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[1] The effects of tidal dynamics on subinertial flows through the Strait of Gibraltar are analyzed. As found in previous studies, an empirical orthogonal function analysis of subinertial currents at the Camarinal Sill yields two dominant oscillation modes. The first mode presents a barotropic character and rather irregular fluctuations and it has been related to meteorological forcing. The second mode is baroclinic and presents a clear deterministic behavior with time that seems to be related to tidal forcing. Against the hypothesis proposed in previous studies stating that tidal mixing cycles explain the second mode, we show, by using a one-dimensional numerical model of two-layer immiscible shallow water, that the origin of this mode may basically be related to nonlinear interactions among the main semidiurnal tidal constituents through the advective terms in the momentum balance and other nonlinear terms in the volume conservation equations. That mode is also crucial to understanding the vertical shear time variations of the horizontal currents. In particular, it minimizes the differences in the maximum shear between neap and spring tides.


1. Introduction

[2] Flow variability through the Strait of Gibraltar can basically be categorized into three distinct types: long-term, subinertial and tidal [Lacombe and Richez, 1982]. The long-term flow exhibits a seasonal and interannual variability and relates to the two-layer baroclinic exchange, whereas subinertial flows, with periods ranging from days to a few months, are mostly barotropic and have been found to be mainly forced by the fluctuations in atmospheric pressure over the Mediterranean Sea. However, a significant part of the variance of subinertial fluctuations has been related to tidal forcing.

[3] Using empirical orthogonal function (EOF) analysis of subinertial velocity time series recorded over the Camarinal Sill, Candela et al. [1989] isolated two dominant oscillation modes. The first mode (explaining about 80% of variance) was related to the fluctuations in atmospheric pressure over the western Mediterranean, and presented an almost barotropic character. The second mode (explaining about 15% of variance) was related to tidal forcing, and presented a baroclinic behavior and very regular fortnightly and monthly periodicities.

[4] Although the tidal origin of this second mode seems widely accepted, the actual mechanism by which it arises remains unclear. The baroclinic character of the second mode, with opposite current directions above and below the pycnocline, was responsible for the observed temporal variations of the vertical shear that reaches maximum/minimum values during neap/spring tides [Candela et al., 1989]. Taking this fact into account, Bryden et al. [1994] and Vargas et al. [2006] stated that variation in tidal mixing intensity between spring and neap tides cycles may be a very likely mechanism. Thus the two-layer flow exchange through the Strait of Gibraltar is maximized during neap tides due to a greater contrast in density between the basins associated with reduced mixing, and minimized during spring tides when there is less difference in density due to more intensive mixing. On the other hand, although not explicitly, the results reported in other works [Farmer and Armi, 1986; Helfrich, 1995; Brandt et al., 2004] indicate that the time-dependent hydraulic control over Camarinal Sill forced by barotropic tidal flows could contribute to the creation of certain subinertial variability.

[5] In this article, we show that nonlinear interactions among the signals of the three main semidiurnal constituents, M₂, S₂ and N₂, may be able to generate the baroclinic fortnightly and monthly signals appearing in the second EOF mode of subinertial fluctuations.

[6] The article is organized as follows: Section 2 describes the analysis of the current velocity observations. Results from the numerical experiments with a two-layer, shallow water numerical model are described in section 3. In section 4, an analytical explanation for the nonlinear...
origin of fortnightly and monthly signals in the flow variables is given. In section 5 there is a general discussion of the results, and finally some conclusions are drawn.

2. Current Velocity Observations

[7] The time series for the current velocity used in this work have been extracted from recorded profiles taken by a 150 KHz ADCP, moored directly over the Camarinal Sill (see map in Figure 1), in a water column of about 280 m depth. The sampling interval was 15 min and the vertical resolution was 10 m spanning from 45 to 265 m depth. Those data were collected during the experiment “Strait 94-96,” from October 1994 to October 1996. In the present analysis we will focus on a 6 month long segment of measurements (from October 1995 to March 1996) during which a continuous record (without any gaps) of current velocity was obtained.

[8] From these records the deterministic part of the subinertial signal will be estimated. The analysis will refer to the west-east component of current velocity that coincides fairly well with the predominant direction in the region of the Camarinal Sill.

[9] As the first step in the analysis, the subinertial signal must be isolated from the original records. To do this, a low-pass filter for removing signals with periods smaller than 33 h was applied to the original time series. Then, as Candela et al. [1989] and Vargas et al. [2006] did, an EOF analysis was applied to subinertial series at all depths in order to isolate the deterministic part of the signal. This practice is necessary to prevent meteorological variability from contaminating the subsequent harmonic analysis, since a substantial proportion of total variance of the meteorological fluctuations is located around the fortnightly and monthly frequencies.

[10] The results from this analysis are illustrated in Figures 2 and 3 where it can be seen that only two modes explain more than 95% of the subinertial current variance throughout the water column over the Camarinal Sill. As expected, the temporal weights of the first mode exhibit a rather irregular fluctuations and a barotropic character (positive spatial weights at all depths), while the second mode shows a clear periodic behavior in time and a clear
baroclinic character (spatial weights change their sign at a given depth). It should be noted in Figure 3b that, while the deterministic mode explains only about 15% of the subinertial variance in the upper layer (0–130 m), in the lower layer (130–300 m) it is the dominant mode, and at this depth it explains about 70% of the total variance. Layer thickness were determined using the mean interface depth, assuming that this depth is located where the vertical profile of mean current changes from positive (toward east) to negative (toward west) [Tsimplis and Bryden, 2000].

[11] This second mode will serve as a basis for determining the harmonic constants for Msf and Mm constituents in the subinertial currents at the Camarinal Sill. To do that, a least squares harmonic analysis [Foreman and Henri, 1989] is applied to the temporal weights of the second mode. In Figure 2b it can be seen that the harmonic prediction made using the computed harmonic constants for Msf and Mm signals presents a fairly good fit to the behavior of mode 2 temporal weights, confirming the deterministic nature of this mode.

[12] To compute amplitudes and Greenwich phases of current velocity throughout the water column, the harmonic constants of mode 2 temporal weights are computed using the corresponding spatial weights (see Figure 2b) at each depth. Finally these harmonic constants are vertically averaged within the upper and lower layers. The resulting values for the two layers are shown in Table 1.

3. Numerical Experiments

[13] The objective of the numerical model experiments is to investigate whether realistic fortnightly and monthly signals of subinertial flows can be explained in the framework equations of motion of nonmiscible fluids. A numerical model that considers 1-D, two-layer, shallow water equations for channels with irregular geometry, in both
Finally, \( v_i(x,t) \) and \( Q_i(x,t) = v_i(x,t) A_i(x,t) \) represent the velocity and the transport of the \( i \)th layer.

The general equations governing the one-dimensional flow of two shallow layers of immiscible fluids (volume conservation and momentum balance) along a straight channel with symmetric cross section of arbitrary shape can be written as follows:

**Upper layer**

\[
\frac{\partial A_1}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial Q_1}{\partial x} = 0
\]

\[
\frac{\partial Q_1}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{Q_1^2}{A_1} + \frac{g}{2 \sigma_1} A_1^2 \right) = -\frac{g A_1}{\sigma_1} \frac{\partial A_2}{\partial x} + \frac{g}{2} \left( \frac{1}{\sigma_1} \right) A_1^2 + g A_1 \int_b^{b+h_1+h_2} \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x} \, dz
\]

\[-gA_1 \frac{\sigma_1}{\sigma_1 \sigma_2} \frac{db}{dx} + F_1 \]

(1)

**Lower layer**

\[
\frac{\partial A_2}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial Q_2}{\partial x} = 0
\]

\[
\frac{\partial Q_2}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{Q_2^2}{A_2} + \frac{g}{2 \sigma_2} A_2^2 \right) = -\frac{g A_2}{\sigma_2} \frac{\partial A_1}{\partial x} + \frac{g}{2} \left( \frac{1}{\sigma_2} \right) A_2^2 + g \left( \frac{r}{\sigma_1} \right) \int_b^{b+h_1} \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x} \, dz + \frac{1-r}{\sigma_3} \int_b^{b+h_2} \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x} \, dz
\]

\[-gA_2 \frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_2 \sigma_3} \frac{db}{dx} + F_2, \]

(2)

where \( \sigma_i(x,t) = \sigma[x,b(x) + h_2(x,t) + h_1(x,t)] \) is the channel width at the free surface; \( \sigma_3(x,t) = \sigma[x,b(x) + h_2(x,t)] \) is the channel width at the bottom; \( \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3 \) are related through the expression \( \frac{1}{\sigma_1} = \frac{1}{\sigma_2} - \frac{r}{\sigma_3} \). Finally, the terms \( F_1 \) and \( F_2 \) are parameterized friction effects on each layer and read as

\[
F_1 = \frac{1}{\rho_1} \left[ -\tau_{b,1} (\sigma_1 - \sigma_3) \right]
\]

(3)

\[
F_2 = \frac{\sigma_3}{\rho_2} \left( \tau_{b,2} - \tau_{b,3} \right),
\]

(4)

where \( \tau_{b,1} = \rho_1 |r_{b,1}(u_1 - u_2)|u_1 - u_2|, \tau_{b,1} = \rho_1 |r_{b,1}|u_1|1 \) and \( \tau_{b,2} = \rho_2 |r_{b,2}|u_2|2 \). \( \tau_{b,2} \) is the friction stress at the interface between layers, while \( \tau_{b,1} \) and \( \tau_{b,2} \) are the friction stresses on the lateral boundaries or bottom; \( u_i (i = 1,2) \) are the velocities of the upper \((i = 1)\) and lower \((i = 2)\) layers; \( r_{int} \) and \( r_{b,i} \) are interfacial and bottom friction coefficients. Note that friction at the sea surface is not considered.

The model approximates the actual geometry of the Strait by using appropriate width and bottom functions. To determine those functions, we use bathymetric data to construct an equivalent symmetric channel with identical areas as actual transverse sections. After defining an along-strait axis, we consider \( M = 200 \) transverse sections along it at intervals \( \Delta x \sim 600 \) m, whose areas \( S_i, i = 1, \ldots, M \), are numerically computed. The bottom depth assigned to each section is taken as the maximum value, \( h_i \), found in the bathymetric data. Finally, the channel width of the sections

### Table 1. Amplitudes and Greenwich Phases Values for Msf and Mn Harmonics at Camarinal Sill as Calculated From Observations and Numerical Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harmonic</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Numerical Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U (m/s)</td>
<td>g (deg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msf</td>
<td>0.075 (0.16)</td>
<td>193.45 (27.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn</td>
<td>0.045 (0.10)</td>
<td>207.86 (13.45)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Here U is the amplitude and g is the Greenwich phase. Values outside (inside) parentheses correspond to upper (lower) layer.*

width and depth, will be used. This general formulation extends the one-layer shallow water equations and takes into account all the sources and coupling terms due to the difference in density between layers, as well as the terms due to the geometry. Models of this kind have been used widely in oceanographic applications, but mainly for channels with rectangular, or sometimes triangular, cross section. In this work, the model takes into account more general cross sections, symmetric but arbitrary in shape; this introduces a more complex shallow water equation system, and makes the numerical solution of the equations much more difficult since the counterpart to the effects of the complex geometry of the Strait of Gibraltar are included in the one-dimensional model.

The working hypothesis adopted in conducting the experiments is that those signals may be generated through the nonlinear terms contained in the momentum balance and volume conservation. The advective acceleration and friction at bottom, the lateral boundaries and the interface separating the two layers will be considered within the momentum balance. By comparing experiments with and without friction terms, the relative importance of those terms in generating the investigated subinertial signals can be assessed.

### 3.1. Model Equations

The numerical model used is well described by Castro et al. [2001, 2004a, 2004b]. All we will do here is briefly introduce the model equations and direct the reader to the cited references for further details. Some notation needs to be introduced first. In general, subscripts 1 and 2 mean “for upper and lower layers,” respectively. The coordinate \( x \) refers to the axis of the channel; \( y \) is the horizontal coordinate normal to the axis; \( z \) is the vertical spatial coordinate; \( t \) is the time; \( g \) is the gravity; \( \rho_i \) is the density of the \( i \)th layer \((\rho_1 < \rho_2)\), \( r = \rho_1/\rho_2 \). Variables \( b(x) \) and \( \sigma(x,z) \) are bottom and width functions, respectively, i.e., channel bottom is defined by the surface of equation: \( z = b(x) \), and channel walls by the equations: \( y = z(1/2)\sigma(x,z) \). The variables \( A_i(x,t) \) and \( h_i(x,t) \) represent the wetted cross section and the thickness of the \( i \)th layer at the section of coordinate at time \( t \) (see Figure 4), respectively. Therefore \( A_i \) and \( h_i (i = 1,2) \) are related through the equations

\[
A_1 = \int_{h_1(x)}^{h_1(x)+h_2} \sigma(x,z) \, dz
\]

\[
A_2 = \int_{h_2(x)}^{h_2(x)+h_2} \sigma(x,z) \, dz.
\]
is approximated by a continuous piecewise linear function constructed in such a way that cross-sectional areas for the model are the same as actual values. Figures 4a and 4b show the bottom function and the width at the top of the channel obtained from this procedure.

3.2. Model Results
[18] Tidal simulation experiments are performed by imposing on the steady state solution, resulting from a “lock exchange” problem, a tidal forcing at the open boundaries of the channel prescribed in terms of harmonic constants of the main tidal constituents of the surface tide: $M_2$, $S_2$, $N_2$, $K_1$ and $O_1$. Boundary conditions are obtained from García la Fuente et al. [1990].

[19] We have performed two experiments: one disregarding the friction terms, and the another considering a friction term parameterized as in equations (3) and (4), using the values $r_{int} = 10^{-4}$, $r_{b,1} = r_{b,2} = 10^{-3}$, $\rho_1 = 1027 \text{ Kg m}^{-3}$ and $\rho_2 = 1029 \text{ Kg m}^{-3}$ which lie within the range of values used by other authors [Izquierdo et al., 2001].

[20] Figure 5 shows the comparison, for the cross section of the Camarinal Sill, between subinertial current velocities simulated by the model and the deterministic fluctuations of subinertial currents constructed using the temporal and spatial weights of the deterministic mode found in the EOF analysis of subinertial current records. Simulated subinertial currents were obtained by applying a low-pass filter on variables of the initial output, to remove signals with periods shorter than 33 h. Table 1 shows a comparison of the harmonic constants of Msf and Mm signals corresponding to the model and the observations. As can be seen, the simulated series are in very good agreement with those extracted from the observations. This result seems to demonstrate that the deterministic mode of the subinertial currents over the Camarinal Sill may be explained using a nonmiscible and nonlinear model without the involvement of mixing phenomena.

[21] From inspection of Figure 5, it is also inferred that friction is not the dominant nonlinear mechanism for explaining the subinertial signals originated; therefore they must be explained through the other nonlinear terms, i.e., advective terms in the momentum balance, and nonlinear terms in the volume conservation equation.

4. An Analytical Explanation for Subinertial Tidal Flows
[22] As commented in the Introduction, fortnightly and monthly signals in the Strait of Gibraltar have previously been related to variations in the tidal mixing intensity during the spring-neap tidal cycle. In contrast, in section 3.2, we have shown, by the use of a nonlinear numerical model, that such signals may be generated without invoking mixing...
phenomena. Furthermore, nonlinear effects due to friction at the interface and bottom do not seem to contribute significantly to creating these signals. In the following paragraphs we will present a suitable physical interpretation of the phenomenon, in the framework of the nonlinear equations of motion for the immiscible and frictionless 1-D, two-layer problem in a channel of rectangular and constant transverse section

\[
\frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ u_1 (d_1 - \xi) \right] = 0 \tag{5}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ u_2 (d_2 + \xi) \right] = 0 \tag{6}
\]

for volume conservation and

\[
\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial t} + u_1 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x} = -g \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x} \tag{7}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial u_2}{\partial t} + u_2 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial x} = -g \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial x} + \frac{\rho_1}{\rho_2} \frac{\partial \xi_1}{\partial x} \tag{8}
\]

for momentum balance. Again, subscripts 1 and 2 stand for upper and lower layers respectively; \(d_1\) and \(d_2\) are the long-term time-averaged thickness of the layers; \(\xi_1\) and \(\xi_2\) are vertical displacement from their mean positions of sea surface level and the interface separating the two layers, respectively; \(u_1\) and \(u_2\) are the velocities in upper and lower layers; \(g'\) is reduced gravity \(g' = g(\rho_2 - \rho_1)/\rho_2\); \(t\) and \(x\) are the time and space coordinates. Notice that the “rigid lid” assumption at the sea surface has been applied in volume conservation equations.

[23] The variables \(u_1, u_2, \xi_s\) and \(\xi_i\) can be expanded in terms of the small parameter \(\varepsilon = A/D\), with \(A\) and \(D\) standing for characteristic values for amplitude of vertical displacement of interface and total depth of the water column in the region of interest, as follows:

\[
u_1 = u_1^0 + \varepsilon u_1^1, \quad (9)\]

\[
u_2 = u_2^0 + \varepsilon u_2^1, \quad (10)\]

\[
\xi = \xi_0^0 + \varepsilon \xi_1^1, \quad (11)\]

\[
\xi_s = \xi_0^0 + \varepsilon \xi_1^1. \quad (12)\]

Substitution of those expansions in equations (5)–(8), after disregarding terms with powers of \(\varepsilon\) greater than one, yields the following zero- and first-order balances:

Zero-order volume conservation

\[
- \frac{\partial \xi_0^0}{\partial t} + d_1 \frac{\partial \nu_1^0}{\partial x} = 0, \quad (13)\]

\[
- \frac{\partial \xi_0^0}{\partial t} + d_2 \frac{\partial \nu_2^0}{\partial x} = 0, \quad (14)\]
Zero-order momentum balance

\[ \frac{\partial u_0^0}{\partial t} = -g \frac{\partial \xi_0^0}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( u_0^0 \frac{\partial \xi_0^0}{\partial x} + \xi_0^0 u_0^0 \right), \tag{15} \]

First-order momentum balance

\[ \frac{\partial u_0^1}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( u_0^1 u_0^1 \right) + g \frac{\partial \xi_0^1}{\partial x} + g^2 \frac{\partial \xi_0^1}{\partial x} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ (u_0^1)^2 \right], \tag{17} \]

First-order momentum balance

\[ \frac{\partial u_0^1}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( u_0^1 u_0^1 \right) + g \frac{\partial \xi_0^1}{\partial x} + g^2 \frac{\partial \xi_0^1}{\partial x} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ (u_0^1)^2 \right]. \tag{18} \]

Note on the right-hand side of those expression that the contribution of the first and second terms in (24), and the first term in (25), is located at the basic tidal frequencies and mean value, so they are not of interest in our problem. However, the last terms of the two expressions create higher and lower frequencies lying outside the basic tidal bands. Those terms may be rewritten as

\[ \sum_{m=1}^{2} \sum_{n=1}^{2} A_{mn}^m U_m^n \cos \left( \omega_{mn} t - \phi_{mn} \right), \tag{26} \]

\[ \sum_{m=1}^{2} \sum_{n=1}^{2} A_{mn}^m U_m^n \cos \left( \omega_{mn} t - \phi_{mn} \right) \cos \left( \omega_{mn} t - \phi_{mn} \right), \tag{27} \]

where a given pair of \( n \) and \( m \) values correspond to a given pair of harmonic constituents. For \( n = m \), second terms within the brackets \{ \} give rise to a contribution to the mean value, while the first terms give rise to overharmonics like \( M_4, S_4 \) and \( N_4 \). For \( n \neq m \), the second terms between the brackets give rise to overharmonics like \( MS_4, MN_4, SN_4 \) and lower frequency harmonics like the fortnightly (\( MSf \)) and monthly (\( Mm \)) which are of interest in this context. For instance, when \( n \) and \( m \) represent the pair of constituents \( M_2 \) and \( S_2 \), the double summation of (27) contains a \( MSf \) signal

\[ U_{M_2}^M U_{S_2}^M \cos \left( \omega_{M2} t - \left( \phi_{M_2}^M - \phi_{S_2}^M \right) \right) \]

and similarly, when the \( M_2 \) and \( N_2 \) pair is considered, there is a \( Mm \) signal

\[ U_{M_2}^M U_{N_2}^M \cos \left( \omega_{M2} t - \left( \phi_{M_2}^M - \phi_{N_2}^M \right) \right), \]

where \( \omega_{M2} = \omega_{S2} - \omega_{M2} \) and \( \omega_{M2} = \omega_{M2} - \omega_{N2} \). Therefore, the part of the terms on the right-hand side of equations (13)–(16) only containing the \( MSf \) and \( Mm \) signals may be written as

\[ \langle \psi_1 \psi_2 \rangle = \frac{U_{M_2}^M A_{S_2}^M}{2} \cos \left( \omega_{M2} t - \left( \phi_{S_2}^M - \phi_{M_2}^M \right) \right) \]

\[ + \frac{U_{S_2}^M A_{M_2}^M}{2} \cos \left( \omega_{S2} t - \left( \phi_{S_2}^M - \phi_{M_2}^M \right) \right) \]

\[ + \frac{U_{M_2}^M A_{N_2}^M}{2} \cos \left( \omega_{M2} t - \left( \phi_{M_2}^M - \phi_{N_2}^M \right) \right) \]

\[ + \frac{U_{N_2}^M A_{M_2}^M}{2} \cos \left( \omega_{N2} t - \left( \phi_{M_2}^M - \phi_{N_2}^M \right) \right) \], \tag{28} \]

\[ \langle \psi_2 \psi_2 \rangle = \frac{U_{S_2}^M A_{S_2}^M}{2} \cos \left( \omega_{S2} t - \left( \phi_{S_2}^M - \phi_{S_2}^M \right) \right) \]

\[ + \frac{U_{S_2}^M A_{M_2}^M}{2} \cos \left( \omega_{S2} t - \left( \phi_{S_2}^M - \phi_{M_2}^M \right) \right) \]

\[ + \frac{U_{N_2}^M A_{M_2}^M}{2} \cos \left( \omega_{N2} t - \left( \phi_{M_2}^M - \phi_{N_2}^M \right) \right) \]

\[ + \frac{U_{M_2}^M A_{N_2}^M}{2} \cos \left( \omega_{M2} t - \left( \phi_{M_2}^M - \phi_{N_2}^M \right) \right). \tag{29} \]
Hereinafter we will focus on the part of the first-order variables on the left-hand side of equations (17)–(20) that matches those low-frequency signals appearing in (28)–(31). Assuming that the first terms on the left-hand side of equations (17)–(20) vary only very slowly over time, their contributions can be disregarded. It should also be noted that the terms in the left-hand side of equations (17)–(20)

\[ u_1^{01}, u_1^0, u_2^{01}, u_2^0, u_1^{N1}, u_1^N, u_2^{N1}, u_2^N, \]

consisting of products between zero- and first-order variables, would only match the spectral composition of the right-hand side terms for the mean value of zero-order variables. Finally, taking into account that the mean value of the variable is zero, first-order balances may be simplified to

\[ \varepsilon [d_1 u_1^1 - \bar{u}_1^{01}] = \langle u_1^{01} \xi_1^1 \rangle, \]

\[ \varepsilon [d_2 u_2^1 - \bar{u}_2^{01}] = -\langle u_2^{01} \xi_2^1 \rangle, \]

\[ \varepsilon [\bar{u}_1 u_1^1 + g \xi_1^1] = -\langle (u_1^{01})^2 \rangle / 2, \]

\[ \varepsilon [\bar{u}_2 u_2^1 + g \xi_2^1 + g \rho_1^{11} \xi_1^1 + g \rho_2^{11} \xi_2^1] = -\langle (u_2^{01})^2 \rangle / 2, \]

and solutions for first-order contribution may be then expressed as

\[ \varepsilon \xi_1^1 = -\frac{\bar{u}_1}{d_1} T_1 + T_2 \]

\[ \varepsilon \xi_2^1 = \frac{\langle u_2^{01} \rangle}{g C} \frac{\bar{u}_2}{d_2} T_1 - \frac{\langle u_1^{01} \rangle}{d_1} T_2 \]

\[ \varepsilon u_1^1 = \frac{\langle u_1^{01} \rangle}{d_1} \frac{\bar{u}_1}{d_1} T_1 - \frac{\bar{u}_1}{d_1} T_2 \frac{\bar{u}_2}{d_2} C + \frac{\bar{u}_1}{d_1} T_2 \frac{\bar{u}_2}{d_2} C \]

\[ \varepsilon u_2^1 = -\frac{\langle u_2^{01} \rangle}{d_2} \frac{\bar{u}_2}{d_2} T_1 + \frac{\bar{u}_2}{d_2} T_2 \frac{\bar{u}_1}{d_1} C + \frac{\bar{u}_2}{d_2} T_2 \frac{\bar{u}_1}{d_1} C \]

where

\[ C = \left[ \frac{(u_2^{01})^2}{d_2} + g \rho_1^{11} \rho_2^{11} \langle u_1^{01} \rangle^2 \right] \]

\[ T_1 = -\frac{\bar{u}_1}{d_1} \frac{\langle u_2^{01} \rangle}{d_2} T_1 - \frac{\langle u_1^{01} \rangle}{d_1} \frac{\langle u_2^{01} \rangle}{d_2} \]

\[ T_2 = -\frac{\bar{u}_2}{d_2} \frac{\langle u_2^{01} \rangle}{d_2} \frac{\langle u_2^{01} \rangle}{d_2} \frac{\langle u_2^{01} \rangle}{d_2} \]

In order to evaluate the first-order analytical solution, it is necessary to prescribe values for the parameters appearing on the right-hand side of expressions (38) and (39). We obtain those values from the numerical model simulations on the cross section corresponding to the Camarinal Sill, described in section 3.2. Values for amplitudes and Greenwich phases of semidiurnal constituents for currents and vertical displacement of the interface are shown in Table 2. Values for mean currents in the upper and lower layers, \( \bar{u}_1 = 0.31 \text{ m/s} \) and \( \bar{u}_2 = -0.70 \text{ m/s} \), are also taken from the numerical model simulations. Finally, the mean layer thickness values, \( d_1 = 154 \text{ m} \) and \( d_2 = 85 \text{ m} \), are chosen in order to allow the quotient \( d_1/d_2 \) to keep the same proportion as the quotient between the time-averaged cross-channel upper and lower layer areas computed by the numerical model.

The resulting temporal evolutions of first-order contribution given by equations (38) and (39) are shown in Figure 6 together with the subinertial currents simulated by the numerical model. As can be seen, the time series predicted by the analytical solution follow fairly well the basic behavior of that simulated by the numerical model time series. Discrepancies could be attributed to the fact that the numerical model accounts for additional nonlinear effects related to: (1) changes in the geometry of the cross section and (2) neglecting the time derivate of the first-order vertical displacement in equations (17) and (18), and (3) the time-dependent hydraulic control over the sill, which have not been accounted for in the analytical solution. Note that although these effects are not negligible, they seem to be of secondary importance.

The authors, BRUNO ET AL.: SUBINERTIAL TIDAL FLOWS IN GIBRALTAR STRAIT, in their study, delve into the complexities of analyzing first-order contributions in the context of tidal flows in the Gibraltar Strait. The research is grounded in theoretical derivations, supported by empirical data from numerical simulations, which are then cross-verified with observations from field studies. The paper is a comprehensive exploration of the dynamics at play in this critical maritime passage, offering insights into the interplay of subinertial tidal flows and their implications on current distribution and interface displacement. The methodologies employed range from analytical formulations to computational modeling, underscoring the interdisciplinary nature of the research. The results provide a nuanced understanding of the stratified flow conditions in the Strait, which is crucial for both natural and applied sciences, including oceanography, marine engineering, and maritime traffic management.

Table 2. Harmonic Constants for the Main Semidiurnal Tidal Constituents of Vertical Displacement of Interface and Current Velocity Simulated by the Numerical Model at the Place of the Mooring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harmonic</th>
<th>Model Current Velocity</th>
<th>Model Interface</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U (m/s)</td>
<td>( g ) (deg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N_2 )</td>
<td>0.22 (0.18)</td>
<td>137.00 (135.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( M_2 )</td>
<td>1.09 (0.95)</td>
<td>149.00 (147.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S_2 )</td>
<td>0.42 (0.30)</td>
<td>180.00 (174.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See map on Figure 1. Here \( U \) and \( g \) are the amplitude and Greenwich phase of tidal constituents for current velocity, \( A \) and \( g \) are the amplitude and Greenwich phase of tidal constituents for the interface displacement. Values outside (inside) parentheses correspond to upper (lower) layer current velocity.

5. Discussion

It is important to note that, in Figure 6, the contribution to the first-order solution from the sum of the two last terms on the right-hand side of equations (38) and (39) are very small in comparison with the first term. This fact may be explained if one considers that, since \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) are of similar size (see equations (41) and (42)), the second and third terms on the right-hand side of equations (38) and (39), which have different sign, tend to cancel each other out; the effect of this is to favor the dominance of the first term on the right-hand side in defining the
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behavior of tidal subinertial oscillations in the current velocity. Accepting this result, the following simpler expression for first-order contribution to subinertial currents is proposed:

\[ \begin{align*}
E u_1 d_1 &= \langle u_1^0 \rangle^\prime \\
E u_2 d_2 &= -\langle u_2^0 \rangle^\prime
\end{align*} \]

(43)

(44)

Therefore, those first-order contributions may be basically interpreted in the framework of the volume conservation equations. In that context, expressions (43) and (44) represent additional transports needed to correct the zero-order tidal transports for the changes in the layer thickness due to vertical displacements of the interface in response to the internal tide. It implies a subtraction or addition of transport from or to the zero-order transport in each layer.

[30] Taking into account the difference in Greenwich phase between the vertical displacement of the interface and the velocity reported by Bray et al. [1990] and Bryden et al. [1994], or using the values given by the model simulations (see Table 2), the upper layer behavior implied would be a subtraction of transport during ebb tide (flow toward the Mediterranean) and flood tide (flow toward the Atlantic). Following the same reasoning, in the lower layer, that term would imply the addition of transport during ebb and flood tides. Figure 7 shows the evolution of those transports during a transition from neap to spring tides. As can be seen, the instantaneous transports \( u_1^0 \zeta_1^o - u_2^0 \zeta_2^o \) are practically negative/positive all the time. Note also that the low-pass filtered transports \( \langle u_1^0 \zeta_1^o \rangle \) and \( \langle u_2^0 \zeta_2^o \rangle \) increase with tidal amplitude from neap to spring tide.

[31] Apart from the creation of a quarter diurnal signal, because those added transports keep in each layer the same sign during flood and ebb tide, they will make a clear contribution to the currents averaged over the complete tidal cycle. The larger the tidal oscillations the larger the contribution. Therefore, those terms must show significant low-frequency variability, with maxima and minima coincident with spring/neap tides, or more generally, with maxima/minima oscillations of tidal current and vertical interface displacement over the Sill.

[32] As shown in Figure 7, induced first-order transports have a different sign for upper and lower layers. As a consequence, when the subinertial current in the upper layer is positive (toward the east) in the lower layer, it is negative (toward the west) and vice versa; this provides a physical explanation for the baroclinic character of the tidally generated subinertial currents.

[33] This baroclinic character is also the factor responsible for the observed temporal behavior of the vertical shear of the horizontal currents. During spring tides, the subtraction/addition of transport in the upper/lower layers implies the creation of a negative/positive current velocity (toward the west/east). This behavior reduces the mean current intensity in both layers, and therefore the vertical shear of horizontal
currents is also reduced. On the other hand, during neap tides the reverse situation is found. Now, a reduced transport is subtracted/added in the upper/lower layers, which leads to greater mean currents in both layers and an increased vertical shear, compared with during spring tides.

Figures 8 and 9 show the vertical shear of the horizontal current deduced from the model and from the observations. As can be seen, in both the model and the observations, the shear reaches its maxima/minima values during neap/spring tides. The similarity between simulated and observed vertical shear indicates that the observed values are basically dominated by the deterministic mode of subinertial currents (second EOF mode of section 2). The importance of this mode in determining the temporal behavior of observed vertical shear is reinforced by the results shown in Figure 10, where we compare the vertical shear after removing the effect of the second EOF mode of subinertial currents and the vertical shear of the total signal. As can be seen, this mode exerts a clear control in defining the time behavior of vertical shear, and smooths the variation in maximum values of vertical shear between spring and neap tide.

6. Conclusions

[35] As found in previous studies, the EOF analysis of records of subinertial currents on the Camarinal Sill yielded two dominant modes that together explain more than 90% of the total variance at all depths. The first (explaining about 85%/30% of variance in the upper/lower layers) presents a barotropic character and a rather irregular fluctuations; it is related basically to meteorological forcing. In contrast, the second mode (explaining about 15%/70% of variance in the upper/lower layer) is baroclinic and presents a clear deterministic behavior with time, which seems to be related to tidal forcing.

[36] Against the hypothesis put forward in previous studies, that tidal mixing cycles may explain the second EOF mode, we have used both numerical and analytical

Figure 7. Temporal evolution of zero‐order solutions built using the information of Table 2 and first‐order transports as approximated by equations (43) and (44): (a) zero‐order interface displacement, (b) zero‐order upper layer velocity, (c) zero‐order lower layer velocity, (d) instantaneous (black curve) and low‐pass filtered (gray curve) transports for upper layer, and (e) instantaneous (black curve) and low‐pass filtered (gray curve) transports for lower layer.

Figure 8. Time series of velocity simulated with the numerical model at Camarinal Sill cross section: (a) total signal in the upper layer, (b) total signal in the lower layer, and (c) vertical shear of subinertial currents. Series begin at 0000 UTC on 16 October 1995.
Figure 9. Same as Figure 7 except for recorded currents over Camarinal Sill. In Figure 9c the shear is represented by the difference of velocity between 45 and 255 m depth. Series begin at 1223 UTC on 16 October 1995.
procedures to show that this deterministic mode may be basically explained in terms of the nonlinear interactions among the main semidiurnal tidal constituents imposed by the volume conservation principle. We have also shown that the deterministic baroclinic mode is the main factor responsible for the vertical shear of subinertial currents that present their maximum/minimum values during neap/spring tides. More specifically, it minimizes the differences of maximum shear between neap and spring tides which could contribute to a more regular interfacial mixing intensity than would be expected if only semidiurnal tide dynamics are considered.

[37] Acknowledgments. The present work has been partially funded by the research projects: CTM2008–06421/MAR, CTM2007–0408/MAR, P09-RNM-4547, and P06-RNM-01443. The authors thank Julio Candela for providing the ADCP records over the Camarinal Sill and the two anonymous reviewers for their useful suggestions.

References


Farmer, D., and L. Armi (1986), Maximal two-layer exchange over a sill and through the combination of a sill and contraction with barotropic flow, J. Fluid Mech., 164, 53–76, doi:10.1017/S0022112086000246X.


BRUNO ET AL.: SUBINERTIAL TIDAL FLOWS IN GIBRALTAR STRAIT

M. Bruno and A. Vázquez, Departamento de Física Aplicada, Universidad de Cádiz, Avda República Saharaui S/N, Puerto Real, E-11510 Cádiz, Spain. (miguel.bruno@uca.es)

J. M. González-Vida, Departamento de Matemática Aplicada, Universidad de Málaga, Campus de Teatinos, S/N, E-29081 Málaga, Spain.

J. Macías, Departamento de Análisis Matemático, Universidad de Málaga, Campus de Teatinos, S/N, E-29081 Málaga, Spain.