff_name(n_qbar, runoffname_StrLen) ;
double temp_src_time(temp_src_time) ;
        temp_src_time:cycle_length = 0 ;
        temp_src_time:long_units = "days since 1900-01-01" ;
double salt_src_time(salt_src_time) ;
        salt_src_time:cycle_length = 0 ;
        salt_src_time:long_units = "days since 1900-01-01" ;
double temp_src(n_qbar, temp_src_time) ;
        temp_src:long_name = "runoff temperature" ;
        temp_src:units = "Degrees Celcius" ;
double salt_src(n_qbar, salt_src_time) ;
        salt_src:long_name = "runoff salinity" ;
        salt_src:units = "psu" ;
double MUD1_src_time(MUD1_src_time) ;
        MUD1_src_time:long_name = "runoff time" ;
        MUD1_src_time:units = "days" ;
        MUD1_src_time:long_units = "days since 1900-01-01" ;
double MUD1_src(n_qbar, MUD1_src_time) ;
```
9. Initial conditions for the sediment cover

Two options:

• Uniform sediment cover

In paraMUSTANG\*.txt:

```
l_unised = .true. <br> ! boolean set to true for a
˓→uniform bottom initialization
fileinised = \cdot./Init.nc' ! File for initialisation (if.
→l unised is False)
hseduni = 0.03 <br> ! initial uniform sediment
˓→thickness(m)
cseduni= 1500.0 ! initial sediment concentration
                       ! mud concentration into..
˓→initial sediment (if =0. ==> csed_mud_ini=cfreshmud)
ksmini = 1 ! lower grid cell indices in the
˓→sediment
ksmauni = 10 \qquad ! upper grid cell indices in
˓→the sediment
```
And then, the fraction of each sediment variable in the seafloor is defined with *cini\_sed\_n()* in parasubsance\_MUSTANG.txt

• Read the sediment cover from a netcdf file or restart from a RESTART file

In paraMUSTANG\*.txt:

```
l_repsed=.true. ! boolean set to .true. if
→sedimentary variables are initialized from a previous.
\rightarrowrun
filrepsed='./repsed.nc' ! file from which the model is
˓→initialized for the continuation of a previous run
```
The netcdf file needs to have the concentration values under the names *NAME\_sed*, with NAME corresponding to the names defined in the SUB-STANCE input files. The number of vertical levels (ksmi, ksma) and the layer thickness (DZS) also need to be defined. The file structure is similar to the RESTART netcdf file, and filerepsed can be used to restart from a CROCO RESTART file.

Header of an example sediment cover file:

```
dimensions:
ni = 821 ;
n_1 = 623;
time = UNLIMITED ; // (1 currently)
level = 10;
variables:
double latitude(nj, ni) ;
double longitude(nj, ni) ;
double time(time) ;
double level(level) ;
double ksmi(time, nj, ni) ;
double ksma(time, nj, ni) ;
double DZS(time, level, nj, ni) ;
double temp_sed(time, level, nj, ni) ;
double salt_sed(time, level, nj, ni) ;
double GRAV_sed(time, level, nj, ni) ;
double SAND_sed(time, level, nj, ni) ;
double MUD1_sed(time, level, nj, ni) ;
```
### Warning:

- The restarts are not *perfect* restarts. To do a perfect restart, you will need to save the erosion and deposition fluxes in a restart file, as was done in MARS3D (cf. subroutine sed\_outsaverestart in sed\_MUSTANG\_CROCO.F90). This has not been implemented yet.
- Further, it will not work for morphological runs as you will need to make a few changes to read the bathymetry from the *filerepsed* file.

### 10. Output options

Outputs for sediment variables are written by CROCO not MUSTANG, using routines that have been modified on purpose (e.g. wrt\_his.F):

• Classic Netcdf outputs with suspended sediment concentrations and various variables within the sediment bed.

Note: The boolean defined in paraMUSTANG\*.txt to select the variables are not operationnal in CROCO (i.e. it will not impact your netcdf file). However, some variables will not be defined if the boolean are set to .FALSE., so by default it is better to put everything at .TRUE. (e.g. l\_outsed\_saltemp =.TRUE.).

- Station files (#define STATIONS) only record suspended sediment concentrations.
- XIOS (#define XIOS) can be configured to output both suspended sediment concentrations and sediment bed variables.

# **15.3 Biogeochemical models**

CROCO comes with series of biogeochemical (BGC) models of increasing complexity, from relatively simple 5- or 7-component NPZD (Gruber et al., 2006, 2011) and N2P2Z2D2 BioEBUS model (Gutknecht, 2013) that proved well suited to upwelling regions to 24-component PISCES (Aumont et al., 2005).

BioEBUS is a nitrogen-based model (Fig. 1) derived from a N2P2Z2D2 evolution of ROMS NPZD model (Gruber et al., 2006, 2011) and accounting for the main planktonic communities in upwelling ecosystems associated oxygen minimum zones (OMZs). It is validated in Gutknecht et al. (2013) using available satellite and in situ data in the northern part of the Benguela upwelling system. In this model, phytoplankton and zooplankton are split into small (PS and ZS: flagellates and ciliates, respectively) and large (PL and ZL: diatoms and copepods, respectively) organisms. Detritus are also separated into small and large particulate compartments (DS and DL). A semi-labile dissolved organic nitrogen (DON) compartment was added since DON can be an important reservoir of OM and can potentially play an important role in supplying nitrogen or carbon from the coastal region to the open ocean (Huret et al., 2005). The pool of dissolved inorganic nitrogen is split into nitrate (NO3-), nitrite (NO2-) and ammonium (NH4+) species to have a detailed description of the microbial loop: ammonification/nitrification processes under oxic conditions, and denitrification/anammox processes under suboxic conditions (Yakushev et al., 2007). These processes are directly oxygen dependent, so an oxygen (O2) equation was also introduced in BioEBUS with the source term (photosynthesis), sink terms (zooplankton respiration, bacteria re-mineralisation) and sea–air O2 fluxes following Pena et al. (2010) and Yakushev et al. (2007). To complete this nitrogen-based model, nitrous oxide (N2O) was introduced using the parameterization of Suntharalingam et al. (2000, 2012). It allows determining the N2O production under oxygenated conditions and at low-oxygen levels, mimicking the N2O production from nitrification and denitrification processes. The SMS terms of BioEBUS and parameter values are described in detail in Gutknecht et al. (2013).

PISCES was developed for NEMO (the French ocean climate model). It was implemented in CROCO for its supposed suitability for a wide range of oceanic regimes. PISCES currently has five modeled limiting nutrients for phytoplankton growth: Nitrate and Ammonium, Phosphate, Silicate and Iron. Phosphate and nitrate+ammonium are linked by constant Redfield ratios but the nitrogen pool undergoes nitrogen fixation and denitrification. Four living compartments are represented: two phytoplankton size-classes/groups corresponding to nanophytoplankton and diatoms, and two zooplankton size classes which are micro-zooplankton and mesozooplankton. For phytoplankton, prognostic variables are total biomass, the iron, chlorophyll and silicon contents. This means that the Fe/C, Chl/C and Si/C ratios of both phytoplankton groups are fully predicted by the model. For zooplankton, only the total biomass is modeled. For all species, the C/N/P/O2 ratios are supposed constant and are not allowed to vary. The Redfield ratio O/C/N/P is set to 172/122/16/1. In addition, the Fe/C ratio of both zooplankton groups is kept constant. No silicified zooplankton is assumed. The bacterial pool is not yet explicitly modeled. There are three non-living compartments: semi-labile dissolved organic matter, small and big sinking particles. The iron, silicon and calcite pools of the particles are explicitly modeled and their ratios are allowed to vary. The sinking speed of the particles is not altered by their content in calcite and biogenic silicate ("The ballast effect"). The latter particles are assumed to sink at the same speed as big organic matter particles. All the non-living compartments experience aggregation due to turbulence and differential settling. In addition to the ecosystem model, PISCES also simulates dissolved inorganic carbon, total alkalinity and dissolved oxygen. The latter tracer is also used to define the regions where oxic or anoxic remineralization takes place. see Aumont et al. (2005) in the documentation section for details.

### Related CPP options:



*Preselected options:*

```
ifdef BIOLOGY
undef PISCES
define BIO_NChlPZD
undef BIO_N2ChlPZD2
```
(continued from previous page)

```
# undef BIO_BioEBUS
# endif
```
# **15.4 Lagrangian floats**

**CHAPTER SIXTEEN**

# **COUPLING CROCO WITH OTHER MODELS**

CROCO is coupled to atmospheric and wave models through the OASIS-MCT (Ocean-Atmosphere-Sea-Ice-Soil, Model Coupling Toolkit) coupler developed by CERFACS (Toulouse, France). This coupler allows the atmospheric, oceanic, and wave models to run at the same time in **parallel**, it exchanges variables, and performs grid interpolations and time transformations if requested. OASIS is not an executable file, but a set of libraries providing functions which are called in the models themselves. The variables exchanged by the coupler, as well as the grid interpolations are specified through a namelist file (called namcouple).

CROCO can therefore be coupled to any code in which OASIS-MCT is implemented. Non-exhaustively, here are some models including OASIS-MCT, that can be coupled to CROCO:

- WRF (Weather Research and Forecast model developed at NCAR, Boulder, USA)
- Meso-NH (Mesoscale Non-Hydrostatic model developed at Laboratoire d'Aérologie, Toulouse, France)
- WW3 (WaveWatch III model developed at NCEP, USA, and Ifremer, France)
- $\bullet$  ...

Those model are not provided for download with CROCO and need to be installed separately, as well as OASIS-MCT library.

A description of the OASIS-MCT features, its implementation in CROCO, WW3 and WRF codes, and the coupled variables that can be exchanged are given in the following.

Datailed step by step coupled tutorial is also available in the Tutorials section.

## **16.1 OASIS philosophy**

### **16.1.1 OASIS libraries**

OASIS-MCT libraries are:

- psmile for coupling
- mct (Argonne National Laboratory) for parallel exchanges
- scrip (Los Alamos National Laboratory) for interpolations

Functions provided by the OASIS-MCT framework are:

Note:  $\text{oasis}$  /  $\text{prism}$  are new / old names for backward compatibility, both useable

- Initialization and creation of a local communicator for internal parallel computation in each model:
	- oasis\_init\_comp / prism\_init\_comp\_proto
	- oasis\_get\_localcomm / prism\_get\_localcomm\_proto
- Grid data definition for exchanges and interpolations:
- oasis\_write\_grid
- oasis\_write\_corner
- oasis\_write\_area
- oasis\_write\_mask
- oasis\_terminate\_grids\_writing
- Partition and exchanged variables definition:
	- oasis\_def\_partition / prism\_def\_partition\_proto
	- oasis\_def\_var / prism\_def\_var\_proto
	- oasis\_enddef / prism\_enddef\_proto
- Exchange of coupling fields:
	- oasis\_get / prism\_get\_proto
	- oasis\_put / prism\_put\_proto
- Finalization:
	- oasis\_terminate / prism\_terminate\_proto

These OASIS3-MCT intrinsic functions are called in each model involved in the coupling. Initialization phase, Definition phase, and Finalization phase are called only once in each simulation while Exchange phase is called every time step. The effective exchanges are done only at specified times, defined by the coupling frequency, although the Exchange phase is called every model time step. The coupling frequency is controlled through the OASIS3-MCT namcouple.

### **16.1.2 Coupling sequence**

The frequency of exchanges between two models is defined by the coupling time step.

The coupling time step must be a multiple of the models time steps. An example of coupling sequence is pictured in the following Figure. In this example, the coupling time step is defined at 360s for both models. The wave model time step is 90s, so it will exchange every 4 time steps. The ocean model time step is 180s, so it will exchange every 2 time steps.

Another coupling parameter defined in the namcouple is the lag. It is used by the OASIS coupler to synchronize the send and receive functions. The lag must be defined for each model at the same value than its own time step. For instance:

- WAVE to OCEAN lag = dt wave =  $90$
- OCEAN to WAVE  $1aq = dt$  ocean = 180



### OW COUPLING - EXAMPLE - LOCTRANS operation on fields before exchange

Therefore, receive and send functions have to be set at the same time in the model codes. OASIS will send the fields at the appropriate time thanks to the lag defined in the namcouple.

The coupling sequence in each model is:



OASIS will exchange fields (get/put) if the time corresponds to a coupling time step, *e.g.* if:

- oasis time corresponds to a coupling time step for get
- $oasis$  time  $+$  lag corresponds to a coupling time step for put



OASIS is also able to store fields from a model if a time transformation is requested in the namcouple (keyword LOCTRANS + type of transformation, see next section). OASIS will store the fields until a coupling time step is reached, then it will apply the time transformation, interpolate spatially the field as specified in the namcouple, and exchange the field with the other model.

### **16.1.3 Restart files**

As reception of coupled fields is called before model computation, you need to create restart files for the coupler containing initial or restart fields for the first time step.

These restart files are for OASIS, and therefore need to have variable names corresponding to OASIS namcouple coupled fields. The initial files for OASIS are named oasis\_oce.nc and oasis\_wave.nc in the example pirctured in the above Figure. oce\_ini and wave\_ini are not related to OASIS, they are usual initialization or restart files from your oceanic and wave model; *e.g.* in CROCO, oce\_ini is croco\_ini.nc, and in WW3, wave ini is restart.ww3).

### Summary of the restart files:

- oasis oce.nc, oasis wave.nc: restart files for OASIS, you need to create them at the beginning of the run, OASIS will overwrite them at the end of the run, and they will be available for next restart
- oce ini, wave ini: correspond to croco ini.nc, restart.ww3. These are your ocean and wave model initial or restart files

Practical example of the coupling sequence pictured in the above Figure:

```
oasis_time = 0
#1 => get field from oasis_wave.nc
rcv(0) => in oasis: get(0)
#2 => timestepping
t = 0+dt = 0+180 = 180#3 => 180 is not a coupling time step, do nothing
\text{snd}(0) \Rightarrow \text{in oasis: put}(0+lag) = \text{put}(0+180) = \text{put}(180)oasis_time = oasis_time+dt = 0+180 = 180#4 => 180 is not a coupling time step, do nothing
rcv(180) => \text{in} oasis: get(180)
#5 => timestepping
t = 180+dt = 180+180 = 360#6 => 360 is a coupling time step, put field
\text{snd}(180) \Rightarrow \text{in oasis: put}(180 + \text{lag}) = \text{put}(180 + 180) = \text{put}(360)
```
### **16.1.4 Interpolations**

The OASIS3-MCT coupler can process time transformations and 2D spatial interpolations of the exchanged fields. The 2D spatial interpolation, requested if models have different grids, is performed by the scrip library using SCRIPR keyword in the namcouple. Available interpolation types are:



See OASIS manual for detailed informations.

Time transformations can also be performed by OASIS using LOCTRANS keywork in the namcouple. Available transformations are:



# **16.2 Detailed OASIS implementation**

### **16.2.1 In CROCO**

The following routines are specifically built for coupling with OASIS and contain calls to OASIS intrinsic functions:

- cpl\_prism\_init.F: Manage the initialization phase of OASIS3-MCT : local MPI communicator
- cpl\_prism\_define.F: Manage the definition phase of OASIS3-MCT: domain partition, name of exchanged fields as read in the namcouple
- cpl\_prism\_grid.F: Manage the definition of grids for the coupler
- cpl prism put.F: Manage the sending of arrays from CROCO to the OASIS3-MCT coupler
- cpl\_prism\_getvar.F: Manage the generic reception from OASIS3-MCT.
- cpl prism qet.F: Manage the specificity of each received variable: C-grid position, and field unit transformations

### These routines are called in the the code in:

- main.F: Initialization, and finalization phases
- get\_initial.F: Definition phase
- zoom.F: Initialization phase for AGRIF nested simulations
- step.F: Exchanges (sending and reception) of coupling variables

### Other CROCO routines have also been slightly modified to introduce coupling:

- testkeys.F: To enable automatic linking to OASIS3-MCT libraries during compilation with jobcomp
- cppdefs.h: Definition of the OA\_COUPLING and OW\_COUPLING cpp-keys, and the other related and requested cpp-keys, as MPI
- set\_global\_definitions.h: Definition of cpp-keys in case of coupling (undef OPENMP, define MPI, define MPI\_COMM\_WORLD ocean\_grid\_comm: MPI\_COMM\_WORLD generic MPI communicator is redefined as the local MPI communicator ocean\_grid\_comm, undef BULK FLUX: no bulk OA parametrization)
- mpi\_roms.h: Newly added to define variables related to OASIS3-MCT operations. It manage the MPI communicator, using either the generic MPI\_COMM\_WORLD, either the local MPI communicator created by OASIS3-MCT
- read\_inp.F: Not reading atmospheric forcing files (croco\_frc.nc and/or croco\_blk.nc) in OA coupled mode

A schematic picture of the calls in CROCO is (with # name.F indicating the routine we enter in):

```
# main.F
if !defined AGRIF
call cpl_prism_init
else
call Agrif_MPI_Init
endif
...
call read_inp
...
call get initial
       # get_initial.F
       ...
       call cpl_prism_define
               # cpl_prism_define.F
               call prism_def_partition_proto
               call cpl_prism_grid
               call prism_def_var_proto
               call prism_enddef_proto
       oasis_time=0
# main.F
...
DO 1:NT
call step
       # step.F
       if ( (iif==-1).and.(oasis_time>=0).and.(nbstep3d<ntimes) ) then
               call cpl_prism_get(oasis_time)
                       # cpl_prism_get.F
                       call cpl_prism_getvar
       endif
       call prestep3d
              call get vbc
               ...
       call step2d
       ...
       call step3d_uv
       call step3d_t
       iif = -1nbstep3d = nbstep3d + 1
       if (iif==-1) then
                if (oasis time>=0.and.(nbstep3d<ntimes)) then
                       call cpl prism put (oasis time)
                       oasis_time = oasis_time + dt
               endif
       endif
# main.F
END DO
...
call prism_terminate_proto
...
```
### **16.2.2 In WW3**

### The following routines have been specifically built for coupling with OASIS:

- w3oacpmd.ftn: main coupling module with calls to oasis intrinsic functions
- w3agcmmd.ftn: module for coupling with an atmospheric model
- w3ogcmmd.ftn: module for coupling with an ocean model

The following routines have been modified for coupling with OASIS:

- w3fldsmd.ftn: routine that manage input fields, and therefore received fields from the coupler
- w3wdatmd.ftn: routine that manage data structure for wave model, and therefore time for coupling
- w3wavemd.ftn: actual wave model, here is located the sending of coupled variables
- ww3\_shel.ftn: main routine managing the wave model, definition/initialisation/partition phases are located here

A schematic picture of the calls in WW3 is given here:



### **16.2.3 In WRF**

### The routines specifically built for coupling are:

- module\_cpl\_oasis3.F
- module\_cpl.F

Implementation of coupling with the ocean implies modifications in the following routines:

- phys/module\_bl\_mynn.F
- phys/module\_bl\_ysu.F
- phys/module\_pbl\_driver.F
- phys/module\_surface\_driver.F
- phys/module\_sf\_sfclay.F
- phys/module\_sf\_sfclayrev.F

### Implementation of coupling with waves implies modifications in the following routines:

- Regristry/Registry.EM\_COMMON: CHA\_COEF added
- dyn/module first rk step part1.F: CHA COEF=grid%cha coef declaration added
- frame/module\_cpl.F: rcv CHA\_COEF added
- phys/module sf sfclay.F and ... sfclayrev.F: introduction of wave coupled case: isftcflx=5 as follows:

```
! SJ: change charnock coefficient as a function of waves, and hence roughness
! length
 IF ( ISFTCFLX.EQ.5 ) THEN
   ZNT(I)=CHA_COEF(I)*UST(I)*UST(I)/G+0.11*1.5E-5/UST(I)
 ENDIF
```
• phys/module surface driver.F: CHA COEF added in calls to sfclay and sfclayrev and "CALL cpl\_rcv" for CHA\_COEF

Schematic picture of WRF architecture and calls to the coupling dependencies:

```
# main/wrf.F
CALL wrf_init
   # main/module_wrf_top.F
  CALL wrf_dm_initialize
      # frame/module_dm.F
     CALL cpl_init( mpi_comm_here )
     CALL cpl_abort( 'wrf_abort', 'look for abort message in rsl* files' )
  CALL cpl_defdomain( head_grid )
# main/wrf.F
CALL wrf_run
   # main/module_wrf_top.F
  CALL integrate ( head_grid )
      # frame/module_integrate.F
     CALL cpl_defdomain( new_nest )
     CALL solve_interface ( grid_ptr )
         # share/solve_interface.F
         CALL solve_em ( grid , config_flags ... )
            # dyn_em/solve_em.F
            curr_secs2 # time for the coupler
            CALL cpl_store_input( grid, config_flags )
           CALL cpl_settime( curr_secs2 )
           CALL first_rk_step_part1
               # dyn_em/module_first_rk_step_part1.F
               CALL surface driver( ... )
                  # phys/module_surface_driver.F
                  CALL cpl_rcv( id, ... )
                  u_phytmp(i,kts,j)=u_phytmp(i,kts,j)-uoce(i,j)
                  v_phytmp(i,kts,j)=v_phytmp(i,kts,j)-voce(i,j)
                  CALL SFCLAY( ... cha_coef ...)
                     # phys/module_sf_sfclay.F
                     CALL SFCLAY1D
                     IF ( ISFTCFLX.EQ.5 ) THEN
                       ZNT(I)=CHA_COEF(I)*UST(I)*UST(I)/G+0.11*1.5E-5/UST(I)
                     ENDIF
                  CALL SFCLAYREV( ... cha_coef ...)
                     # phys/module\_sf\_sfclayrev.F
                     CALL SFCLAYREV1D
                     IF ( ISFTCFLX.EQ.5 ) THEN
                       ZNT(I)=CHA_COEF(I)*UST(I)*UST(I)/G+0.11*1.5E-5/UST(I)
```
(continued from previous page)

```
ENDIF
               # dyn_em/module_first_rk_step_part1.F
               CALL pbl_driver( ... )
                  # phys/module_pbl_driver.F
                  CALL ysu( ... uoce,voce, ... )
                     # module_bl_ysu.F
                     call ysu2d ( ... uox,vox, ...)
                     wspd1(i) = sqrt( (ux(i,1)-uox(i)) * (ux(i,1)-uox(i))+ (vx(i,1)-vox(i))*(vx(i,1)-vox(i)) +1.e-9f1(i,1) = ux(i,1) + uox(i) * ust(i) * *2*q/del(i,1) *dt2/wspdl(i)f2(i,1) = vx(i,1) +vox(i) *ust(i) **2*g/del(i,1) *dt2/wspd1(i)
                  CALL mynn_bl_driver( ... uoce,voce, ... )
                     # module_bl_mynn.F
                     d(1)=u(k)+dtz(k)*uoce*ust**2/wspd
                     d(1)=v(k)+dtz(k)*voce+ust**2/wspd# dyn_em/solve_em.F
            CALL first_rk_step_part2
      # frame/module_integrate.F
      CALL cpl_snd( grid_ptr )
   # Check where this routine is called...
   # frame/module_io_quilt.F # for IO server (used with namelist variable: nio_
˓→tasks_per_group
   CALL cpl_set_dm_communicator( mpi_comm_local )
   CALL cpl_finalize()
# main/wrf.F
CALL wrf_finalize
    #main/module_wrf_top.F
    CALL cpl_finalize()
```
## **16.3 Coupled variables**

### **16.3.1 Coupling with an atmospheric model**

When coupling CROCO to an atmospheric model, to have a consistent interface, you should use momentum and heat fluxes computed from the atmospheric model bulk formula.

No surface forcing file is required (only boundary forcing, and eventually tidal forcing).

The following cpp-keys have to be set:

```
# define OA_COUPLING
# define MPI
# undef BULK_FLUX
# undef SMFLUX_CFB
```
Note: SMFLUX\_CFB is a cpp-key to use a wind stress relative to the current in forced mode. In coupled mode, as current is sent to the atmosphere, the wind stress from the atmospheric model account for such a current feedback.








Note: If you decide to couple CROCO with multiple WRF domains, variables coming from WRF will be defined by adding  $EXT^*$ . Here  $*$  corresponds to which domains the variable is coming (1=Parent, 2=Nest 1,...).

### **16.3.2 Coupling with a wave model**

When coupling CROCO to a wave model, the wave-current interactions have to be set on. At the moment, only mean wave parameters are exchanged, their contribution to ocean dynamics is computed into the wave-current interaction routine in CROCO.

The following cpp-keys have to be set:

```
# define OW_COUPLING
# define MPI
# define MRL_WCI
```
Note: You also have to be careful to the choice of the momentum flux. For better consistency, here we suggest to account for the momentum flux seen by the wave model, and thus set:

# undef BULK\_FLUX # define WAVE\_SMFLUX











# **16.3.3 Coupling atmosphere and wave models**









### **16.3.4 Note on momentum flux when coupling 3 models**

As the wave model has a quite complex parameterization of wave generation by winds, which is in subtle balance with the wave dissipation, the wind stress for the wave model is computed by its own parameterization. Therefore, to ensure energetic consistency of the momentum flux when coupling 3 models, we prescribe the wind stress in CROCO as:

```
sustr = sustr_from_atm_model - taws + twoxs \text{vstr} = s \text{vstr\_from\_atm_model} - t \text{awy} + t \text{woy}# where taw is stress from atm to waves
  and two is stress from waves to ocean
```
### **16.3.5 Note on coupling with AGRIF**

You may decide to coupled CROCO while using AGRIF. To do so, the variables sent by the parent domain (0) and the child domains  $(1,2,...)$  must be separated. Thus the variables sent, in case of using AGRIF, take the radical defined above (CROCO\_VAR) to which we add  $\beta$  (for parent) or  $\alpha$  1 (for first child). This gives, for example for variable SST, CROCO\_SST\_0 or CROCO\_SST\_1 for parent and child respectively.

For the variables received by CROCO, we will use its ability to handle CPLMASK. Each of the domains (parent or children) will be assigned a coupling mask named coupling\_mask0.nc (parent), coupling\_mask1.nc (child 1), each coupling mask being relative to its grid. The CROCO domain that receives a variable will be identified by its mask (CPLMASK\*), which will be added to the previous radical. This will give CROCO\_VAR\_CPLMASK0 for the parent or CROCO\_VAR\_CPLMASK1 for child 1.

This makes it easy to define the received variables in a case where one decides to couple CROCO-AGRIF with several WRF domains. In this case the variables will have the nomenclature CROCO\_VAR\_CPLMASK0 for the parent CROCO to which we add \_EXT1 for the first domain of coupling\_mask0.nc. By continuity \_EXT2 will correspond to domain 2 of coupling\_mask0.nc. Then the variables received by CROCO, in a case of CROCO-AGRIF/WRF-nest simulation, will follow the format CROCO\_VAR\_CPLMASK\*\_EXT\*.

## **16.4 Grids**

#### **16.4.1 OASIS grid files**

OASIS manage grids and interpolations by using dedicated grid files:

- grids.nc
- masks.nc
- areas.nc (requested only for some of the interpolation types)

These files can be automatically created by OASIS functions called in each model, or can be created by the user in advance if specificities are requested. Some facilities are provided in croco\_tools/Coupling\_tools to create such grids.

If grids.nc, masks.nc, areas.nc exist in the working directory, they won't be overwritten by OASIS functions. So, be sure to have the good files or remove them before running the coupled model.

### **16.4.2 Multiple model grids (nesting case)**

Multiple nested grids in the different models can be used in coupled mode.

The variables are therefore exchanged from/to the different grids. To do so, each coupled variable is identified in the coupler with its grid number:

- For CROCO the last character of the OASIS variable name defines the domain
	- 0 being the parent domain
	- 1 the first child domain, etc.
- For WRF the domains are defined by d01, d02, etc, and the target domain (CROCO for instance), by EXT\_d01, EXT\_d02, etc.

For example if you are coupling 2 CROCO domains to one atmospheric domain, you will specify 2 types of exchanges in the namcouple:

```
# exchange between CROCO parent domain to WRF domain
SRMSSTV0 WRF_d01_EXT_d01_SST
# exchange between CROCO child domain to WRF domain
SRMSSTV1 WRF_d01_EXT_d02_SST
```
If you are coupling 2 WRF domains to one CROCO domain:

```
# exchange between WRF d01 domain to CROCO domain
WRF_d01_EXT_d01_TAUMOD RRMTAUM0
# exchange between WRF d02 domain to CROCO domain
WRF_d02_EXT_d01_TAUMOD RRMTAUM0
```
#### Related CPP options:



*Preselected options:*

#undef OA\_COUPLING #undef OW\_COUPLING

# **CHAPTER SEVENTEEN**

# **I/O AND ONLINE DIAGNOSTICS**

#### Basic CPP options:



XIOS is an external library for output (developed at IPSL) providing for flexibility and design to improve performances for HPC : see <http://forge.ipsl.jussieu.fr/ioserver>

*Preselected options:*

```
# define AVERAGES
# define AVERAGES_K
# undef XIOS
```
Advanced diagnostics CPP options:



The different budgets and their computation are detailled in [https://www.jgula.fr/Croco/diagnostics\\_croco.pdf](https://www.jgula.fr/Croco/diagnostics_croco.pdf)

*Preselected options:*



# **CHAPTER EIGHTEEN**

# **REVIEW OF TEST CASES**

## **18.1 Basin**

This is a rectangular, flat-bottomed basin with double-gyre wind forcing. It produces a western boundary current flowing into a central Gulf Stream which goes unstable and generates eddies if resolution is increased

# define BASIN

#### CPP options:



#### Settings :

Results :

## **18.2 Canyon**

# define CANYON

#### CPP options:

```
# undef OPENMP
# undef MPI
# define CANYON_STRAT
# define UV_ADV
# define UV_COR
# define SOLVE3D
# define EW_PERIODIC
# define ANA_GRID
# define ANA_INITIAL
# define ANA_SMFLUX
# define ANA_STFLUX
```






Fig. 1: BASIN results : density (up) and sea surface elevation (down)

```
# define ANA_BTFLUX
# define NO_FRCFILE
```
#### Settings :

Results :





Fig. 2: CANYON results : density (up) and sea surface elevation (down)

# **18.3 Equator**

Boccaletti, G., R.C. Pacanowski, G.H. Philander and A.V. Fedorov, 2004, The Thermal Structure of the Upper Ocean, J.Phys.Oceanogr., 34, 888-902.

# define EQUATOR

CPP options:



#### Settings :



Fig. 3: EQUATOR results : temperature , time evolution (up) vertical section (down)



Fig. 4: EQUATOR results : speed (up) and sea surface elevation (down)

## **18.4 Inner Shelf**

Compare wind driven innershelf dynamics between 2D Ekman theory and CROCO numerical solution

Estrade P., P. Marchesiello, A. Colin de Verdiere, C. Roy, 2008: Cross-shelf structure of coastal upwelling : a two-dimensional expansion of Ekman's theory and a mechanism for innershelf upwelling shut down. Journal of Marine Research, 66, 589-616.

Marchesiello P., and P. Estrade, 2010: Upwelling limitation by geostrophic onshore flow. Journal of Marine Research, 68, 37-62.

define INNERSHELF

CPP options:

# undef OPENMP # undef MPI # undef NBQ # define INNERSHELF\_EKMAN # define INNERSHELF\_APG # define SOLVE3D define UV\_COR define ANA GRID define ANA\_INITIAL define AVERAGES define ANA\_SSFLUX define ANA\_SRFLUX define ANA\_STFLUX define ANA\_BSFLUX define ANA\_BTFLUX



### Settings :



Fig. 5: INNERSHELF results : comparison with analytical solution

# **18.5 River Runoff**

# define RIVER

CPP options:



Settings :

Results :

# **18.6 Gravitational/Overflow**

# define OVERFLOW

CPP options:

```
# undef OPENMP
# undef MPI
# define UV_ADV
# define UV_COR
# define UV_VIS2
# define TS_DIF2
# define TS_MIX_GEO
# define SOLVE3D
```


Fig. 6: RIVER results : river plume



### Setting :



Fig. 7: OVERFLOW results : initial state (up) and density evolution (down)

# **18.7 Seamount**

# define SEAMOUNT

#### CPP options:



#### Settings :



Fig. 8: SEAMOUNT results : bottom speed

# **18.8 Shelf front**

# define SHELFRONT

#### CPP options:



#### Settings :



Fig. 9: SHELFRONT results : temerature profile

# **18.9 Equatorial Rossby Wave**

This test problem considers the propagation of a Rossby soliton on an equatorial beta-plane, for which an asymptotic solution exists to the inviscid, nonlinear shallow water equations. In principle, the soliton should propagate westwards at fixed phase speed, without change of shape. Since the uniform propagation and shape preservation of the soliton are achieved through a delicate balance between linear wave dynamics and nonlinearity, this is a good context in which to look for erroneous wave dispersion and/or numerical damping.

The problem is nondimensionalized with:  $H = 40$  cm,  $L = 295$  km,  $T = 1.71$  days and  $U = L/T = 1.981$  m/s. Theorical propagation speed is  $0.4$  (0.395) so that at  $t=120$ , the soliton should be back to its initial position after crossing the periodic channel of length 48.

Boyd J.P., 1980: Equatorial solitary waves. Part I: Rossby solitons. JPO, 10, 1699-1717

define SOLITON

CPP options:



#### Settings :



Fig. 10: SOLITON results : sea surface evolution

# **18.10 Thacker**

Thacker, W., (1981), Some exact solutions to the nonlinear shallow-water wave equations. J. Fluid Mech., 107.

# define THACKER





#### Settings :

Results :





# **18.11 Upwelling**

# define UPWELLING

CPP options:

```
# undef OPENMP
# undef MPI
# define SOLVE3D
 define UV_COR
```


#### Settings :

Results :



Fig. 12: UPWELLING results : temperature

## **18.12 Baroclinic Vortex**

Free evolution of a baroclinic vortex (South West drift) that retains part of its initial axisymmetric shape as advective effects compensate for weak-amplitude Rossby-wave dispersion in its wake. 1-way and 2-way nesting were tested with this configuration.

McWilliams, J.C., Flierl, G.R., 1979. On the evolution of isolated nonlinear vortices. J. Phys. Oceanogr. 9, 1155–1182.

Penven, P., Debreu, L., Marchesiello, P., McWilliams, J.C., 2006. Application of the ROMS embedding procedure for the central California upwelling system. Ocean Model. 12, 157–187.

Debreu L., P. Marchesiello, P. Penven and G. Cambon, 2012: Two-way nesting in split-explicit ocean models: Algorithms, implementation and validation. Ocean Modelling 49-50 (2012) 1–21

#### # define VORTEX

#### CPP options:



#### Settings :



Fig. 13: VORTEX results : difference between parent and child grid (cm)

# **18.13 Internal Tide**

Internal Gravity Wave solution over a ridge.

Di Lorenzo, E, W.R. Young and S.L. Smith, 2006, Numerical and anlytical estimates of M2 tidal conversion at steep oceanic ridges, J. Phys. Oceanogr., 36, 1072-1084.

# define INTERNAL

CPP options:



#### Settings :

Results :

# **18.14 Internal Tide (COMODO)**

Internal Gravity Wave solution over continental slope and shelf (COMODO test)

Pichon, A., 2007: Tests academiques de maree, Rapport interne n 21 du 19 octobre 2007, Service Hydrographique et Oceanographique de la Marine.

# define IGW

CPP options:







Settings :





Fig. 15: IGW results : internal gravity waves generation

# **18.15 Baroclinic Jet**

Effective resolution is limited by the numerical dissipation range, which is a function of the model numerical filters (assuming that dispersive numerical modes are efficiently removed). Soufflet et al. (2016) present a Baroclinic jet test case set in a zonally reentrant channel that provides a controllable test of a model capacity at resolving submesoscale dynamics.

A semi-idealized configuration in a periodic channel is set up to generate two dominant mechanisms of upper ocean turbulence: (i) surface density stirring by mesoscale eddies and (ii) fine scale instabilities directly energizing the submesoscale range. The setup consists of a flat reentrant channel of 500 km by 2000 km by 4000 m, centered around 30 deg of latitude on a  $\beta$ -plane (the Coriolis frequency is  $1.10^{-4}s^{-1}$  at the center,  $\beta = 1.610^{-11}m^{-1}s^{-1}$ ). Eastern/western boundary conditions are periodic while northern/southern conditions are closed. The initial density field is constructed with interior and surface meridional density gradients and associated geostrophic currents that are linearly unstable to both interior baroclinic and Charney instability modes. A linear stability analysis provides the exponential growth rate of unstable modes as a function of wavenumber. The two most unstable modes are clearly distinct in length scales on either side of the Rossby deformation radius ( around 30 km in the center +/- 5 km from south to north). The interior geostrophic instability thus injects energy at mesoscale and Charney instability at submesoscale if resolution allows (2 km). The default resolution is 20 km (40 vertical levels) where only mesoscale instabilities are at work.

Soufflet Y., Marchesiello P., Lemarie F., Jouanno Julien, Capet X., Debreu L., Benshila R. (2016). On effective resolution in ocean models. Ocean Modelling, 98, 36-50.

define JET

CPP options:



#### Settings :

Results :

## **18.16 Plannar Beach**

This test case is a littoral flow driven by obliquely incident waves on a plane beach with a uniform slope of 1:80. The model is forced by monochromatic waves computed with the WKB wave model (Uchiyama et al., 2010) propagating offshore waves with 2 m significant wave height, a peak period of 10 s at an angle of 10° off the shore-normal direction. The horizontal extent of the domain is 1180 m in x (cross- shore), 140 m in y (alongshore) with grid spacings of  $dx = dy = 20$  m. The model coordinates have a west-coast orientation, with the offshore open boundary located at  $x = 0$ . The resting depth h varies linearly from 12 m offshore, and is discretized with 20 uniform vertical sigma levels. Boundary conditions are alongshore periodicity, weetin-drying conditions at shore and open boundary conditions at the offshore boundary. Rotation is excluded with  $f = 0$ . There is no lateral



Fig. 16: JET results : initial state



Fig. 17: JET results : results after 180 days



Fig. 18: JET results : vorticity evolutione

momentum diffusion, stratification, nor surface wind/heat/freshwater fluxes. Breaking acceleration is given by the Church and Thornton (1993) formulation in the WKB model and wave-enhanced vertical mixing is computed by the first-order turbulent closure model, K-Profile Parameterization (KPP).

Uchiyama, Y., McWilliams, J.C. and Shchepetkin, A.F. (2010): Wave-current interaction in an oceanic circulation model with a vortex force formalism: Application to the surf zone. Ocean Modelling Vol. 34:1-2, pp.16-35.

#### define SHOREFACE

#### CPP options:





#### Settings :

Results :



Fig. 19: SHOREFACE results : Eulerian velocities (left), Stokes velocities (center), Vertical mixing (right)

## **18.17 Rip Current**

Rip currents are strong, seaward flows formed by longshore variation of the wave-induced momentum flux. They are responsible for the recirculation of water accumulated on a beach by a weaker and broader shoreward flow. Here, we consider longshore variation of the wave-induced momentum flux due to breaking at barred bottom topography with an imposed longshore perturbation, as in Weir et al. (2010) but in the 3D case. The basin is rectangular (768 m by 768 m) and the topography is constant over time and based on field surveys at Duck, North Carolina. Shore-normal, monochoromatic waves (1m, 10s) are imposed at the offshore boundary and propagate through the WKB wave model coupled with the 3D circulation model (Uchiyama et al., 2011). The domain is periodic in the alongshore direction. We assume that the nearshore boundary is reflectionless, and there is no net outflow at the offshore boundary.

Weir, B., Y. Uchiyama, E. M. Lane, J. M. Restrepo, and J. C. McWilliams (2011), A vortex force analysis of the interaction of rip currents and surface gravity waves, J. Geophys. Res., 116, C05001.

### Related CPP options:



### CPP options:





#### Settings :

Results :

# **18.18 Sandbar**

This test case is part of an effort to develop a comprehensive 3D nearshore model that predicts onshore and offshore sandbar migrations under storm and post-storm conditions, without the need to modify the model setting parameters. In this test, we attempt to reproduce the results of sandbar migration experiments, the European Large Installation Plan (LIP) experiments, which were carried out at full scale in Delft Hydraulics's Delta Flume (Roelvink and Reniers, 1995). Hydrostatic wave-averaged simulations of LIP-1B (erosion) and LIP-1C (accretion) using CROCO are described in Shafiei et al. (2022), while wave-resolving simulations are in Marchesiello et al. (2021) for hydrodynamics and Marchesiello et al. (2022) for morphodynamics.

In LIP, three types of experiments were carried out under different types of irregular waves, which subsequently



Fig. 20: RIP results : velocity

resulted in a stable (1A), erosive (1B), and accretive (1C) beach state. The initial profile is linear in LIP-1A, with a slope of 1:30 and consisting of a median grain size of 0.22 mm. The final profile of LIP-1A was used as the initial profile of LIP-1B and the final profile of LIP-1B as the initial profile of LIP-1C. The wave conditions were a JONSWAP narrow-banded random wave spectrum with a peak enhancement factor of 3.3 and characteristic wave height and period: Hs =1.4m,Tp =5s (LIP-1B) and Hs =0.6m,Tp =8s (LIP-1C).Under this wave forcing, the sandbar developed during LIP-1B, increasing in height and migrating in the offshore direction. Under the accretive conditions of LIP-1C, the bar migration reversed to the onshore direction. For validation of currents and sand concentration, we consider the time 8 hours after initialization in experiment 1B and 7 hours in 1C. The LIP-1B and LIP-1C experiments lasted 18 and 13 hours, respectively. In both cases, the model was run for one hour with a morphological acceleration factor equal to 18 and 13 respectively.

The model can be run using wave-averaged equations in hydrostatic mode or wave-resolving nonhydrostatic equations.

### **18.18.1 Wave-averaged solution (default)**

Here, wave-averaged equations are used that require parametrization of wave effects on morphodynamics. Bedload nonlinear wave-related transport is parametrized with the SANTOSS formulation, which follows the wave half-cycle concept to account for wave asymmetry and skewness. LIP1b and LIP1c experiments are conducted sequentially, meaning that the final bathymetry of LIP1b is the initial bathymetry of LIP1c. The numerical domain is 200 meters long and 4.1 m deep. The numerical domain is discretized using a uniform grid with horizontal resolution of 1.5 m and the number of vertical layers is 20 throughout the domain (the heights of the cells in the deep region and around the bar are about 21 cm and 5 cm respectively).

For wave forcing, CROCO is fully coupled to built-in ray-theory spectrum-peak wave propagation model. The offshore wave height is forced at the model boundary with values of the experiments. The resulting Dean number  $\Omega = H_s/T_pW_s$  clearly differentiates the erosive and accretive conditions. Apart from the forcing conditions, all other wave model parameters are the same for both cases.

For the sediment transport model, the main calibration parameters to be tuned in the suspended load model are: the settling velocity  $W_s = 25$  mm/s; the critical bed shear stress  $\tau_{CE} = 0.18$  N/m<sup>2</sup>; and erosion rate  $E_0 =$ 0.001 kg/m<sup>2</sup>/s. For bed roughness, the bottom boundary layer model (BBL) uses empirical formulations for sand mobilization based on grain size and wave statistics. For bedload transport, SANTOSS is implemented with only one calibration parameter: the bedload factor, which is set to 0.5.

### **18.18.2 Wave-resolved solution (#define NBQ)**

In this case, we do not rely on parametrization for the bottom boundary layer or bedload transport, as as skewedasymmetric waves are resolved explicitly, but we make sure that the wave-boundary layer is resolved, and that the first vertical level is in a sheet flow layer (about 10 times the grain size). This is particularly important for the onshore bar migration phase. Note that in our formulation, the turbulence intensity (calculated with the closure model) affects the sediment resuspension. A numerical wave maker forces the JONSWAP spectrum of linear waves at the offshore boundary (as in the laboratory experiments).

Roelvink, J.A., Reniers, 1995. LIP 11D delta flume experiments : a dataset for profile model validation. WL / Delft Hydraulics.

Shafiei H., J. Chauchat, C. Bonamy, and P. Marchesiello, 2022: Numerical simulation of on-shore/off-shore sandbar migration using wave-cycle concept – application to a 3D wave-averaged oceanic model (CROCO), in preparation for Ocean Modelling.

Marchesiello P., J. Chauchat, H. Shafiei, R. Almar, R. Benshila, F. Dumas, 2022: 3D wave-resolving simulation of sandbar migration. Coastal Engineering, submitted.

Marchesiello P., F. Auclair, L. Debreu, J.C. McWilliams, R. Almar, R. Benshila, F. Dumas, 2021: Tridimensional nonhydrostatic transient rip currents in a wave-resolving model. Ocean Modelling, 163, 101816.

define SANDBAR

#### CPP options:





#### Results :

## **18.19 Swash**

This test case addresses wave dynamics on a gently sloping laboratory beach (Globex experiment), using a waveresolving configuration. The simulation is compared in Marchesiello et al. (2021) against GLOBEX experiments B2 and A3 performed in 2012 in the Scheldt flume of Deltares (Delft, the Netherlands), and described in Michallet et al. (2014). The flume is 110 m long and contains a solid beach of 1:80 slope with its toe at 16.6 m from the wave maker. Experiments are run with a still water depth of  $0.85$  m and shoreline at  $x = 84.6$  m. Second-order bichromatic waves (B2) are generated at the offshore boundary, with shore normal direction. The grid spacing is dx=1 cm with 10 vertical levels evenly spaced between the free surface and bottom. A simulation with 20 levels gives similar results, while the solution is moderately degraded (mostly in higher moments) with coarser horizontal resolution (dx=3, 6 and 12 cm), which shows good convergence properties. The model time step is dt  $= 0.15$  ms. The minimum depth is 1 mm on the shore, the position of which varies with the swash oscillation, relying on the wetting-drying scheme in CROCO. For bottom drag, the logarithmic law of the wall is used with


Fig. 21: SANDBAR results : validation of offshore sandbar migration against LIP-1B flume experiment

roughness length  $z_0 = 0.0625$  mm.

Marchesiello P., F. Auclair, L. Debreu, J.C. McWilliams, R. Almar, R. Benshila, F. Dumas, 2021: Tridimensional nonhydrostatic transient rip currents in a wave-resolving model. Ocean Modelling, 163, 101816.

Michallet H., B. G. Ruessink, M.V.L.M. da Rocha, A. de Bakker, D. van der A, et al.. GLOBEX: Wave dynamics on a shallow sloping beach. HYDRALAB IV Joint User Meeting, Lisbon, July 2014, Jul 2014, Lisbonne, Portugal.

# define SWASH

#### CPP options:

# define SWASH\_GLOBEX\_B2 # undef SWASH\_GLOBEX\_A3 # undef OPENMP # undef MPI # define SOLVE3D # define AVERAGES # define NBQ # define NBQ\_PRECISE # define WAVE\_MAKER # define UV\_ADV # define UV\_HADV\_WENO5 # define UV\_VADV\_WENO5 # define W\_HADV\_WENO5 # define W\_VADV\_WENO5 # define GLS\_MIXING\_3D # define NEW\_S\_COORD # define ANA\_GRID # define ANA\_INITIAL # define ANA\_SMFLUX # define ANA\_STFLUX # define ANA\_SSFLUX # define ANA\_SRFLUX # define ANA\_SST # define ANA\_BTFLUX # define OBC\_WEST # define OBC\_SPECIFIED\_WEST # define FRC\_BRY # define ANA\_BRY # define Z\_FRC\_BRY # define M2\_FRC\_BRY # define M3\_FRC\_BRY # define T\_FRC\_BRY # define WET\_DRY # define NO\_FRCFILE

#### Settings :

Results :

## **18.20 Tank**

The non-hydrostatic solver is tested with several analytical solutions and laboratory experiments. The TANK test case simulates a two-dimensional, deepwater standing wave in a rectangular basin with a depth  $D$  and length  $l$ of 10 m. The oscillation is caused by a sinusoidal free-surface set-up at time=0. The model uses a uniform grid spacing of 0.2 m in the horizontal and vertical directions. From the dispersion relation ( $\sigma = 2\pi/T = qk \tanh kD$ , with  $L = k/2\pi = 2l$  the wave length), the wave period is T = 3.6 s and phase speed is c = 5.6 m/s. With the hydrostatic assumption, the phase speed and frequency are higher  $(T = 2.0 \text{ s}$  and  $c = 9.9 \text{ m/s})$ . The simulations are compared to analytical solutions.



Fig. 22: SWASH results : Velocity and elevation

Chen, X.J., 2003. A fully hydrodynamic model for three-dimensional, free-surface flows. Int. J. Numer. Methods Fluids 42

# define TANK

#### CPP options:



#### Settings :

Results :

## **18.21 Acoustic wave**

```
# define ACOUSTIC
```
CPP options:

```
# undef MPI
# define NBQ
# ifdef NBQ
  undef NBQ_PRECISE
# define NBQ_PERF
# endif
 undef UV_VIS2
```
(continues on next page)



Fig. 23: TANK results : Comparison between analytical, hydrostatique and non-hydrostatique solutions

(continued from previous page)



## **18.22 Gravitational Adjustment**

The goal of this test case, also known as Lock-Exchange experiment, is to evaluate different numerical advection schemes on representing the adiabatic process in a dam breaking experiment. At the initial time, a vertical density front separates two density classes. Adjustment occurs in which lighter water moves above heavier water (Shin et al., 2004). The model experiments are designed to reproduce the lock-exchange problem described in Ilicak et al., 2012). Analytical solutions to this problem exist and from Bernouilli's equation for an ideal fluid, the front propagates with speed  $0.5\sqrt{gH\delta\rho/\rho_0}$ . This speed may be slowed down by mixing between the two layers due to numerical diapycnal diffusion.

The setup is a closed, two-dimensional (x,z) domain with a constant depth of  $H = 20$  m and a length of  $L = 64$ km. At  $t = 0$  the two initial densities that represent the two water masses are separated by a vertical barrier. The right and left halves of the domain have densities of 1020 and 1025 kg/m<sup>3</sup> respectively. To investigate the impact of the model resolution and the choice of advection scheme on spurious mixing, the model uses three different horizontal and vertical model grid spacings: coarse  $(dx=2 \text{ km}; \text{N}=10)$ ; medium is default  $(dx=500 \text{ m}, \text{N}=40)$ ; fine  $(dx=125 \text{ m}, N=160)$ .

A non-hydrostatique version can be run (#define NBQ) in a smaller domain of 3 m by 30 cm and resolution of 1 cm. In this case, Kelvin-Helmholtz instabilities develop along the front during the gravitational adjustment.

Shin, Dalziel, S., Linden, P, 2004: gravity currents produced by lock exchange. Journal of Fluid Mechanics, 521, 1–34.

Gouillon, F., 2010: Internal Wave Propagation and numerically induced diapycnal mixing in Oceanic general Circulation Models. PhD Thesis at Florida State University, 93pp.

Ilicak, M, Adcroft, A., Griffies, S., Hallberg, R., 2012: Spurious dianeutral mixing and the role of momentum closure. Ocean Modelling, 45–46, 37–58.



CPP options:

```
# undef OPENMP
# undef MPI
# undef NBQ
# undef XIOS
# define SOLVE3D
# define NEW_S_COORD
# define UV_ADV
# define TS_HADV_WENO5
# define TS_VADV_WENO5
# define UV_HADV_WENO5
# define UV_VADV_WENO5
# ifdef NBQ
 define W_HADV_WENO5
  define W_VADV_WENO5
# endif
 undef IIV VIS2
```
(continues on next page)





#### Settings :

Results :



Fig. 24: GRAV\_ADJ results : density front evolution for a medium resolution of 500m.

## **18.23 Internal Soliton**

The non-hydrostatic solver is tested with several analytical solutions and laboratory experiments. The Internal Soliton test case is setup from the experiment of Horn et al. (2001). It illustrates the processes acting on an interfacial basin-scale standing wave known as an internal seiche, neglecting the Earth's rotation. The propagation regimes depends on the ratio of the amplitude of the initial wave to the depth of the thermocline, and the ratio of the depth of the thermocline to the overall depth of the basin. In the present setup with moderate wave amplitude, the degeneration mechanism of the basin-scale internal wave is the generation of solitons by nonlinear steepening. As the wave steepens its horizontal lengthscale decreases until the dispersive terms can no longer be neglected. Eventually, a balance between nonlinear steepening and dispersion leads to the evolution of solitary waves, a process described by the Korteweg–de Vries (KdV) equation for the interfacial displacement  $\eta_i$ :

$$
\frac{\partial \eta_i}{\partial t} + c_0 \frac{\partial \eta_i}{\partial x} + \alpha \eta_i \frac{\partial \eta_i}{\partial x} + \beta \frac{\partial^3 \eta_i}{\partial x^3}
$$

The evolution of solitons is sensitive to the numerical damping associated with the choice of resolution, advection schemes and diffusion operators (implicit in the advection scheme or explicit).

The simulations can be compared with the laboratory experiments of Horn et al. (2001), which were carried out in a tank 6 m long and 29 cm deep. The two-layer fluid is given by a hyperbolic tangent density profile, which is rotated around the center of the basin to initiate the internal seiche at the basin scale. The resolution of the model is 10 cm horizontally and 4 mm vertically.

Horn, D.A., J. Imberger, & G.N. Ivey, (2001). The degeneration of large-scale interfacial gravity waves in lakes. J. Fluid Mech., 434:181-207.

# define ISOLITON

### CPP options:



### Settings :





Fig. 25: ISOLITON results : generation of a train of internal solitons from a basin-scale internal seiche

## **18.24 Kelvin-Helmoltz Instability**

This test case runs a Kelvin-Helmholtz instability between two fluid layers. It is part of experiments conducted with CROCO by Penney et al. (2020). The numerical simulations are performed using the non-hydrostatic, non-Boussinesq version of CROCO. While numerical simulations of KH instabilities are often considered in a periodic domain with rigid lid conditionsfor the upper boundary, the implementation presented here uses a free-surface upper boundary, with periodic lateral boundary conditions in the x- and y-directions. The setup is two-dimensional (default) or three-dimensional, with initial density distribution defined as two constant-density layers separated by a strongly stratified pycnocline, with a weak stable background stratification superimposed. The configuration parameters are chosen so that the necessary criterion for stratified shear instability,  $\mathrm{Ri}$  < 1/4, is satisfied. U(z), the initial background flow providing the shear, is defined by a hyperbolic tangent profile, with the upper layer moving leftward, and the lower layer rightward. Small amplitude perturbations are required to kickstart the instability.

The existence of a free surface and compressibility adds two dynamical processes (surface and acoustic waves) compared to more traditional studies in incompressible, unbounded or rigid lid flows. With the chosen configurations where the instability develops far from the vertical boundaries, the impact of these additional processes is negligible, but in certain circumstances, surface and acoustic waves may play a role in modifying the turbulent cascade.

The results are sensitive to the resolution (1 m by default) and the choice of advection schemes and diffusion operator (implicit in the advection schemes or explicit).

Penney, J., Morel, Y., Haynes, P., Auclair, F., & Nguyen, C. (2020). Diapycnal mixing of passive tracers by Kelvin–Helmholtz instabilities. Journal of Fluid Mechanics, 900, A26.

define KH\_INST

#### CPP options:

# undef KH\_INSTY # undef KH\_INST3D # define MPI # define NBQ # define NBQ\_PRECISE # undef XIOS # define SOLVE3D # define NEW\_S\_COORD # define UV\_ADV # define TS\_HADV\_WENO5 # define TS\_VADV\_WENO5 # define UV\_HADV\_WENO5 # define UV\_VADV\_WENO5 # define W\_HADV\_WENO5 # define W\_VADV\_WENO5 # undef SALINITY # undef PASSIVE\_TRACER # define ANA\_GRID # define ANA\_INITIAL # define ANA\_SMFLUX # define ANA\_STFLUX # undef ANA\_SRFLUX # define ANA\_BTFLUX # define ANA\_SSFLUX # define ANA\_BSFLUX # ifndef KH\_INSTY define EW\_PERIODIC  $#$  else define NS\_PERIODIC # endif # define NO\_FRCFILE



Fig. 26: KH\_INST results : instability generation

## **18.25 Horizontal tracer advection**

Test CROCO horizontal advection schemes for tracers

SOLID\_BODY\_ROT Example with spatially varying velocity DIAGONAL\_ADV Constant advection in the diagonal SOLID\_BODY\_PER Example with a space and time-varying velocity

```
# define TS_HADV_TEST
```

```
CPP options:
```

```
# undef SOLID_BODY_ROT
# undef DIAGONAL_ADV
# define SOLID_BODY_PER
# undef OPENMP
# undef MPI
# undef UV_ADV
# define NEW_S_COORD
# undef UV_COR
# define SOLVE3D
# define M2FILTER_NONE
# define ANA_VMIX
# define ANA_GRID
# define ANA_INITIAL
# define ANA_SMFLUX
# define ANA_SRFLUX
# define ANA_STFLUX
# define ANA_BTFLUX
# define ANA_BSFLUX
# define ANA_SSFLUX
 define NO_FRCFILE
```
(continues on next page)

(continued from previous page)



## **18.26 Sediment test cases**

All the test cases can be defined either with MUSTANG or the USGS sediment model.

#### 1. DUNE cases :

Migration of a dune composed by different sand classes. Bedload process only

```
# define DUNE
```
#### CPP options:



#### => For Mustang model, just add:

```
# define MUSTANG
# ifdef MUSTANG
# define key_MUSTANG_V2
# define key_MUSTANG_bedload
# define key_tenfon_upwind
# endif
```
=> For USGS sediment model, just add:



#### DUNE case (default):

Dune 2m. Sediment composed of two sand fractions. stratigraphy diagnostics

CPP options to add:

```
# undef ANA_DUNE /* Analytical test case (Marieu) */
                    /* 3D example */
```
Results :



Fig. 27: Fine sand fraction after 10 days in the seabed. The read line indicates the initial position of the dune.

### DUNE3D case:

Extension of the DUNE case in 3D. Migration of a Sand bump forced by a barotropic constant flow

CPP options to add:

```
# undef ANA_DUNE /* Analytical test case (Marieu) */
# define DUNE3D /* 3D example */
```
Results :



Fig. 28: Sand bump at initialization



Fig. 29: Sand bump after 20 days

#### ANA\_DUNE case :

Adaptation of the DUNE case. Migration of a sand dune with an analytical bedload formulation that provides an analytical solution for the dune evolution (Long et al., 2008).

Wen Long, James T. Kirby, Zhiyu Shao, A numerical scheme for morphological bed level calculations, Coastal Engineering, Volume 55, Issue 2, 2008, Pages 167-180, [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2007.09.009) [org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2007.09.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coastaleng.2007.09.009)

CPP options to add:

```
# define ANA_DUNE /* Analytical test case (Marieu) */
# undef DUNE3D /* 3D example */
```
=> For Mustang model, just add:

```
# define MUSTANG
# ifdef MUSTANG
# define key_MUSTANG_V2
# define key_MUSTANG_bedload
# define key_tenfon_upwind
# endif
```
=> For USGS sediment model, just add:

```
# define SEDIMENT
# ifdef SEDIMENT
# undef SUSPLOAD
# define BEDLOAD
# undef BEDLOAD_WENO5
# define BEDLOAD_MARIEU
# endif
```
#### Results :

Formulation du Charriage Q=aU^b (Long at al.,2008) Evolution de la dune: toutes les 30mins (debit=10m2/s)



Fig. 30: Comparison between dune propagation (every 30 mins) simulated with CROCO/MUSTANG and computed using the analytical solution

#### 2. SED\_TOY cases :

Single column test case

# define SED\_TOY

CPP options:



#### SED\_TOY/ROUSE case :

Testing sediment suspension in a 1DV framework to verify the agreement with Rouse theory

CPP options to add:

# define SED\_TOY\_ROUSE # define ANA\_VMIX # define BODYFORCE

=> For Mustang model, just add:

# define MUSTANG

=> For USGS sediment model, just add:

```
# define SEDIMENT
# define SUSPLOAD
# define SED_TAU_CD_CONST
```
Results :

#### SED\_TOY/CONSOLID case :

This 1DV test case exemplifies the sequence of depth-limited erosion, deposition, and compaction that characterizes the response of mixed and cohesive sediment in the model. From COAWST experiments, Cohesive and mixed sediment in the Regional Ocean Modeling System (ROMS v3.6) implemented in the Coupled Ocean–Atmosphere–Wave–Sediment Transport Modeling System (COAWST r1234) Sherwood et al., 2018, Geosci. Model Dev., 11, 1849–1871, 2018, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-1849-2018>



Comparaison: Profil vertical des concentrations de sable a l equilibre / profil de Rouse (model:dt=1s,nz=400)

Fig. 31: Comparison between suspended concentration and analytical Rouse profiles for 6 different settling velocities

2 sand classes and 2 mud classes, cohesive behaviour, up to 38 days :

CPP options to add:

```
# define SED_TOY_CONSOLID
# define SEDIMENT
 define SUSPLOAD
 undef BBL
 define GLS_MIXING
 define GLS_KOMEGA
 define MIXED_BED
 undef COHESIVE_BED
```


#### SED\_TOY/RESUSP case :

This 1DV test case to demonstrate the evolution of stratigraphy caused by resuspension and subsequent settling of different class of sediment during time-dependent bottom shear stress events. From COAWST experiments, Cohesive and mixed sediment in the Regional Ocean Modeling System (ROMS v3.6) implemented in the Coupled Ocean–Atmosphere–Wave–Sediment Transport Modeling System (COAWST r1234) Sherwood et al., 2018, Geosci. Model Dev., 11, 1849–1871, 2018, [https://doi.org/10.5194/](https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-1849-2018) [gmd-11-1849-2018](https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-1849-2018)

2 sand classes and 2 mud classes, non cohesive behaviour:

CPP options to add:

```
# define SED_TOY_RESUSP
# define SEDIMENT
# define SUSPLOAD
 undef BBL
```
(continues on next page)



Fig. 32: Evolution of equilibrium bulk critical stress profile for erosion (red solid line) and the instantaneous profile of bulk critical stress for erosion (blue solid line)



Fig. 33: Double surface stress event and response on stratigraphy 5 days later

#### 3. TIDAL\_FLAT case :

2DV tidal flat with a sediment mixture (mud, fine sand, medium sand) - suspension only

# define TIDAL\_FLAT

CPP options:

```
# undef OPENMP
# undef MPI
# undef NONLIN_EOS
# define NEW_S_COORD
# define SALINITY
# define UV_ADV
# define TS_HADV_WENO5
# define TS_VADV_WENO5
 define UV_HADV_WENO5
```
(continues on next page)

(continued from previous page)





Fig. 34: Bottom mud concentration evolution over several tidal cycles

# **CHAPTER NINETEEN**

# **APPENDICES**

## **19.1 cppdefs.h**

This file defines the CPP keys that are used by the the C-preprocessor when compiling CROCO. The Cpreprocessor selects the different parts of the Fortran code which needs to be compiled depending on the defined CPP options. These options are separated in two parts: the basic option keys in cppdefs.h and the advanced options keys in cppdefs\_dev.h.

CPP keys define the case: test case, realistic case, as well as the numerical schemes, parameterizations, and modules used, and the forcing and boundary conditions.

### • Configuration



#### • Prallelisation



## • Nesting



## • Open Boundary Conditions



## • Tides



## • Applications



## • Grid Configuration



## • Model Dynamics



### • Lateral Momentum Advection



## • Lateral Momentum Mixing



• Lateral Tracer Advection



### • Lateral Tracer Mixing



## • Nudging



## • Vertical Mixing







• Equation of State



## • Surface Forcing



## • Coupling



## • Sponge Layer



## • Lateral forcing



## • Bottom Forcing



## • Point Sources - Rivers



## • Open boundary conditions II



## • I/O - Diagnostics



## • Biogeochemical models



## • Sediment Dynamics



## • Bottom Boundary Layer



## • Wave-Current interactions



# **19.2 croco.in**



<b>KEYWORD</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
restart	
	NRST: Number of time-steps between writing of
	re-start fields
	<b>NRPFRST</b>
	0: write several records every NRST time steps
	$>0$ : create more than one file (with sequential numbers) and write NRPRST records per file
	-1: overwrite record every NRST time steps
	filename: name of restart file
history	
	LDEFHIS: flag (T/F) for writing history files
	NWRT: Number of time-steps between writing of
	history fields <b>NRPFHIS:</b>
	0: write several records every NWRT time
	steps
	$>0$ : create more than one file (with sequential
	numbers) and write NRPHIS records per file
	-1: overwrite record every NWRT time steps
	filename: Name of history file
averages	
	NTSAVG: Starting timestep for the accumulation of output time-averaged data. For instance,
	you might want to average over the last day of a
	thirty-day run.
	NAVG: Number of time-steps between writing of averaged fields
	NRPFAVG:
	0: write several records every NAVG time
	steps
	$>0$ : create more than one file (with sequential
	numbers) and write NRPFAVG records per file
	-1: overwrite record every NAVG time steps
	filename: Name of average file
primary_history_fields	Flags for writing primary variables in history NetCDF file
auxiliary_history_fields	Flags for writing auxiliary variables in history NetCDF file
primary_averages	Flags for writing primary variables in average NetCDF file
auxiliary_averages	Flags for writing auxiliary variables in average NetCDF file
rho0	Mean density used in the Boussinesq equation.
lateral_visc	
	VISC2: Laplaplacian background viscosity in m2/s (with UV_VIS2 CPP option)
	VISC4: Bilaplacian background viscosity in m4/s (with UV_VIS4 CPP option)

Table 1 – continued from previous page

<b>KEYWORD</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
tracer_diff2	TNU2(1:NT): Laplacian background diffusivity in
	m2/s for each tracer (with TS_DIF2 CPP option)
tracer_diff4	TNU4(1:NT): Laplacian background diffusivity in
	m4/s for each tracer (with TS_DIF4 CPP option)
vertical_mixing	
	Constant vertical viscosity coefficient in m2/s for
	analytical vertical mixing scheme
	(with ANA_VMIX CPP option)
bottom_drag	
	RDRG [m/s]: Drag coefficient for linear bottom
	stress formulation
	RDRG2: Drag coefficient for constant quadratic
	bottom stress formulation
	Zob [m]: Roughness length for Von-Karman
	quadratic bottom stress formulation
	Cdb_min: Minimum value of drag coefficient for
	Von-Karman quadratic bottom stress formulation
	Cdb_max: Maximum value of drag coefficient for
	Von-Karman quadratic bottom stress formulation.
gamma2	Free- or partial- or no-slip wall boundary condition. 1
	means free slip conditions are used.
sponge	
	sponge parameters are only needed if
	SPONGE_GRID is undefined in
	set_global_definitions.h;
	otherwise, these parameters are assigned internally.
	X_SPONGE [m]: width of sponge layers
	V_SPONGE [m2/s]: viscosity/diffusivity values in
	sponge layers. These values follow a
	cosine profile from zero interior value to
	V_SPONGE at the boundary.

Table 1 – continued from previous page





<b>KEYWORD</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
diag_avg	
	ldefdia_avg: flag that activates the storage of
	averaged tracer budget terms in a diagnostic file
	ntsdia_avg: Starting timestep for the accumulation of
	output time-averaged data. For
	instance, you might want to average over the last day of a thirty-day run.
	nwrtdia_avg: Number of time-steps between writing of averaged diagnostic fields
	nprfdia_avg:
	0: write several records every
	NWRTDIA_AVG time steps
	>0: create more than one file (with sequential numbers) and write NRPFDIA_AVG records per file
	-1: overwrite record every NWRTDIA_AVG time steps
	filename: Name of average tracer diagnostic file
diag3D_history_fields	
	flag to select which tracer equation (temp, salt, etc
	) to store in diagnostic file.
	These terms are 3D.
diag2D_history_fields	
	flags to select which tracer equation integrated over
	the mixed layer depth (cf
	DIAGNOSTICS_TS_MLD)
	to store in diagnostic file. These terms are 2D.
diag3D_average_fields	same as diag3D_history _fields but for averaged fields
diag2D_average_fields	same as diag2D_history _fields but for averaged fields
diagnosticsM	
	Same format as diagnostics but for momentum
	equations
	ldefdiaM:
	nwrtdiaM:
	nrpfdiaM:
	filename:
diagM_avg	Same format as diag_avg but for momentum equa-
	tions
diagM_history_fields	flag to select which momentum equation $(u, v)$ to store
	in diagnostic file. These terms are 3D.
diagM_average _fields	same as diagM_history _fields but for averaged fields
diagnosticsM_bio	Same format as diagnostics but for biogeochemical
	budget terms (other than advection/diffusion)
diagbio_avg	Same format as diag_avg but for biogeochemical bud-
	get terms (other than advection/diffusion)

Table 1 – continued from previous page





<b>KEYWORD</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
station fields	Fixed station application. Same format as diagnostics <b>LDEFSTA</b> <b>NSTA</b> <b>NRPFSTA</b> inpname, hisname
psource	Nsrc: point source number Isrc: I point source indice Jsrc: J point source indice Dsrc: Direction of point source flow $(u=0, v=1)$ Qbar [m3/s]: Total transport at point source Lsrc: Logical switch for type of tracer to apply Tsrc: Tracer value
psource_ncfile	Nsrc: point source number Isrc: I point source indice Jsrc: J point source indice Dsrc: Direction of point source flow $(u=0, v=1)$ qbardir: Orientation: South=0 or North=0, East=0 or $West=1$ Lsrc: Logical switch for type of tracer to apply Tsrc: Tracer value in case of analytical value [ #undef PSOURCE_NCFILE_TS ] runoff file name: Input netCDF runoff file

Table 1 – continued from previous page

# **19.3 Comparison of ROMS and CROCO versions**



## CODE FEATURES


## TIME STEPPING



## STABILITY CONSTRAINTS (Max Courant number)

