A mechanism for the generation of wave-driven rhythmic patterns in the surf zone
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Abstract. The coupling between topographic irregularities and wave-driven mean water motion in the surf zone is examined. This coupling occurs because the topographic perturbations produce excess gradients in the wave radiation stress that cause a steady circulation. This circulation, in turn, creates a sediment transport pattern that can reinforce the bottom disturbance and may thereby lead to the growth of large-scale bed forms. To investigate this coupling mechanism, the linearized stability problem with an originally plane sloping beach and normal wave incidence is solved in two different cases. First, the breaking line is considered to be fixed, and second, the perturbations in water depth that produce a displacement of the breaker line are accounted for. The first case shows that the basic topography can be unstable with respect to two different modes: a giant cusp pattern with shore-attached transverse bars that extend across the whole surf zone and a crescentic pattern with alternate shoals and pools at both sides of the breaking line showing a mirroring effect. In the second case, the varying breaker line may have a strong influence on the circulation. This is clear for the giant cusp topography whose growth is totally inhibited. In contrast, the morphology and the growth of the crescentic pattern remains almost unchanged.

1. Introduction

The nearshore zone in front of sandy beaches sometimes shows quite regular morphological patterns at length scales well above the length scale of incident wind or swell waves. Giant cusp [Komar, 1971], shore-attached oblique/transverse bar systems [Niedoroda and Tanner, 1970; Hunter et al., 1979; Lippmann and Holman, 1990], crescentic bars [Bowen and Inman, 1971] and ridge and runnel systems [Mulrennan, 1992] are well-known examples of such features. These patterns are certainly intriguing and have scientific interest in themselves. More importantly, their regularity gives an indication that the large-scale complex dynamics of the surf zone as a whole can be understood in terms of simple physical mechanisms, at least in some circumstances.

These large-scale beach processes, which involve long time-scales have sometimes been related to the presence of low-frequency waves, in particular infragravity edge waves. These waves can be excited by the presence of low-frequency patterns in the external wave forcing [Bowen and Guza, 1978; Holman and Bowen, 1982]. This is an example of a forced topographic response in which an imposed velocity field creates the underlying topography. However, another possibility is that these patterns can be the result of morphodynamic instabilities of the alongshore uniform equilibrium, an example of free or self-organized behavior of the nearshore dynamical system [Southgate and Beltrán, 1998]. Of course, it is very plausible that in many circumstances both kind of behaviors will interact on natural beaches. Since the earlier suggestions by Sonu [1968] and the work of Barcilon and Lau [1973] and Hino [1974], little attention had been paid to nearshore morphodynamic instabilities. In the nineties an increasing interest in this approach developed, and those early investigations have been revisited and extended by Christensen et al. [1994], Dugard et al. [1999], Vittori et al. [1999], Falqué [1991] and Falqué et al. [1996a,b]. In addition, the concept of self-organization in the nearshore has been further extended by the work of Werner and
Morphodynamic instabilities arise from the coupling that sediment transport induces between the small perturbations on a reference uniform bottom topography and the disturbances thereby produced on water motions. In the case of normal wave incidence, where there is no longshore current, this coupling can occur through the perturbation that the bed forms cause on the incident wave field. Basically, the shoals and the troughs cause wave energy redistribution, variations in the breaking point, wave refraction, reflection, and diffraction, which produce, in turn, a radiation stress distribution that is no longer in equilibrium with the setup/setdown, and a steady circulation is created. We will refer to this interaction as bed-surf interaction.

When there is a significant longshore current, the deflection that the bed forms produce on the current is another source of morphodynamic interaction. This mechanism is responsible for the formation of free bars in rivers and can also be important in the nearshore environment in case of currents generated by tides, by wind stress, or by river discharge. We will refer to it as bedflow interaction. For wave-driven longshore currents this effect is usually mixed with the bed-surf interaction. However, from a conceptual point of view, bed-flow interaction is worth investigating in isolation [Falques et al., 1996a and Falques et al., 1996b] suggest that the bed-flow mechanism can be dominant under some circumstances. This is quite satisfactory since bed-flow effects are much easier to deal with than bed-surf interaction, which is based on the complex processes that waves undergo within the surf/shoaling zone.

Normal wave incidence is assumed in the present paper to avoid a mean longshore current. A satisfactory understanding of each of the individual processes, bedflow and bed-surf, in isolation is convenient before dealing with the general situation of oblique wave incidence. As far as we know, instability in case of normal wave incidence is essentially unexplored. For instance, the model of Christensen et al. [1994] could not deal with the case of \( \theta_b = 0 \). Apparently, Hino [1974] did some numerical experiments with normal incidence. However, even though his results were promising, a lack of a systematic investigation by both numerical and analytical tools is apparent. More recently, Vittori et al. [1999] proposed a morphodynamic instability mechanism resulting in the formation of crescentic patterns. Such an approach considers normally incident waves and results in the appearance of rhythmic features offshore of the breaking area so that the direct influence of a moving breaking line is not considered.

The purpose of the present paper is to present a first detailed investigation of bed-surf interaction as a source of morphodynamic instability. In fact, this paper is the natural continuation of Falques et al. [1999a] who showed that there were not purely hydrodynamic instabilities in the case of normal incidence unless wave-current or bed-surf interactions were taken into account. We will concentrate here on a single bed-surf effect: wave energy redistribution in the surf zone which is believed to be the major source of bed-surf interaction at an initial stage. This analysis shows that even with this rather simplified modeling, morphodynamic instability indeed develops and produces bed forms that compare well with features that can occur on natural beaches. Furthermore, this study suggests some interesting links between morphological patterns and sediment transport modes. The effect of the variation of the breaking point due to the bed forms, always disregarded in previous studies concerning morphodynamic instabilities in the nearshore region [Hino, 1974; Christensen et al., 1994; Vittori et al., 1999], will be also investigated, and the importance of such a localized effect will be considered in detail. On the other hand, wave refraction will be neglected here and its effect left for further research. Also, the present study is restricted to the case of nonbarred beaches and to only the initial growth of the perturbations.

In section 2 we present the theoretical setting of morphodynamic stability. In section 3 we give some general properties of the instability and investigate the physical mechanisms. This is done by analytical tools and by considering an idealized situation. In section 4 we present numerical simulations under the hypothesis of a fixed breaking line. In section 5 we present numerical experiments in case of more realistic conditions that include a varying breaking line. In section 6 we give a brief summary, some discussion, and a comparison with natural morphological patterns. Three appendixes are included, one on the sediment transport parameterization, the second on some mathematical developments, and the third on the parameterization of the moving breaking line.

2. Governing Equations and Stability Analysis

2.1. Governing Equations

We consider a rectilinear beach with a shoreline given by the \( y \) axis and with a topography given by \( z = z_b(x, y, t) \), where \( x \) is the cross-shore coordinate and \( z \) is the vertical one (positive upward, see Figure 1). The two-dimensional horizontal nearshore hydrodynamics on timescales larger than the incident waves proceed from depth-averaged momentum and mass conservation and read

\[
\frac{\partial v_i}{\partial t} + v_j \frac{\partial v_i}{\partial x_j} = -g z_{x,i} - \frac{1}{\rho D} (\tau_i + S v_{i,j}) \\
+ \frac{1}{D}[v D(v_{i,j} + v_{j,i}), j] = \frac{\partial D}{\partial t} + (D v_j), j = 0
\]  

(1)

(2)

Here \( v = (v_1, v_2) \) is the depth-averaged horizontal ve-
Figure 1: Sketch of the geometry and coordinate system.

Figure 1:

Locality, \( x_1 = x, \ x_2 = y \), and repeated indexes are assumed to be summed. The derivative with respect to \( x_i \) has been indicated by the subindex \( i \). The total depth is \( D = z_s - z_b \), where \( z_s(x, y, t) \) stands for the free surface elevation. The bottom shear stress is \( \tau \), and the water density is \( \rho \). The lateral mixing from wave breaking turbulence is parameterized by means of the eddy viscosity coefficient \( \nu(x) \). The forcing from incident waves is given by the radiation stresses, which read

\[
S_{ij} = \left[ \frac{k_i k_j}{k^2} + \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ij} \right] E \quad i, j = 1, 2
\]

where \( k \) and \( E \) are the wave number and the energy of incident waves, respectively [Horikawa, 1988]. Since we are dealing with shallow water waves, the phase and the group celerities are assumed to coincide approximately, \( c_p = c_g = c \). The morphological evolution is given by the sediment conservation equation

\[
\frac{\partial z_b}{\partial t} + q_{j,j} = 0,
\]

where \( q(v, z_b) \) is the horizontal sediment flux vector.

2.2. Basic state

We now consider regular incident wind or swell waves approaching the beach normally with energy distribution \( E = E_0(x) \) and look for a basic undisturbed state, which is a steady and motionless solution of (1), (2), and (4), that is,

\[
v_1 = v_2 = 0 \quad z_s = \zeta_0(x) \quad z_b = -d_0(x)
\]

The radiation stresses will be of the form

\[
S_{xx} = \frac{3}{2} E_0(x), \quad S_{yy} = \frac{1}{2} E_0(x), \quad S_{xy} = 0.
\]

Furthermore, we will assume that both the bottom shear stress and the sediment flux are proportional to some power of the mean flow velocity. Therefore, since \( v = 0 \), the bottom friction and the sediment flux will vanish: \( \tau = 0 \), and \( q = 0 \). As a result, the cross-shore component of (1) reads

\[
g \frac{d z_b}{d x} = \frac{3}{2} \frac{1}{\rho d_0} \frac{d F_0}{d x},
\]

with the other governing equations being verified. Thus the basic undisturbed state is defined as a steady setup/setdown of the mean water level given by \( z_s = \zeta_0(x) \) over a fixed topography without mean motion.

2.3. Linear stability equations

Any departure from the basic planar topography will produce a modification of the incident wave field. The wave energy distribution will change, and as a result, the setup and the setdown of the basic state, \( \zeta_0(x) \), will not be in equilibrium any longer, and a mean flow will thus be generated. This flow will carry sediments so that the initial topographic disturbance will evolve. A morphodynamic loop will thus be formed, and if a positive feedback occurs, a new topography coupled to a horizontal circulation will develop in time. To look at this possibility, a small perturbation will be assumed on the topography and on the mean free surface:

\[
z_b(x, y, t) = -d_0(x) + h(x, y, t)
\]

\[
z_s(x, y, t) = \zeta_0(x) + \eta(x, y, t),
\]

and a small horizontal mean flow,

\[
v = (u(x, y, t), v(x, y, t)),
\]

will be assumed as well. We will look at the dynamics of these small perturbations by linearizing the governing equations (1), (2), and (4) with respect to them.

A difficult and crucial point is how this disturbance will affect the incident wave field. In a saturated surf zone this will be basically through three effects: wave energy redistribution, wave refraction by depth variations and currents, and the modification of the breaking point by growing shoals and pools at the breaking line. Both the wave refraction and the modification of the breaking point are first order effects (with respect to the perturbations). The influence of a varying breaking line will be analyzed in detail as will the importance of such a "localized" effect on the growth of morphological patterns. On the other hand, the effect of wave refraction, because diffused over much wider areas, will have assumed to be comparatively small, at least in a linear analysis, with respect to the other effects and will be neglected in this study. Thus we will keep waves approaching normally to the shore, while their energy will suffer small modifications because of depth variations. For this purpose [see also Falques et al., 1999a], we will assume that wave energy in the nearshore is a known function of the total depth:

\[
E = E(D).
\]

This allows us to describe one source of coupling between morphology and waves in a quite simple manner.
How wave refraction affects this mechanism is left for future research. Note that (10) is not valid in the case of barred beaches. Thus we will hereinafter assume a planar beach profile. Equation (10) can easily be determined for a saturated surf zone, where

$$E = \frac{1}{8} \rho g^2 \gamma_0^2 D^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

is usually assumed with $\gamma_0 \approx 1$ being a breaking index. The Green's law for wave amplitude in the shoaling zone is also in accordance with the form of (10) [Mei, 1989].

Sediment transport parameterization is another important point. The sediment flux is usually parameterized as being proportional to some power $m$ of the mean flow and the wave orbital velocity. Since there is no flow in the basic state, the sediment transport in the perturbed state will be proportional to the power $m$ of $v$ which is first order. Then, if $m > 1$, the linearized problem would have no sediment transport. Therefore we will assume that $m = 1$ in our linear analysis, and we will leave for future research the nonlinear problem, checking the robustness of the instability mechanism to the choice of $m$. Thus we will assume that

$$q = \hat{\alpha}(x)v - \hat{\gamma}(x)\nabla h.$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

This linear parameterization of sediment transport can be interpreted as the sediment's being stirred by wave motion and then advected by the mean current. Thus $\alpha(x)$ is a wave stirring coefficient, which is expected to have a cross-shore gradient (see Appendix A). Furthermore, because of both wave oscillations and wave-breaking turbulence, any bump superimposed on the nearshore sea bottom will be potentially smoothed out if no positive feedback occurs into the water motion. This is parameterized through a morphodynamic diffusion coefficient $\gamma(x)$ in (12).

Bottom shear stress will also be parameterized as being proportional to the mean flow through a coefficient that depends on the wave orbital velocity $U_0$:

$$\frac{\tau_{bx}}{\rho D} = \mu_x u, \quad \frac{\tau_{by}}{\rho D} = \mu_y v,$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

where $\mu_x = 2\mu_y = 4c_f U_0/(\pi D_0)$ and where, in the surf zone, $U_0 = (\gamma_0/2)^{1/2}\sqrt{gD_0}$ [Horskaowa, 1988]. Here $c_f$ is the drag coefficient that relates the instantaneous bottom shear stress to the squared instantaneous velocity $\tau = \rho c_f v^2$. The momentum diffusion in the surf zone will be parameterized as

$$\nu(x) = Nz \sqrt{gD}$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

and as an exponential decay beyond the breaking line. The constant $N$ is estimated to range between 0.01 and 0.06 [Bowen and Inman, 1972] although smaller values have also been suggested [Longuet-Higgins, 1970a, b].

Now we are going to introduce a scaling. The width of the surf zone, $X_b$, is chosen as the horizontal length scale and a vertical length scale $\beta X_b$ will be introduced where $\beta$ is some mean slope of the basic topography $O(dh/dx) = \beta$. An arbitrary velocity scale $U$ is also considered. The natural timescale for hydrodynamics is then $X_b/U$. However, morphological evolution is much slower, with a timescale $T$ that will be defined later. We will have $\epsilon = (X_b/U)/T \ll 1$. Then we will define the nondimensional variables as:

$$(x, y) = X_b(x', y'), \quad h = \beta X_b h', \quad D_0 = \beta X_b D_0'$$

$$(u, v) = U(u', v'), \quad \eta = \frac{U^2}{g} \eta', \quad t = T't'.$$

Hereinafter primes will be dropped for simplicity. Then the linearized nondimensional form of the governing equations (1) and (2) in the surf zone will read

\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \mu_x u + (1 + \frac{3}{8} \gamma_0^2) \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} - V_x = \frac{3}{8} \gamma_0^2 \frac{\partial h}{\partial x}, \quad (15) \\
\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + \mu_y v + (1 + \frac{1}{8} \gamma_0^2) \frac{\partial h}{\partial y} - V_y = \frac{1}{8} \gamma_0^2 \frac{\partial h}{\partial y}, \quad (16) \\
\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(F^2 \eta - h) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(D_0 u) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y}(D_0 v) - 0, \quad (17)
\end{align*}

where a Froude number $F = U/\sqrt{g \beta X_b}$ has been introduced and $\mu_x = \mu_x X_b/U$ and $\mu_y = \mu_y X_b/U$ have been defined. The nondimensional coefficients $\mu_x$ and $\mu_y$ depend on the drag coefficient $c_f$ through $r = c_f/\beta$, which will be adopted as the frictional parameter for our simulations [see Falqués et al., 1996a]. Notice that the same equations will be valid out of the surf zone, but, since there are no perturbations on the radiation stress, $\gamma_0$ must be substituted by 0. The momentum diffusion terms read

\begin{align*}
V_x &= \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(\nu D_0 \frac{\partial u}{\partial x}\right) + \nu \frac{\partial}{\partial y}\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial x}\right) \\
V_y &= \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(\nu D_0 \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial x}\right) + 2\nu \frac{\partial v}{\partial y}.
\end{align*}

Equations (15)-(16) describe the linearized momentum balance only in the case of a fixed breaking line. As shown in Appendix C, a moving breaking line changes the linearization of the cross-shore momentum balance.

To scale the sediment conservation equation (4), we first define a nondimensional wave-stirring coefficient:

$$\hat{\alpha}(x) = \frac{\alpha(x)}{\alpha},$$

where $\alpha(x)$ is now order one. By carrying out the scaling of (4) the coefficient $UT\alpha/\beta X_b$ appears in front of $\alpha(x)$ in the divergence of the sediment flux. Therefore, if we want significant morphological changes during one time unit, we must choose a morphological timescale

$$T = \beta X_b^2/U \hat{\alpha}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (18)

Then, from (4) the bottom evolution equation becomes

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(\alpha u) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y}(\alpha v) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(\gamma h \frac{\partial h}{\partial x}\right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y}\left(\gamma h \frac{\partial h}{\partial y}\right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (19)

where $\gamma = \gamma T/X_b^2$. 


Now, in case of a fixed breaking line the linear stability analysis proceeds in its standard way by assuming alongshore periodic perturbations of the form

\[ [u(x, y, t), v(x, y, t), \eta(x, y, t), h(x, y, t)] = \Re \{e^{\sigma t + ik y} [\tilde{u}(x), \tilde{v}(x), \tilde{\eta}(x), \tilde{h}(x)] \}, \]  
(20)

where \(2\pi/k\) is its alongshore wavelength and \(\sigma\) is its growth rate. By inserting this form of the solution into the system of the governing equations (15), (16), (17) and (19) an eigenproblem is obtained, where \(\sigma\) is the eigenvalue and \((\tilde{u}(x), \tilde{v}(x), \tilde{\eta}(x), \tilde{h}(x))\) is the eigenfunction. Its structure is the same as that of (15), (16), (17) and (19) but with the substitutions of \(\partial/\partial t\) by \(\sigma\) and \(\partial/\partial y\) by \(ik\).

A spectral numerical technique based on the use of rational Chebyshev functions has been applied in order to solve the eigenvalue problem posed by the linear stability analysis. This method has already been successfully applied to other morphodynamical models (see, for instance, Falqués et al. [1996a, b]) where a description of the technique can also be found) and allows for the determination, for a given wavenumber, of as many eigenvalues as the number of discretization points. The numerical model that solves the present eigenproblem is called morfo13. The relevant morphodynamic instability modes have real \(\sigma\) in this case. This means a growth (if \(\sigma > 0\)) in place without migration. The model is also able, however, to describe purely hydrodynamic modes like edge waves. In this case the imaginary part of \(\sigma\) is the frequency, and it gives the alongshore phase speed. The relevant extension of the model, taking into account the effect of a moving breaking line, is described in detail in Appendix C.

3. Analysis of the Instability Mechanism

In sections 4 and 5, the use of the numerical model morfo13 will show that morphodynamic instability indeed develops, and the properties of such a process will be explored for quite realistic conditions. However, the use of analytical tools, when possible and perhaps in very idealized situations, gives a better understanding of the outputs of the numerical models and a higher confidence in them. This section is devoted to some analytical developments concerning the bed-surf interaction.

3.1. Bottom Evolution Equation

A very useful tool for analyzing morphodynamic instabilities is a bottom evolution equation where only the cross-shore flow component is involved [Falqués et al., 1996a]. This form of equation can easily be obtained by substituting \(\partial v/\partial y\) from the mass conservation equation (17) into the sediment conservation equation (19). Since the morphologic evolution is much slower than the fluid motions, we can safely consider \(\epsilon = 0\) in this section. Then the bottom evolution equation will read

\[ \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \gamma \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( \gamma \frac{\partial h}{\partial y} \right) = -u \frac{d}{dx} \ln \left( \frac{\alpha}{D_0} \right). \]  
(21)

The conditions leading to the instability are immediately found from (21). The growth of any hec form requires \(\partial h/\partial t > 0\), where \(h > 0\), and \(\partial h/\partial t < 0\), where \(h < 0\). In the linear theory each of these conditions implies the other. So, let us examine when the first condition occurs. The second and the third terms on the left-hand side are diffusive so that they play just a damping role, and any instability will be related to the right-hand term. Thus, since \(\alpha > 0\), instability requires that

\[ u \frac{d}{dx} \ln \left( \frac{\alpha}{D_0} \right) < 0, \]  
(22)

where \(h > 0\), that is, over the shoals. This means that the shoals grow if the cross-shore flow opposes the gradient of the \(\alpha(x)/D_0(x)\) function. In other words, if the stirring function increases seaward faster (slower) than the water depth, the growth of bed forms needs a shoreward (seaward) flow over the shoals.

This can be understood as follows. Assume first a constant \(\alpha\). A seaward flow over a sloping beach has to converge in order to preserve mass, as the depth is increasing in the direction of the water motion. Since \(\alpha\) is constant, this implies a convergence of sediments and therefore sedimentation. Assume now a constant depth but an increasing wave stirring \(\alpha\) and assume again a seaward flow. Its divergence will now vanish. However, given a control volume, the sediment concentration will be smaller at its shoreward side than at its seaward side. Therefore more sediment will go out than will enter the control volume, so erosion will occur. Thus we get two counteracting effects, one related to the gradients in the depth, \(D_0(x)\), and the other related to the gradients in the stirring function, \(\alpha(x)\).

To conclude this stability analysis, we now need to know, for any given topographic pattern, whether the cross shore flow will be seaward or shoreward over the shoals. This requires solving the flow equations (15), (16) and (17) for a given bottom perturbation \(h\), that is, the "flow over topography problem" (FOT problem).

3.2. FOT Problem

In this section and in section 3.3 the variations of the breaker line will be disregarded. We will assume that the bottom perturbation and the flow related to it are alongshore periodic; that is, we will assume the form given by (30). Lateral momentum mixing will be neglected here since it is not essential for the instability mechanism. Its effects will be investigated numerically in section 5. Also, the quasi-steady approximation, \(\epsilon = 0\), will be adopted as in the section 3.1. For simplicity the hats on \(u, v, \eta\) and \(h\) are dropped. With all these assumptions, and defining the parameters \(m = \frac{1}{\delta} \), \(s = \frac{\gamma^2}{\delta \rho^2}\),
In this study we assume a shoal with a monotonically decreasing amplitude seaward, $\partial h/\partial x < 0$. Then, according to (27) the cross-shore velocity is shoreward ($u < 0$) everywhere on the shoal. Indeed, assume that there was a cross-shore location $x = x_3$, where $u(x_3) > 0$. Then, by continuity, there would exist $x_1'$ and $x_2'$ such that $\infty > x_2' > x_3 > x_1' > 0$ such that $u(x_1') = u(x_2') = 0$ and $u(x) > 0$ for all $x_1' > x > x_1'$. In this case, (27) would not be satisfied. Therefore such a shoal would produce a shoreward current (and of course, because of the alongshore periodicity, a seaward current in the troughs between shoals). Then, according to the bottom evolution equation (21), since $\alpha/D_0$ is an increasing function, an inshore flow over the shoals will produce a growth of such shoals (see Figure 2). Thus the motionless equilibrium on a plane sloping beach would be unstable with respect to this kind of topographic perturbations. Of course, this depends on the basic assumption of an ever increasing $\alpha/D_0$ function, which is not realistic. By numerical simulation we will see that the topographic and flow patterns emerging

![Figure 2. Sketch of the bed-surf instability mechanism in the idealized case of a monotonically increasing $\alpha/D_0$ function.](image-url)

### 3.3. The Instability Mechanism in a Simple Case

We now turn to a simple idealized situation where morphodynamic instability can be predicted by the analytical tools developed in sections 3.1 and 3.2. The basic assumption now is that $\alpha/D_0$ is a monotonically increasing function. This may be realistic in the surf zone but not beyond the breaking line. However, this case provides an example of how bed-surf interaction can indeed lead to morphodynamic instability. More realistic situations will be dealt with in sections 4 and 5 by means of numerical experiments. The example we now describe provides some confidence in the numerical model set up to solve the instability equations in realistic conditions.
from the instability are very sensitive to the sediment transport parameterization.

4. Numerical Simulation With a Fixed Breaking Line

The previously described eigenvalue problem has been solved numerically in order to assess the sensitivity of the morphodynamic instabilities and their alongshore spacing to parameters such as the bottom friction, the eddy viscosity, and the morphodynamic diffusion. The numerical model has also been used to evaluate the sensitivity of the results to the quasi-steady hypothesis and the convergence of the numerical solution for a different number of discretization points. Finally, the dependence of the results on the way the stirring function is parameterized in the sediment transport formulation has been carefully analyzed. A plane sloping beach has been assumed through all the numerical simulations.

Physically realistic ranges of parameter values have been used. The parameter related to the bottom friction, \( r \), has been varied between 0.01 and 0.5, and that representing the eddy viscosity, \( N \), has been varied between 0.001 and 0.02. For the morphodynamic diffusion parameter \( \gamma \), a profile changing with the cross-shore velocity gradients has been considered with a maximum value ranging between 0.01 and 0.1, chosen at the beginning of the simulation. Values of these parameters from out of the defined range have sometimes been used in order to understand their effect and importance for the growth of the instability. The simulations show robustness toward all the parameters concerning hydrodynamic and morphodynamic behavior but a very strong dependence on the form of the stirring function \( \alpha \) used in the sediment transport formulation. For this reason, results will be analyzed separately for a series of qualitatively distinct forms of the stirring function \( \alpha(x) \).

4.1. Crescentic Bar Pattern

For simplicity the first case analyzed is a stirring function \( \alpha(x) \) quadratically increasing from a small shoreline value to the breaking line. Seaward of the surf zone, the stirring function is kept constant and equal to the value at the breaking line (simulations have also been run with an exponential decrease beyond the breaking line, but the results are not significantly affected by such a change). Figure 3 shows a typical growth rate curve (the real part of the frequency \( \sigma \)) for a defined and realistic set of the parameters. In general, results are quite robust and indicate an along-shore spacing of the resulting features between 3 and 5 times the width of the surf zone. Significantly different values are obtained only when the input parameters are extended toward non-realistic values. A feature that all these simulations as well as most of the ones that will be shown in the following sections, have in common is the lack of other modes displaying unstable wavenumbers (\( \sigma > 0 \)). Other modes are obviously present, but they are all characterized by negative growth rates unless unrealistically low values for the parameters related to the damping of the topography (bed friction and diffusivity) are chosen.

The typical perturbation pattern and the related flow pattern are shown in Figure 4. Because of the linear analysis, the amplitude of the topographic disturbance is arbitrary. A 3-D view is given in Figure 5 that clearly shows the presence of periodic features, resembling what in the literature have been defined as crescentic bars [Bowen and Inman, 1971; Lippmann and Holman, 1990], around the breaking line. A form of "mirroring effect" offshore of the breaking line is also present such that opposite to deposition, an area of erosion is present and vice versa. In agreement with the theoretical analysis of section 3, the flow pattern is such that onshore flow is present over the shoals and offshore flow is present over the troughs within the surf zone, where \( \alpha/D \) increases. Beyond the breaking line the opposite occurs since \( \alpha/D \) decreases.

Simulations have also been performed with a sediment transport parameterization that is very similar to the approach given by Bowen [1980] and Baudard [1981]. As shown in Appendix A, this results in a stirring coefficient and in a morphodynamic diffusion increasing inside the surf zone as offshore distance to a power of 3/2 and 5/2, respectively, and decreasing out of the surf zone to a power of \(-9/4\) and \(-15/4\), respectively. The pattern obtained through this simulation is qualitatively similar to that for the quadratic function of offshore distance. The only difference is that the growth rate is smaller than that shown in Figures 4 and 5. The use of such exponents should not be considered as an attempt to obtain more realistic results but an attempt to indicate the robustness of the results and the possible link to already accepted approaches.

![Figure 3. Nondimensional growth rate \( \sigma \) as a function of nondimensional alongshore wavenumber \( k \) in the case of \( r = 0.1, N = 0.01, \gamma = 0.02, \) and \( \alpha(0) = 0.1 \)](image-url)
4.2. Giant Cusp Pattern

So far, we have considered only a sediment transport stirring function \( \alpha(x) \), which increases through the surf zone. The use of a constant value of \( \alpha \) throughout the whole cross-shore section does not affect the process generating the instability, and compared to the previously analyzed case, results seem to indicate a higher variability of the wavelength such that the spacing of the bed forms may vary between 2 and 8 times the width of the surf zone (see, e.g. Figure 6).

The difference between an increasing \( \alpha(x) \) and a constant \( \alpha(x) \) is much more evident when the bottom perturbation and the flow pattern are analyzed (Figure 7). For constant \( \alpha \) the shape of the bottom perturbation now extends to the shoreline and is not restricted to the region around the breaking line. Also, the mirroring effect present for the case of a varying stirring coefficient is not now present, as can be clearly seen from the 3-D view given in Figure 8. The flow (Figure 7) is offshore over the shoals so that the final pattern, for both flow and topography, is very similar to that related to rip currents and giant cusps as reported by different authors [Shepard, 1963; Komar, 1971]. This is again in accordance with the theoretical analysis in section 3 since \( \alpha/D \) is now decreasing through the surf zone. The case of constant \( \alpha \) does not present any other mode characterized by a positive growth.

As an example of a stirring coefficient \( \alpha(x) \) that is decreasing from the shoreline, an exponentially decaying form has also been studied. As discussed in Appendix A, such runs might simulate conditions where reflection at the shoreline or infragravity motions are predominant. The morphology resulting from such sim-
Figure 6. Nondimensional growth rate $\sigma$ as a function of nondimensional alongshore wavenumber $k$ in the case of $r = 0.1, N = 0.01, \gamma = 0.02$, and $\alpha(x) = \text{const.}$

5. Numerical Simulations Including Breaking Line Variation

The introduction of a moving breaking line, described in detail in Appendix C, has a significant effect on the formation of morphological patterns in the nearshore region. Not only the growth rates but also the existence of the patterns can significantly depend on the inclusion of a moving breaking line in the model. For this reason the flow patterns produced by the topographic perturbations previously obtained have been considered in order to check if a further finite development is possible or if any growth of the features is prevented. The study of the wave-driven flow over a given small topographic perturbation has been achieved by solving the linear FOT problem (equation 26) for a fixed $\theta$.

5.1. Crescentic Bar Pattern

The influence of a varying breaker on the crescentic bar pattern appears to be limited. Growth rates slightly decrease, but the pattern appears to be very stable. A sensitivity analysis has been performed in order to check the variations in the growth rates with changing parameters. The results, shown in Figure 9, clearly indicate the presence of a maximum characterized by a wavelength around twice the width of the surf zone. In particular, Figure 9 (a), shows the variations induced by using different values of the friction parameter $r$. Evidently such changes only affect the maximum growth rate but not the wavelength of such a maximum. Furthermore, in reality the value of $r$ should be considered quite constant, and a value of 0.1 seems to be acceptable. Variations in the momentum diffusion $N$ and morphodynamic diffusion $\gamma$ have relative importance in the growth of the instability (Figures 9b and 9c respectively). As expected, the higher their values the smaller the perturbation growth rates. Another interesting result that has revealed its consistency throughout all the simulations, with and without the inclusion of the breaking line effect, concerns the quasi-steady hypothesis. The model, in fact, allows this hypothesis to

Figure 7. Topographic perturbation and flow pattern ($k = 3.0, r = 0.5, N = 0.01, \gamma = 0.02$, and $\alpha(x) = \text{const.})$. Shoals are white, and deeper areas are shaded. The shoreline is at $x = 0.0$, and the breaking line is at $x = 1.0$. 
Figure 8. A 3-D view of the topographic perturbation (basic slope and perturbation amplitude have chosen arbitrarily) for $k = 3.0$, $r = 0.5$, $N = 0.01$, $\gamma = 0.02$, and $\alpha(x) = \text{const}$. The shoreline is at $x = 0.0$, and the breaking line is at $x = 1.0$.

Figure 9. Effects of (a) friction $r$, (b) momentum diffusion $N$, (c) morphodynamic diffusion $\gamma$, (d) $\epsilon$ parameter, and (c) and (f) stirring function on crescentic pattern growth rates. Default parameters are $r = 0.1$, $N = 0.01$, $\gamma = 0.02$, $\epsilon = 0.01$, $\alpha(0) = 0.1$, and $p = 2$. 
be verified by changing the value of the previously defined coefficient $\epsilon$. Figure 9d shows that the adoption of relatively small values ($\epsilon = 0.01$) results in an instability curve that does not differ much (< 2%) from $\epsilon = 0$. This is because the instability is on a morphological scale that is much larger than the hydrodynamical one so that the fluid adjusts instantaneously to the topographic changes. However, differences appear, though primarily more in the magnitude of the growth rate than in the wavelength, when comparable values are used for the morphological and hydrodynamical timescale (i.e., $\epsilon = 0.1$). Figures 9e and 9f are instead related to the sensitivity of the instability toward the parameterization of the stirring function. The usual form considered through the simulations is given by a quadratically increasing expression with a small nonzero value at the shoreline ($\alpha(0) = 0.1$). Variations in the shoreline value are shown in Figure 9e and, intriguingly, indicate a dependency of such a value also on the spacing of the features. As expected, higher shoreline values of the stirring coefficient, and so tending toward a constant profile, result in smaller growth rates, and for values $\alpha(0) > 0.3$, no instability is present. As previously indicated, a quadratic expression has been used in order to describe the stirring coefficient throughout the surf zone. The use of other exponents, here indicated with the letter $p$, results in strong variations in the growth rates which increase with higher powers (Figure 9f). The variation of the stirring coefficient profile offshore of the breaking line has also been investigated by using a constant value (equal to the one at the breaking line) or exponentially decreasing function. Results indicate that the growth rates are independent from the variation of the stirring function profile offshore of the breaking line.

5.2. Giant Cusp Pattern

Surprisingly, when the breaker line variations due to the perturbations in the water level and in the topography are included, the model does not predict any instability in the case of a constant stirring function. This is the case also for the other choices of the stirring function that for fixed breaker line produced the growth of the giant cusp pattern (like those exponentially decaying from the shoreline). Therefore, the movement of the breaker line inhibits the formation of the giant cusp pattern.

In order to understand this behavior, the circulation produced by the giant cusp topography was investigated by solving the FOT problem in the case including breaker line variations. As can be seen in Figure 10, a strong onshore current is created over the transverse bars while rip currents appear in the troughs. So, the flow pattern is reversed with respect to the case where the breaker line is kept fixed (Figure 7), and the cross-shore flow component has now the same direction as the gradient in $\alpha(x)/D_0(x)$. Therefore, in accordance with the bottom evolution equation (21) the bottom perturbation tends to decay, as predicted by the stability analysis.

The flow reversal can be understood as follows. The transverse bars crossing the breaker line produce a wa-
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**Figure 10.** Linearized flow pattern over a fixed small-amplitude cuspate topography including the effect of the breaking line variation (solution of the linear FOT problem). Shoals are white, and deeper areas are shaded (shoreline at $x = 0.0$).
ter depth reduction, so that the breaker line moves seaward. This implies that the surf zone extension is increased and that waves that were not breaking in the basic state are now breaking in this new portion of surf zone. This produces a strong additional shorward force that is capable of reversing the current. Similarly, an additional seaward force is created in between the bars. Figure 10 also shows how the onshore force due to the moving breaker line produces a strong increase (decrease) of setup over the bars (troughs).

Since the flow is onshore over the transverse bars, according to the predictions of section 3 this topographic pattern should grow if we assume an \( \alpha(x)/D_0(x) \) function that increases seaward. However, the only unstable mode in this case is the crescentic pattern. The explanation for this is that any pattern that arises as a growing linear eigenmode has not only a positive growth rate but also (by definition) a uniform growth rate. According to the bottom evolution equation (21) this implies that \( h \) should be proportional to \( |w_a| d \sqrt{\alpha(x)/D_0}|dz| \). This condition is not met in the case of the giant cusp pattern since the maximum sediment transport would be located where the perturbation is relatively small.

In order to make a comparison with the behavior of the giant cusp pattern we also include a similar POT simulation for the crescentic pattern topography. The circulation and the free surface elevation are shown in Figure 11. There is an offshore flow over the shoals out of the surf zone and an onshore flow over the shoals within the surf zone. Comparison with Figure 4 reveals that this flow is almost the same as that observed in the case of a fixed breaker line. This is due to the fact that the crescentic pattern consists of alternating shoals and pools on both sides of the breaker line, so that the bathymetric perturbation vanishes at the breaker line. Therefore there is no perturbation of the breaker line, so the flow remains unchanged.

6. Discussion

Perturbations of the incident wave radiation stress induced by the topographic irregularities in a saturated surf zone can drive a cellular flow with a sediment transport pattern that is able to reinforce the bottom perturbations. In this way a positive feedback that leads to the coupled growth of nearshore large-scale bed forms and horizontal circulation with rip currents may occur. Basically, two instability modes may appear depending upon the form of the sediment stirring function \( \alpha(x) \). The perturbation in water depth due to the instabilities produces a shift in the breaking line. Such an effect had not been accounted for in earlier similar studies. The present research has considered both fixed and varying breaking line cases.

For an \( \alpha \) function with a significant increase seaward across the surf zone a "crescentic pattern" is generated. This consists of alternating shoals and pools on both sides of the breaking line, showing a mirroring effect. The associated flow pattern extends through the whole surf zone but has its maximum strength at the vortices developed around the breaking line. The alongshore wavelength of such features ranges between 3 and 5 times the surf zone width \( X_0 \) and depends on the bot-
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**Figure 11.** Linearized flow pattern over a fixed small amplitude crescentic bar topography including the effect of the breaking line variation (solution of the linear POT problem). Shoals are white, and deeper areas are shaded (shoreline at \( x = 0.0 \)).
tom friction, lateral momentum diffusion, and morphological diffusion, which have a damping effect. However, for realistic values of the damping parameters, growth rates are usually positive. This instability mode turns out to be essentially unaffected by the variations of the breaking line.

An interesting issue following these results is the shape of the crescentic pattern obtained in the present study, which is very similar to the one obtained by Vitieri et al. [1999]. This is striking since their analysis aims to features outside the surf zone and the mean flow is generated by a very different mechanism (synchronous edge waves). However, a closer look reveals that this is not so surprising as they adopt the same sediment transport parameterization with a similar structure for the stirring function. Once again, we obtain a confirmation of something that can be unexpected at first sight: the coastal self-organization is often dominated by the sediment transport mode rather than by the mean hydrodynamics. This is clearly the case for the present investigation, where the emerging topography and the flow pattern depend ultimately on the distribution of wave stirring on the sediment. Another example is the orientation of oblique bars with respect to the coastline, upcurrent or downcurrent, which could sometimes depend on the $\alpha(x)$ function [Falqués et al., 1999b].

An indication of the order of magnitude of the growth time of these features can be obtained from our morphological time scaling defined in (18). According to the data reported by Antsyferov and Kosyan [1990] or by Russell [1993], 5 kg m$^{-3}$ seems to be an appropriate order of magnitude of the suspended sediment concentration. Assuming a reference depth of 0.5 m, we then have $\bar{\alpha} \sim 10^{-3}$ m. The velocity scale can be calculated from the Froude number we used in the computations, $F = 0.12$, so that $U = 0.12\sqrt{g\beta X_b}$. Thus we find the estimate

$$T_{gro} \sim 2.6 \times 10^2 \beta^{1/2} X_b^{3/2} \sigma^{-1}.$$  

By assuming a nondimensional growth rate of $\sigma \sim 1$, a beach slope of $\beta \sim 0.05$, and a surf zone width of $X_b \sim 10$ m, the features, whose wavelength would be $\sim 30$ m, would grow significantly within some 5 hours. According to this, bed forms for $X_b \sim 5$ m, would grow within 1.8 hours, while very large bed forms for $X_b \sim 20$ m would not grow significantly until some 14 hours. These features seem very sensible and perhaps suggest that the larger scale bed forms are not observed very often perhaps because of the fact that their growth time is longer than the typical time scale of the variability of wave conditions.

Alternatively, for an $\alpha$ function more or less constant or even decreasing seaward across the surf zone, a "giant cusp pattern" occurs if the breaking line is considered to be fixed. This consists of transverse bars attached to the shoreline and extending across the whole surf zone. The associated circulation has offshore flow over the crests and a return flow in between. The alongshore spacing between the bars is $\sim 2$ and 8 times $X_b$, typically somewhat shorter than the wavelength of the crescentic pattern. However, the breaking line displacement has a strong impact on this instability mode so that the associated flow pattern becomes reversed, the currents now being onshore at the crests and offshore at the troughs. Therefore, the circulation causes a damping of the bed forms whose growth becomes now inhibited. Which flow pattern results in the formation and development of giant cusps remains unclear, as is also testified to by the contradictions present in the literature (for a review, see, e.g., Carter [1988, p.120]). The possibility that the flow pattern providing the initial growth of the features differs from the one observed over finite amplitude features, where other effects like wave refraction [Nederoda and Tanner, 1970] can become dominant, has to be considered.

The dependence of the instability modes upon the wave-stirring distribution suggests that crescentic patterns are likely to occur under relatively low wave conditions, while in principle, giant cusp patterns would be more likely under high wave conditions, when reflected long-period motion becomes significant. However, the varying breaking line effects rule out this latter possibility. Therefore we should conclude in agreement with Carter [1988] that the generation of giant cusps and more in general transverse bars, although observed in several circumstances, still remains something of an "enigma." Thus morphodynamic instabilities of an unbounded coast in case of normal wave incidence deserves further research.

The most obvious limitation of the present analysis is the assumption of regular waves, which results in a nonsmooth wave energy distribution. This introduces a singularity in the linear stability analysis and makes the mathematical procedure seem somewhat artificial. However, even with the common smooth energy distributions in the case of random waves, there are strong changes in the energy gradient at the location where the majority of the waves start to break. Therefore, even though there is no singularity in this case, there are strong variations in wave forcing with respect to the basic equilibrium in a narrow region. Thus the present idealized analysis seems to be representative of more realistic conditions.

Another limitation is the assumption that long-period motion is simply a stirring mechanism affecting the results only through $\alpha$ neglects its direct contribution to the hydrodynamics. Direct influence through the bottom shear stress (equation 13) is not expected to be qualitatively significant (see Figure 9). However, work is in progress to add long-period motion to the coupling of incident waves and sediment response to determine its effect on the morphodynamic instabilities discussed in this paper.

We should finally mention that the present study has been based on the assumption of a sediment transport
related only to the mean flow. The transport directly related to the waves should be also considered in future research through suitable parameterizations of undertow, wave asymmetry, etc.

The effect of incident wave refraction by the growing bed forms and the currents on the instability mechanism has been neglected. We do not think that this effect has a significant influence at the initial stage. However, as suggested by Niedoroda and Tanner [1970], it can be very important for the finite amplitude development of these features. This requires a nonlinear stability analysis, which is now under way. This kind of study of the finite amplitude evolution will also allow for the investigation of a different sediment transport, nonlinear in the mean flow. This will permit checking of the robustness of the crescentic pattern, gaining of new insight into the giant cusp pattern, and looking for possible subcritical finite amplitude instabilities.

Appendix A

In this appendix we show the link between the sediment transport parameterization described through (12) and other already accepted models based on an energetics approach. Bovens [1980] applied the Bagnold [1963] energetics equation to the case of a sinusoidal wave velocity and a much smaller mean flow and showed that the net sediment transport rate for both suspended and bedload transport takes the same form as (12). In particular, the suspended sediment transport rate takes the form

\[ q = \frac{16\varepsilon_c c_f \rho}{3\pi w} \left( uU_0^3 + \frac{\beta}{5w} U_0^5 \right), \]

where \( \varepsilon_c \) is the suspended sediment transport efficiency, \( c_f \) is the drag coefficient, \( \rho \) is the water density, \( w \) is the settling velocity, \( \beta \) is the slope, \( U_0 \) is the maximum wave orbital velocity, and \( u \) is the steady current. A comparison between such a formulation and that given in (12) implies that

\[ \alpha(x) = C_1 U_0^3 \gamma(x) = -\frac{C_1}{5w} U_0^5, \]

while inside the surf zone:

\[ \alpha(x) = C_1 c_2 x^{3/2} x^{-3/2} \gamma(x) = -\frac{C_1}{5w} c_2 x^{5/2} x^{-9/2}. \]

These are the functions of \( x \) that have been modeled in this paper.

The case of \( \alpha(x) \) and \( \gamma(x) \) increasing toward the shoreline is related to the possibility of an environment dominated by the presence of edge wave motions. The edge wave theory is already well established [Eckart, 1951; Ursell, 1952] and for the present purposes it is important to note only that a standing edge wave in shallow water has a velocity potential given by

\[ \Phi = \frac{g a_n}{\omega} L_n(2kx)e^{-kx} \cos ky \cos \omega t, \]

where \( a_n \) is the amplitude of order \( n \), \( \omega \) is the frequency, \( L_n(2kx) \) is the Laguerre polynomial of order \( n \), \( x \) and \( y \) are the horizontal coordinates in the offshore and along shore direction, \( t \) is the time, and \( k \) is the long-shore wavenumber of the edge wave. The cross-shore orbital velocity field is given by the gradient of the velocity potential, and it results in a cross-shore profile of the form

\[ u_c(x) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial (kx)} [L_n(2kx)e^{-kx}]. \]

In nature one would expect to find the coexistence of edge waves characterized by different modes and wavelengths. For example, Figure 12 shows the effect of superimposing the velocity squared of the first seven modes of an edge wave of arbitrary wavelength. The rapid increase toward the shoreline is at least qualitatively modeled by the exponential forms used in the simulations in this paper.

For suspended sediment transport the function \( \alpha \) in (12) models the cross-shore profile of the depth-integrated mean suspended sediment concentration. The
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Figure 12. The sum of squares of the cross-shore velocities (Y) for the first seven edge wave modes on a linear slope (arbitrary units; X indicates the cross-shore direction).
relatively small number of published observations of mean concentration in the nearshore zone confirm that this cross-shore profile can take any of the qualitatively different forms that have been used in this study. Antsyferov and Kos’yan [1990] show measurements from a natural beach under “relatively constant small swell” (estimated breaker height around 1 m), where mean concentrations increase seaward from near zero at the shoreline, reach a maximum at the breakpoint, and then decay farther seaward. This profile shape is qualitatively similar to the form of α that we have found to create crescentic topography (figure 4). On the other hand, observations described by Hwang et al. [1996], from a beach of mild slope and offshore wave heights of between 1.0 and 2.2 m, show almost constant concentration through the surf zone, a form found to create giant cusp topography (figure 7). The observations of Russell [1993], for a breaker height in excess of 3 m, suggest that during storm conditions the concentration can even increase toward the shoreline, a form that could potentially create giant cusp topography.

Breaking incident waves alone would be expected to result in concentrations that decrease toward the shore; the simple model of the stirring effect of breaking wave currents described here is in fair agreement with the observations of Antsyferov and Kos’yan [1990]. However, waves reflected at the beach would have significant amplitude at the shoreline. There is strong evidence that long-period reflected wave height and velocity increase approximately linearly with breakpoint wave height [Gaza and Thornton, 1982; Huntley et al., 1993]. Thus the cross-shore concentration profiles observed by Hwang et al. [1996] and Russell [1993] for larger incident waves heights may be the result of the addition of significant long wave stirring, with a profile that would generally increase toward the shoreline. In fact Russell [1993] shows that long wave motion was dominant for his observations from the inner surf zone.

### Appendix B

In this appendix we derive an integral identity and an inequality that are useful to show some of the properties of the solutions of the FOT equation (26) (flow over topography problem) in case of a fixed breaker line. To this end, let us multiply this equation by $D_0 u$ and choose two arbitrary cross-shore locations in the surf zone $1 \geq x_2 > x_1 \geq 0$ where the cross-shore velocity vanishes:

$$u(x_1) = u(x_2) = 0.$$ 

Then integration by parts leads to

$$
\int_{x_1}^{x_2} \frac{\mu_y}{D_0} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (D_0 u) \right]^2 dx + \frac{1 + m}{3m} k^2 \int_{x_1}^{x_2} \mu_x D_0 u^2 dx
$$

$$= \frac{2s}{1 + 3m} k^2 \int_{x_1}^{x_2} D_0 u \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} dx .
$$

If both cross-shore positions were out the surf zone, $x_2 > x_1 \geq 1$, one then would obtain

$$
\int_{x_1}^{x_2} \frac{\mu_y}{D_0} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (D_0 u) \right]^2 dx + k^2 \int_{x_1}^{x_2} \mu_x D_0 u^2 dx = 0 .
$$

Since $\mu_x, \mu_y, D_0 > 0$, it then follows that $u(x) = 0$ for $x_2 \geq x \geq x_1$. By taking $u(\infty) = 0$ and by choosing $x_2 \rightarrow \infty$, we then have $u(x) = 0$ for $x \geq x_2$. Finally, by continuity, $x_1$ can be lowered to the breaker line $x = 1$. Therefore either $u(x) = 0$ for all $x \geq 1$ or $u(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \geq 1$. Another possibility would be $x_2 > 1 > x_1 > 0$ with $x_2 \rightarrow \infty$. In this case we get

$$
\int_{x_1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_y}{D_0} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (D_0 u) \right]^2 dx + k^2 \frac{1 + m}{1 + 3m} \int_{x_1}^{1} \mu_x D_0 u^2 dx
$$

$$+ k^2 \int_{1}^{\infty} \mu_x D_0 u^2 dx = \frac{2s}{1 + 3m} k^2 \int_{x_1}^{1} D_0 u \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} dx .
$$

Therefore we conclude that

$$
\int_{x_1}^{x_2} D_0 u \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} dx > 0 \quad (B1)
$$

whenever $u(x_1) = 0$ and either $u(x_2) = 0$ or $x_2 - 1$.

### Appendix C

The model equations in case of a fixed breaker line presented in section 2 are now extended to allow for a variable breaker line. Since the position of the breaking line $x = X_b$ is defined by the condition

$$\gamma_h D(X_b) = H_b , \quad (C1)
$$

where $H_b$ is the wave height and $D(x)$ is the total water depth, the perturbations in water depth due to the instability result in a perturbation of the breaking line, $\Delta X_b(y, t)$. To first order in the perturbations, equation (C1) reads

$$\gamma_h [D_0(X_b) + \eta(X_b, y, t) - h(X_b, y, t)$$

$$+ D_0(x) \Delta X_b(y, t)] = H_b ,$$

so that

$$\Delta X_b = - \frac{\eta(X_b, y, t) - h(X_b, y, t)}{D_0(x)} \quad (C2)$$

as $H_b = \gamma_h D_0(X_b)$ and where $X_b$ is the position of the breaker line in the basic state. Notice that since the depth perturbations are assumed to be infinitesimal, the gradient of total water depth, $D_0 + \eta - h$, is always positive, and the assumption of $H = \gamma h D$ does not produce any spurious wave amplitude increase shoreward.

As we will see, when the breaking line moves from $x = X_b$ to $x = X_b + \Delta X_b$, there is an unbalanced zero-order term in the cross-shore momentum equation. This term is nonvanishing only in an infinitesimal interval of $\Delta X_b$ width so that the resulting contribution is first order and should be considered for the stability analysis. The procedure is as follows. By inserting the radiation stress (equation (3)) and the expression of the wave energy (equation (11)) in the governing equations (1), the $x$ momentum balance to first order reads
\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = -g\frac{\partial \eta_0}{\partial x} - \frac{3}{8}g\gamma b^2 \frac{\partial (D_0 + \eta - h)}{\partial x} + \Theta_x, \\
0 < x < X_b \quad (C3)
\]

within the surf zone, and
\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = -g\frac{\partial \eta_0}{\partial x} + \Theta_x, \\
X_b + \Delta X_b < x \quad (C4)
\]

out of the surf zone, where it is assumed that there are no gradients in the radiation stress. The dissipation terms (friction and viscosity) are indicated by \(\Theta_x\), and \(\eta_0\) and \(D_0\) are the free surface elevation and the total depth in the basic state (zero-order). We have assumed an alongshore position where \(\Delta X_b > 0\). The opposite case can be treated in a similar manner. The momentum balance in the basic state then reads
\[
0 = -g\frac{\partial \eta_0}{\partial x} - \frac{3}{8}g\gamma b^2 \frac{\partial (D_0)}{\partial x}, \\
0 < x < X_b, \quad (C5)
\]

within the surf zone, and
\[
0 = -g\frac{\partial \eta_0}{\partial x}, \\
X_b < x \quad (C6)
\]

out of the surf zone. By subtracting the zero-order equations from (C3)-(C4) we then obtain
\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = -g\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial x} - \frac{3}{8}g\gamma b^2 \frac{\partial (\eta - h)}{\partial x} + \Theta_x, \\
0 < x < X_b, \quad (C7)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = -g\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial x} - \frac{3}{8}g\gamma b^2 \frac{\partial (\eta - h)}{\partial x} + \Theta_x - \frac{3}{8}g\gamma b^2 \frac{\partial D_0}{\partial x}, \\
X_b < x < X_b + \Delta X_b, \quad (C8)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = -g\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial x} + \Theta_x, \\
X_b + \Delta X_b < x \quad (C9)
\]

The important fact in these equations is that the last right-hand side term in (C8) is zero order. After a similar development in the case where \(\Delta X_b < 0\), the three equations can be written as a single one that reads
\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial x} - \Theta_x - F_1 - F_2 = 0, \\
0 < x < \infty. \quad (C10)
\]

The first wave forcing term is
\[
F_1 = \begin{cases} 
\frac{3}{8}g\gamma b^2 \frac{\partial (\eta - h)}{\partial x} & 0 < x < X_b \\
0 & X_b < x
\end{cases}
\]

and the second one is
\[
F_2 = \begin{cases} 
\frac{3}{8}g\gamma b^2 \frac{\partial D_0}{\partial x} & X_b < x < X_b + \Delta X_b \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

in case where \(\Delta X_b > 0\) and
\[
F_2 = \begin{cases} 
\frac{3}{8}g\gamma b^2 \frac{\partial D_0}{\partial x} & X_b + \Delta X_b < x < X_b \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

in case where \(\Delta X_b < 0\).

Assume now that the perturbations \(u, v, \eta, h, \) and \(\Delta X_b\) are of order \(\varepsilon \ll 1\). If we divide (C10) by \(\varepsilon\) and then make \(\varepsilon \to 0\), all the terms will be of \(O(1)\) except \(F_2 / \varepsilon\) which will tend to \(\infty\) but only in an infinitesimal interval of a width of order \(\varepsilon\). We then get a Dirac \(\delta\) and the way to deal with it is to solve the differential equation (C10) in \((0, X_b)\) and in \((X_b, \infty)\) (i.e., with \(F_2 = 0\), with the restriction that the integral of the left hand side over the whole \((0, \infty)\) must vanish:
\[
\int_0^\infty \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \, dx + \int_0^\infty \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial x} \, dx - \int_0^\infty \Theta_x \, dx \\
+ \frac{3}{8}g\gamma b^2 \int_{X_b}^{X_b + |\Delta X_b|} \frac{\partial (\eta - h)}{\partial x} \, dx - \int_{X_b - |\Delta X_b|}^{X_b + |\Delta X_b|} F_2 \, dx = 0.
\]

Since to first order in the perturbations
\[
\int_{X_b - |\Delta X_b|}^{X_b + |\Delta X_b|} F_2 \, dx \sim \frac{3}{8}g\gamma b^2 \frac{\partial D_0}{\partial x} (X_b) \Delta X_b,
\]

we finally obtain
\[
g(1 + \frac{3}{8}g\gamma b^2 \eta)_{x=0} - \frac{3}{8}g\gamma b^2 h_{x=0} + \int_0^\infty \Theta_x \, dx = \sigma \int_0^\infty u \, dx \quad (C11)
\]
as the integral condition on the eigensolution, where it has already been assumed that \(u \sim e^{\omega t}\) and where use of (C2) has been made.

This formulation has been implemented in the numerical model morfo13 by just substituting the differential equation (C10) at the first collocation point with \(\tau_i \geq X_b\) by the discrete version of the integral equation (C11). Very small sensitivity to \(\tau_i - X_b\) has been observed.
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