



HAL
open science

Kinematics of nonlinear waves over variable bathymetry. Part II: Statistical distributions of orbital velocities and accelerations in irregular long-crested seas

Jie Zhang, Yuxiang Ma, Michel Benoit

► **To cite this version:**

Jie Zhang, Yuxiang Ma, Michel Benoit. Kinematics of nonlinear waves over variable bathymetry. Part II: Statistical distributions of orbital velocities and accelerations in irregular long-crested seas. Coastal Engineering, 2024, 193, pp.104589. 10.1016/j.coastaleng.2024.104589 . hal-04681768

HAL Id: hal-04681768

<https://edf.hal.science/hal-04681768v1>

Submitted on 30 Aug 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Kinematics of nonlinear waves over variable bathymetry. Part II: Statistical distributions of orbital velocities and accelerations in irregular long-crested seas

Jie Zhang^{a,b,*}, Yuxiang Ma^c and Michel Benoit^{d,e}

^aQingdao Innovation and Development Base, Harbin Engineering University, Qingdao 266400, PR China

^bQingdao Innovation and Development Center of Harbin Engineering University, Qingdao 266400, PR China

^cState Key Laboratory of Coastal and Offshore Engineering, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian 116023, PR China

^dEDF R&D, Laboratoire National d'Hydraulique et Environnement (LNHE), Chatou, France

^eLHSV, Saint-Venant Hydraulics Laboratory (Ecole des Ponts, EDF R&D), Chatou, France

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Coastal waves

Nonlinear waves

Wave kinematics

Numerical simulation

Statistical distribution

ABSTRACT

In coastal areas, variable bottom effects significantly enhance wave nonlinearity and complicate wave propagation. It is of practical interest to characterize the nonlinear effect on the statistics of free surface displacements and particle kinematics. In this work, we take advantage of a fully nonlinear potential flow model to investigate the statistics of unidirectional irregular waves propagating over an uneven bottom. By confronting the simulated results with existing experimental results (free surface elevation and horizontal velocity beneath the mean sea level) in the temporal, spectral, and statistical domains, we show the high fidelity of the model in predicting the nonlinear irregular wave kinematics. As the relative importance of low-frequency harmonics becomes lower for acceleration, the model performance in predicting the measured horizontal acceleration is even better than that for the measured horizontal velocity. The empirical statistical distributions of velocity and acceleration in both horizontal and vertical directions are compared with both the normal (Gaussian) and the log-normal (LN) distributions. The latter requires skewness as an input in addition to the mean and standard deviation of the signal. We notice that, unlike the free surface displacement generally of positive skewness, the signal of velocities and accelerations are sometimes characterized by negative skewness. In such cases, the negative LN distribution should be adopted. Although the LN distribution has rarely been used for short-term statistics of wave elevation and kinematics, the detailed comparisons presented here demonstrate very good performance for all kinematic variables. In particular, in the area following a rapid reduction of water depth, where the sea-state is out-of-equilibrium, the heavy tails in the distributions are well reproduced by the LN model, indicating some generality and merits of this model.


1. Introduction

The statistics of Wave kinematics is of great importance in coastal and ocean engineering. For ships and offshore structures, it is keenly related to wave-induced forces (Kriebel, 1998; Wilson, 2002; Goda, 2010) while in coastal areas, it is relevant to the prediction of bottom shear stress, scour, and deposit of sediments. Wave kinematics is one of the key factors dominating the topography evolution, especially in coastal estuaries and along shorelines (Fredsoe and Deigaard, 1992; Elfrink and Baldock, 2002; Ostrowski et al., 2018). In the transition areas between offshore and coastal regions, as bottom effects get more and more involved, waves are subject to refraction, reflection, shoaling, and dissipation induced by bottom friction. The wave nonlinearity is gradually enhanced due to the reduction of water depth (Freilich and Guza, 1984), eventually, depth-limited breaking occurs in the surf zone. Recent studies show that, if the depth transition is sufficiently rapid and the relative water depth after depth change is below $k_p h < 1.3$ (with k_p denoting the

wave number corresponding to the spectral peak frequency and h the water depth), the waves are dominated by the so-called non-equilibrium dynamics after shoaling, as argued in Trulsen et al. (2012, 2020). The non-equilibrium dynamics is, in essence, the interaction of bound and free superharmonics excited by the depth change (Li et al., 2021). Out-of-equilibrium sea-states are characterized by rapid spectral evolution, local and distinct non-Gaussian statistics, and intensified freak wave occurrence probability (see e.g. Zhang et al., 2019; Zheng et al., 2020; Bonar et al., 2021; Zhang and Benoit, 2021; Lawrence et al., 2021, 2022). Furthermore, in the context of global warming, coastal and ocean engineering is faced with extreme events becoming more frequent and challenging than ever (see e.g. Didenkulova and Pelinovsky, 2016, 2020; Didenkulova et al., 2023; Shi et al., 2024). Consequently, a better understanding and statistical/deterministic prediction of the strongly nonlinear free surface displacement and the flow field underneath remain of paramount importance (Zelt et al., 1995; Stansberg et al., 1995; Aggarwal et al., 2016; Vested et al., 2020; Li et al., 2023; Deng et al., 2023).

For linear sea-states, the irregular wave train is assumed to be the sum of an infinite number of statistically independent harmonic components with random phases. According

*Corresponding author

 jie.zhang@hrbeu.edu.cn (J. Zhang); yuxma@dlut.edu.cn (Y. Ma);

michel.benoit@edf.fr (M. Benoit)

ORCID(s): 0000-0003-0794-2335 (J. Zhang); 0000-0003-4314-0428 (Y. Ma); 0000-0003-4195-2983 (M. Benoit)

to the central limit theorem, the probability density function (PDF) of the free surface elevation (FSE), the orbital velocities and accelerations underneath all follow the Gaussian (G) distribution (Longuet-Higgins, 1952; You, 2009). For nonlinear sea-states, the nonlinearity modifies the statistics of FSE and leads to deviations from Gaussianity. Various approaches have been put forward to take these nonlinear effects into account in the FSE distribution, such as the asymptotic approach based on Stokes expansion which can be extended to high order within the validity range of the Stokes theory (Tayfun and Alkhalidi, 2020; Fuhrman et al., 2023; Klahn et al., 2024); the transformed Gaussian method which models the non-Gaussian FSE distribution using the knowledge associated with the Gaussian processes (Ochi and Wang, 1984; Socquet-Juglard et al., 2005; Winterstein and Haver, 2015); and the moment-based approach which build the FSE models based on the first three or four cumulants of the random process. The distribution model in Edgeworth's form of the Gram-Charlier (G-C) series (Longuet-Higgins, 1963), the Gamma model (Bolles et al., 2019), the exponential Gamma model (Herrman et al., 1997; Kobayashi et al., 1998), and the log-normal (LN) distribution (Zhang et al., 2024) belong to this third category. In Zhang et al. (2024), the LN distribution has been extensively compared with six models of different types for the FSE distribution, showing advantages in capturing the heavy tails in the empirical PDF of FSE. As for FSE, nonlinearity also results in deviations in the statistics of kinematics from Gaussianity. However, studies about non-Gaussian velocity and acceleration distributions are relatively limited. The G-C type model was adopted to describe the non-Gaussianity of the distribution of orbital velocity, but its performance fluctuates depending on the data set (Sultan and Hughes, 1993; Song and Wu, 2000). Considering the non-equilibrium statistics after a rapid depth variation, the discussion on the characteristics of kinematics statistics is rather scant, particularly due to the lack of high-quality and long-duration time series of either measured or simulated kinematic variables.

In the companion Part I article (Benoit et al., 2024) (hereafter referred to as BZM2024 for brevity), we have detailed the computation of wave kinematics within the framework of the fully nonlinear potential flow (FNPF) code Whispers3D (W3D). The numerical implementation has been verified by comparing the simulated kinematics of strongly nonlinear regular waves with the corresponding stream function solution and validated against experimental results of regular waves propagating over an uneven bottom. After providing further validation of the numerical code for computing the kinematics of strongly nonlinear irregular waves over an uneven bottom, the main target of this work is to test the applicability of the LN distribution to wave kinematics. Indeed, the LN model has been shown in Zhang et al. (2024) to be appropriate for the distribution of FSE. However, to the limit of our knowledge, the LN distribution has never been employed for describing the non-equilibrium statistics of particle kinematics in strongly variable seabed conditions.

The remainder of this article is organized as follows: In

section 2, the W3D numerical computation of wave kinematics is further validated for nonlinear irregular waves propagating over a variable seabed. Comparing simulation results with experimental measurements, we show and discuss the time series of the horizontal velocity and acceleration, the evolution of the corresponding spectra, and statistical moments. Section 3 presents the statistical distributions of FSE, the horizontal and vertical components of the velocity and acceleration. The empirical (measured and simulated) distributions are compared with the G and the LN models. Conclusions and perspectives are provided in section 4.

2. Experimental validation for irregular nonlinear wave kinematics in variable water depth

2.1. Experimental configuration

In this section, an experimental case with irregular unidirectional waves propagating in variable water depth reported in Trulsen et al. (2020) is simulated, and we focus on the characteristics of particle kinematics. The experiments were performed in the University of Oslo (Norway) hydrodynamics laboratory. The sketch of the bathymetry is displayed in Fig. 1. The submerged bar is installed 10.78 m away from the piston-type wavemaker and consists of upslope, bar crest, and downslope sections, each of 1.6 m in length. The water depth in the deeper flat regions is $h_1 = 0.53$ m, and that over the bar is $h_2 = 0.11$ m. A series of non-breaking irregular wave configurations were tested during the experimental campaign. In Zhang and Benoit (2021), run 3 has been simulated using W3D, with analyses of the FSE and horizontal velocity presented. In the present work, we adopt the numerical method introduced in BZM2024 to directly evaluate the particle velocity and acceleration in both horizontal and vertical directions, and further discuss the spectral and statistical properties of velocity and acceleration.

Incident wave conditions of Run 3 are defined by a JON-SWAP spectrum:

$$S(f) = \frac{\alpha g^2}{(2\pi)^4 f^5} \exp \left[-\frac{5}{4} \left(\frac{f_p}{f} \right)^4 \right] \gamma \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{f-f_p}{\sigma_J f_p} \right)^2 \right], \quad (1)$$

where α controls the significant wave height H_s , f_p is the peak frequency, and σ_J is the asymmetry parameter, $\sigma_J = 0.07$ for $f < f_p$ and $\sigma_J = 0.09$ for $f > f_p$. The peak enhancement factor $\gamma = 3.3$ was fixed during the experimental campaign, the peak period is $T_p = 1/f_p = 1.1$ s, and the incident significant wave height is $H_s = 0.025$ m. In this configuration, the non-dimensional parameters offshore of the bar read: relative depth $\mu_1 = k_p h = 1.85$, wave steepness $\epsilon_1 = k_p a_c = 0.031$, and Ursell number $Ur_1 = \epsilon/\mu^3 = 0.005$, where k_p denotes the wave number corresponding to T_p and $a_c = H_s/\sqrt{8}$ the characteristic wave amplitude. Over the bar crest, $\mu_2 = 0.64$, $\epsilon_2 = 0.052$, and $Ur_2 = 0.192$.

The FSE η was measured at 91 positions with sampling frequency $f_s = 125$ Hz; the horizontal velocity $u(z_0)$ was




Figure 1: Sketch of the bathymetry used in the experiments reported in Trulsen et al. (2020)

163 measured with an acoustic Doppler velocimeter (ADV) de-
 164 vice at 37 positions at the elevation $z_0 = -0.048$ m be-
 165 low the still water level (SWL), with a sampling frequency
 166 $f_s = 200$ Hz. Due to the limited number of measurement
 167 devices, the results were gathered by repeating the same ex-
 168 periment several times. In each repetition, the experiment
 169 lasted for 90 min, which represents a series of about 5000
 170 waves with peak period T_p .

171 2.2. Numerical model setup

172 The implementation of the kinematics computation within
 173 the W3D model has been detailed in the part I paper and
 174 will not be duplicated here. In the current scenario, waves
 175 were generated and damped using relaxation zones of $3L_p =$
 176 5.4 m length located at both ends of the flume, with $L_p \approx$
 177 1.80 m denoting the wavelength corresponding to T_p in water
 178 depth h_1 . The space and time are discretized with constant
 179 intervals, $\Delta x = 0.01$ m, and $\Delta t = 0.01$ s. The Courant-
 180 Friedrichs-Lewy number $CFL \equiv (L\Delta t)/(T_{SF}\Delta x) = 1.64$ in
 181 the deeper region and 0.97 in the shallower one. The poly-
 182 nomial order $N_T = 7$ is chosen.

183 In Fig. 2, the time series of the measured horizontal ve-
 184 locity $\bar{u}(z_0)$ and acceleration $\bar{a}x(z_0)$ (evaluated from $u(z_0)$
 185 with a finite difference method in time) at different locations
 186 are displayed and compared with the simulated results. Here,
 187 $\bar{u}(z_0)$ and $\bar{a}x(z_0)$ denote the time series of $u(z_0)$ and
 188 $ax(z_0)$ normalized by the root-mean-square of the correspond-
 189 ing signal. Note that the measured and simulated time series
 190 need to be aligned at each location by introducing slightly
 191 different time shifts. This could result from three sources:
 192 (i) the measurements of $u(z_0)$ did not start at the same time
 193 in different repetitions of run 3; (ii) different wave propaga-
 194 tion velocities (dispersion characteristics) in the numerical
 195 and experimental flumes; (iii) small error in the installation
 196 locations of the ADV device. Thus, the phase shift due to
 197 different dispersion characteristics alone cannot be directly
 198 evaluated. We anticipate that the phase shift due to the dif-
 199 ferences in wave velocity is small. This is because the agree-
 200 ment in the magnitudes of horizontal velocity and accelera-
 201 tion is quite good. Therefore, the nonlinear dispersion ef-
 202 fects should be well captured by the model.

203 In the experiment, the horizontal velocity $u(z_0)$ was mea-
 204 sured at 33 locations in the range $x \in [-0.45, 3.6]$ m, with
 205 the first measuring location set over the up-slope. In our sim-
 206 ulations, we extend this range to $x \in [-2, 3.6]$ m by com-
 207 puting wave kinematics at 15 additional locations to track

the "complete" evolution of kinematics as waves propagate
 over the shoal.

210 2.3. Wave kinematics computation validation for 211 run 3 of Trulsen et al. (2020)

212 The spatial evolution of the frequency spectrum of $u(z_0)$
 213 is shown in Fig. 3, with the measured one in panel (a) and the
 214 simulated one in panel (b). To better demonstrate the evolu-
 215 tion of harmonics with relatively low amplitudes, $\log_{10}(S(f))$
 216 is plotted in Fig. 3. In Fig. 3(b), the spectral evolution of
 217 simulated $u(z_0)$ in the spatial range $x \in [-2, -0.45]$ m is
 218 displayed as well, although no corresponding measurement
 219 is available in this range. It is observed that the simulated
 220 and measured spectra are in good agreement. In Fig. 5 of
 221 Zhang and Benoit (2021) it was noticed that the spectrum of
 222 η shows a beating pattern around $2f_p$ (due to the interaction
 223 between second-order free and bound harmonics). However,
 224 such a beating pattern is not so evident in the spectrum of
 225 $u(z_0)$. In Fig. 3(b), it is observed that the shoal starts to in-
 226 fluence the spectral shape of $u(z_0)$ in a short distance after
 227 the beginning of the slope. The second-order harmonics in
 228 the spectrum of $u(z_0)$ are noticeably enhanced in the middle
 229 of the bar crest. The low-frequency components of $u(z_0)$ are
 230 also enhanced over the bar. As waves leave the bar crest and
 231 propagate over the de-shoaling zone, the spectrum of $u(z_0)$
 232 gradually recovers a shape close to the one it had before en-
 233 counter the bar.

234 The statistical parameters, skewness, asymmetry, and kurtosis
 235 indicate the magnitude of wave nonlinearity, and they
 236 are defined as:

$$\lambda_3(\bar{X}) = \langle \bar{X}^3 \rangle, \quad (2)$$

$$\lambda_3[\mathcal{H}(\bar{X})] = \langle \mathcal{H}(\bar{X})^3 \rangle, \quad (3)$$

$$\lambda_4(\bar{X}) = \langle \bar{X}^4 \rangle. \quad (4)$$

237 where $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denotes a mean operator, \bar{X} denotes the random
 238 variable with zero mean and unit standard deviation, and
 239 $\mathcal{H}(\cdot)$ is the Hilbert transform operator. Here \bar{X} could be nor-
 240 malized FSE, velocity, or acceleration. In particular, the kur-
 241 tosis of FSE is frequently used as a proxy of freak wave prob-
 242 ability. The extreme values in the time series of velocity and
 243 acceleration are related to extreme forces on structures, thus
 244 the statistical parameters of the particle kinematics below
 245 the free surface are of interest to engineers. Fig. 4 shows the
 246 spatial evolution of skewness, asymmetry, and kurtosis of
 247 both measured (red curves) and simulated (black asterisks)




Figure 2: Normalized time series of the horizontal velocity $\bar{u}(z_0)$ (a) and horizontal acceleration $\bar{a}_x(z_0)$ (b) recorded along the wave flume in the simulation (red solid lines) and experiment (black dash lines).




Figure 3: Spatial evolution of the spectrum of horizontal velocity $u(z_0)$ in the experiment (a) and in the simulation (b). The vertical dash lines indicate the extent of the submerged bar.

248 horizontal velocity $u(z_0)$ along the wave flume. Those of
 249 the simulated vertical velocity $w(z_0)$ (blue curves) are also
 250 displayed despite the lack of corresponding measurements.
 251 It is conjectured that the vertical velocity $w(z_0)$ is predicted
 252 with high fidelity, based on the excellent agreement achieved
 253 between simulated and measured $u(z_0)$ in both spectral and
 254 statistical domains.

255 In Fig. 4(a), the evolution trends of the skewness of $u(z_0)$
 256 and $w(z_0)$ are similar to each other, yet the modulation of

$\lambda_3[w(z_0)]$ in response to the depth variation develops faster
 257 in space than that of $\lambda_3[u(z_0)]$. Interestingly, it is noticed
 258 that, after the shoal, $\lambda_3[u(z_0)]$ achieves local extreme value
 259 when $\lambda_3[w(z_0)]$ vanishes, and vice versa. It indicates that
 260 the asymmetry (in the vertical direction) does not develop
 261 simultaneously for horizontal and vertical velocity components.
 262 In Fig. 4(b), the asymmetry parameter (indicating
 263 the velocity profile asymmetry in the horizontal direction)
 264 $\lambda_3[\mathcal{H}(u(z_0))]$ shows that the profile of $u(z_0)$ first leans back
 265




Figure 4: Spatial evolution of the statistical parameters of the horizontal velocity ($u(z_0)$) and the vertical velocity ($w(z_0)$), skewness is shown in panel (a), asymmetry parameter in panel (b) and kurtosis in panel (c). The gray areas indicate the extent of the submerged bar.

ward and then forward while, on the contrary, the profile of $w(z_0)$ first leans forward then backward in an averaged sense. For the kurtosis in Fig. 4(c), $\lambda_4[w(z_0)]$ achieves its global maximum over the bar crest whereas $\lambda_4[u(z_0)]$ is more or less unchanged over the bar and is locally enhanced over the down-slope area due to the de-shoaling effect, as it has been pointed out in Trulsen et al. (2020) and explained in Zhang and Benoit (2021).

Fig. 5 compares the spectral evolution of measured (in panel a) and simulated (in panel b) $ax(z_0)$. It is observed that in comparison to the spectral evolution of $u(z_0)$ shown in Fig. 3, the second-order harmonics are more evident, and the beating pattern is present in the spectral evolution of acceleration. This can be explained by the linear theory, the modulus of the particle acceleration is ω times the particle velocity at the same location, thus the amplitudes of the high-frequency harmonics are larger compared to the velocity. Note that the "beating pattern" mainly appears around $2f_p$, it is anticipated that the beating in higher harmonics does not manifest because of the presence of the de-shoaling area. In Fig. 5, it is seen that the low-frequency components are of low amplitudes such that they are not visible with the current colour scale. This is again in agreement with linear theory, for long waves with $\omega < 1$ rad/s at this scale, the acceleration moduli are smaller in comparison to the ones of the velocities. The good agreement between the measured and the simulated acceleration spectra in Fig. 5 shows the high fidelity of W3D for computing particle acceleration below strongly nonlinear irregular waves.

Fig. 6 displays the spatial evolution of statistical param-

eters of both horizontal and vertical accelerations, with skewness shown in panel (a), asymmetry parameter in panel (b), and kurtosis in panel (c). As a general remark, the statistical parameters of the simulated results are in excellent agreement with those of the measured data. Only some minor underestimations of the second local peak of kurtosis (around $x = 1.9$ m) are observed. The simulated statistical parameter evolution of $ax(z_0)$ seems to agree better with the measurements than that of $u(z_0)$. It is possibly related to the fact that the differences between the simulation results and the measurements in low-frequency components are reduced for $ax(z_0)$, as indicated in Fig. 5. The statistical parameters of the vertical acceleration $az(z_0)$ are superimposed in Fig. 6, despite the lack of corresponding measurements. The skewness $\lambda_3(az(z_0))$ is negative over the bar crest indicating a strongly skewed probability distribution, and the kurtosis $\lambda_4(az(z_0))$ achieves its global maximum value of about 5.4 shortly after the shoal and is much higher than that of $ax(z_0)$.

3. Statistical distribution of nonlinear irregular wave kinematics

3.1. Positive and negative log-normal distribution

Now we focus on the statistical distribution of water particle kinematics. Within the linear framework, both velocity and acceleration should follow the Gaussian (G) distribution. The wave nonlinearity would result in non-Gaussian characteristics in the distributions. Recently, Zhang et al. (2024) introduced a new distribution model of FSE of log-normal shape, which shows very good performance in the statisti-




Figure 5: Spatial evolution of the spectrum of horizontal acceleration $ax(z_0)$ in the experiment (a) and in the simulation (b). The vertical dash lines indicate the shape of the submerged bar.




Figure 6: Spatial evolution of the statistical parameters of the horizontal acceleration ($ax(z_0)$) and the vertical acceleration ($az(z_0)$), skewness is shown in panel (a), asymmetry parameter in panel (b) and kurtosis in panel (c). The gray areas indicate the submerged bar.

324 cal description of waves propagating over a submerged step
 325 bottom. For completeness, we recall the definition and some
 326 properties of the LN model.

The LN distribution is fully determined by three parameters: a location parameter a_p , a scale parameter a_s , and a shape parameter τ . The standard LN model of a random variable X is defined by:

$$p_{LN}(X) = \frac{1}{(X - a_p) \tau \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{[\ln(X - a_p) - a_s]^2}{2\tau^2}\right) \quad (5)$$

327 over the range $X \in (a_p, +\infty)$, which we also call the "pos-
 328 itive LN model" as the positive tail extends to $+\infty$. When
 329 $X \sim \text{LN}(a_p, a_s, \tau^2)$, one can easily verify that the random
 330 variable $Z := \ln(X - a_p)$ follows the G distribution, $Z \sim$
 331 $G(a_s, \tau^2)$. When the shape parameters $\tau \rightarrow 0^+$, the LN
 332 model tends to the G model. From now on, let us assume
 333 that $\tau > 0$ and define $q(\tau) \equiv \exp(\tau^2) > 1$. The first four
 334 statistical moments of the distribution (5) can be obtained
 335 analytically:

$$\langle X \rangle = a_p + \sqrt{q} e^{a_s}, \quad (6)$$

$$\sigma(X) = e^{a_s} \sqrt{q(q-1)}, \quad (7)$$

$$\lambda_3(X) = (q + 2) \sqrt{q - 1}, \quad (8)$$

$$\lambda_4(X) = 3 + (q - 1)(q^3 + 3q^2 + 6q + 6) \quad (9)$$

336 which shows that both the skewness λ_3 and the excess kurtosis $\lambda_{40} \equiv \lambda_4 - 3$ are both strictly positive as soon as $q > 1$,
 337 i.e. $\tau > 0$. In practice, the 3 parameters of model (5) can be determined from the mean, standard deviation and skewness
 338 of the empirical distribution using eqs. (6-8). Furthermore, as we work here with a normalized variable $\bar{X} \equiv$
 339 $(X - \langle \bar{X} \rangle) / \sigma(X)$, implying $\langle \bar{X} \rangle = 0$ and $\sigma(\bar{X}) = 1$, we obtain from eqs. (6-7):
 340
 341
 342
 343

$$a_p = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{q-1}}, \quad (10)$$

$$a_s = -\frac{1}{2}[\ln q + \ln(q-1)], \quad (11)$$

showing that the location parameter a_p (i.e. the lower bound of the definition range of \bar{X}) is finite and strictly negative. All 3 parameters of model (5) for a normalized random variable are thus functions of the sole parameter q , which can be computed from the skewness solving a cubic polynomial equation from eq. (8). This yields:

$$q(\lambda_3) = \left[1 + \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \left(\lambda_3 + \sqrt{\lambda_3^2 + 4} \right) \right]^{1/3} + \left[1 + \frac{\lambda_3}{2} \left(\lambda_3 - \sqrt{\lambda_3^2 + 4} \right) \right]^{1/3} - 1 \quad (12)$$

Another interest of the LN model is that the kurtosis can be computed from eq. (9) once q is known, i.e. from the knowledge of the skewness solely. That is, the LN model possesses an intrinsic (fixed) Skewness–Kurtosis (S–K) relationship, deduced from eqs. (8-9):

$$\lambda_{40} = \lambda_4 - 3 = \frac{q^3 + 3q^2 + 6q + 6}{q^2 + 4q + 4} \lambda_3^2 \quad (13)$$

344 with $q(\lambda_3)$ given by eq. (12). This relation is explicit yet cumbersome. It can be approximated by noticing that q varies
 345 in a limited range above 1: when λ_3 increases from 0 (Gaussian case) to 1.5 (which is a quite large upper bound considering
 346 the results shown in Figures 4(b) and 6(b)), q increases from 1 to 1.217 approximately. Consequently, introducing
 347 $\delta \equiv q - 1 \ll 1$, eq. (13) can be reformulated as:
 348
 349
 350

$$\frac{\lambda_{40}}{\lambda_3^2} = \frac{16 + 15\delta + 6\delta^2 + \delta^3}{9 + 6\delta + \delta^2}, \quad (14)$$

$$= \frac{16}{9} \frac{1 + \frac{15}{16}\delta + \frac{3}{8}\delta^2 + \frac{1}{16}\delta^3}{1 + \frac{2}{3}\delta + \frac{1}{9}\delta^2}, \quad (15)$$

and then approximated as:

$$\frac{\lambda_{40}}{\lambda_3^2} \approx \frac{16}{9} \left(1 + \frac{13}{48}\delta + \frac{1}{12}\delta^2 - \frac{5}{216}\delta^3 \right). \quad (16)$$

351 It is remarkable that, at leading order, the S–K relationship of the LN model exactly matches the S–K relationship $\lambda_{40} =$
 352

$\frac{16}{9}\lambda_3^2$ derived by Mori and Kobayashi (1998) from a model
 of second-order in wave steepness. Furthermore, the dependency of the right-hand-side of eq. (16) in λ_3 is weak over
 the usual range of λ_3 : taking again $\lambda_3 = 1.5$ as an indicative upper bound, one finds that the term in brackets in eq. (16)
 does not exceed 1.063. This closeness with the S–K relation of Mori and Kobayashi (1998) can be regarded as another advantage
 of the LN model, as recently shown in Zhang et al. (2024) for the FSE statistics in variable depth conditions.

However, we notice that the above "positive" LN model, adopted for FSE distribution in Zhang et al. (2024), is limited to non-negative skewness (due to the nature of eq. (8)). The FSE is generally of positive skewness (Longuet-Higgins, 1963) whereas the signal of velocities and accelerations are sometimes characterized by negative skewness (see e.g. Figs. 4(b) and 6(b)). We accommodate that by reversing the sign of the signal (which consequently reverses the sign of skewness) and then by flipping the obtained distribution, the LN distribution can then be used to describe random processes with negative skewness (therefore called "negative" LN distribution). With this simple manipulation of the signal, the LN distribution can not only be used for the FSE but also for the fluid kinematics underneath.

In the following, the statistical distributions of both measured and simulated FSE/velocity/acceleration at eight positions are displayed, and compared with the G distribution (as a linear expectation) and the LN distribution (as a nonlinear prediction). The chosen locations are considered representative, as they locate in the shoaling area ($x = -0.45$ m, and $x = 0$ m which is the end of the up-slope), over the bar crest ($x = 0.65$ m, $x = 0.75$ m, $x = 1.05$ m and $x = 1.5$ m), in the de-shoaling area ($x = 2.2$ m), and after the submerged bar ($x = 3.6$ m). It should be mentioned that the LN distribution can be built based on either the measured skewness or the simulated one. Here we adopt the measured skewness for the distribution of FSE, and the simulated skewness for the distributions of velocity and acceleration. The latter is chosen because the simulated results of velocity and acceleration cover a longer spatial extent than in the measurements. Furthermore, the vertical components of velocity and acceleration are available from simulations only for validating the LN model. We confirm that such a choice does not significantly differ from using the other way around, as the skewness of FSE/velocity/acceleration is reproduced in the simulation with high accuracy, as shown previously.

3.2. Distribution of FSE

In Fig. 7, it can be seen that the empirical PDF of the measured FSE is close to the Gaussian distribution in panel (a), the non-Gaussianity gradually develops when waves propagate over the shallower region, as shown in panels (b–d). Then the deviation of the empirical PDF from Gaussianity reduces when waves further propagate over the bar and the de-shoaling area, as shown in panels (e–h). Overall, the empirical PDFs of the measured and simulated FSE agree in a point-to-point manner, which was shown in Zhang and Benoit (2021). Interestingly, the LN model proves capa-

Part II: Statistical distributions of kinematics




Figure 7: Empirical distribution of the measured and simulated FSE at eight locations along the wave flume, and the corresponding predictions of the G and LN distributions.




Figure 8: Spatial evolution of the exceedance probability for normalized FSE ($\bar{\eta}$) higher than 3. The gray areas indicate the submerged bar.

all 91 probes displayed in Fig. 8 shows that both W3D and the LN model predict the tail part of the measured empirical FSE distribution with high accuracy. Good predictions are achieved not only for the near-equilibrium wave statistics before the shoal but also for the out-of-equilibrium wave statistics over the uneven seabed region. The black solid line represents the Gaussian prediction, which is a constant for all positions. The values of measured and predicted (by numerical simulation and LN model) $P(\bar{\eta} > 3)$ are higher than the prediction of normal distribution in the shallower flat region by a factor of 6.7 approximately, then lower in de-shoaling area. After the de-shoaling area, $P(\bar{\eta} > 3)$ seems to recover the prediction of the normal distribution.

3.3. Distributions of orbital velocities at

$$z_0 = -0.048 \text{ m}$$

Figs. 9 and 10 show the empirical/normal/LN distributions of particle velocity at $z_0 = -0.048 \text{ m}$ in horizontal and vertical directions, respectively. Fig. 10 shows only the empirical PDF of simulated vertical velocity \bar{w} due to the lack of corresponding measurements. In Fig. 9, the PDF of $u(\bar{z}_0)$ from the simulation is in excellent agreement with that from measurements. Both empirical PDFs deviate from the normal distribution over the bar crest yet the deviations are not as significant as in the empirical distributions of $\bar{\eta}$. The LN distribution shows good performance in general, despite some minor overestimation of the largest positive values at $x = 0.65 \text{ m}$ and 0.75 m . In Fig. 10, the LN distribution predicts the empirical PDF of the simulated \bar{w} quite well in general. However, at $x = 0.65 \text{ m}$ and 0.75 m where $\lambda_3(\bar{w}) \sim 0$, the empirical PDFs are indeed symmetric with respect to $\bar{w} = 0$ but are slightly higher than the prediction of normal distribution on both sides. At these two locations, the LN distribution is very close to the normal distribution,




Figure 9: Empirical distribution of the measured and simulated horizontal velocity $\bar{u}(z_0)$ at $z_0 = -0.048$ m at eight locations along the wave flume, and the corresponding predictions of the G and LN distributions.

thus not capturing the non-Gaussian feature of the empirical distributions.

As for $\bar{\eta}$, the probabilities of \bar{u} and \bar{w} exceeding 3 are displayed for all locations where the velocities are measured or simulated. Fig. 11 shows the comparison of the exceedance probabilities of the empirical, normal, and LN distributions for the horizontal (in panel a) and the vertical velocity (in panel b). Again, the LN distributions are obtained based on the simulated skewness. The $P(\bar{u} > 3)$ in the measurement is well predicted by the LN distribution as well as the numerical simulation. However, for the simulated $P(\bar{w} > 3)$ shown in panel (b), the LN distribution under-predicts the exceedance probability. This under-prediction is related to the fact that the empirical distribution is symmetric yet higher than Gaussian prediction.

3.4. Distributions of Eulerian accelerations at

$$z_0 = -0.048 \text{ m}$$

The horizontal and vertical acceleration distributions are shown in Fig. 12 and 13 respectively, comparing the empirical PDFs with predictions of normal and LN models at eight locations. In Fig. 12, the change of horizontal acceleration distribution as waves propagate over the bar is evidently different from that of the FSE and the horizontal velocity. After entering the shallower flat region, the empirical PDF becomes non-Gaussian in the sense that the probability of both positive and negative $\bar{a}x$ are higher than Gaussian expectation. This feature is well captured by the numerical simulation, yet it is beyond the capability of the normal and LN distribution. In Fig. 13, the vertical acceleration probability is enhanced in the negative range of $\bar{a}z$, which is related to its phase. The positive range of $\bar{a}z$ is not as low as predicted by the LN distribution, but more or less in agreement with the normal distribution.

In Fig. 14, the exceedance probabilities of acceleration in

both horizontal (panel a) and vertical (panel b) directions are displayed. As the vertical acceleration is mainly of negative skewness, $P(\bar{a}z < -3)$ is shown instead of $P(\bar{a}z > 3)$. In panel (a), the performance of the LN distribution for $P(\bar{a}x)$ is acceptable but not as good as for other variables. This is again due to the non-Gaussian behaviour of the empirical distribution, which is symmetric but higher than Gaussian in both positive and negative ranges of $\bar{a}x$. In panel (b), the LN distribution captures well the evolution of $P(\bar{a}z < -3)$.

To summarize, as random variables, the FSE, horizontal and vertical velocity, and acceleration, all follow the normal distribution when wave nonlinearity is insignificant. Non-Gaussian characteristics develop as waves propagate over the uneven bottom, and deviations from the normal distribution become clear. Our analyses show that, with the skewness of the random process given as an additional input, the LN distribution has great capabilities in describing random processes with evident non-Gaussian behaviour, especially for the abnormally high probability of large events. The LN distribution is quite general and can be applied not only for the FSE of nonlinear irregular waves but also for the particle kinematics underneath. The LN distribution has some limitations though, it cannot describe non-Gaussian statistical processes with symmetric PDF (i.e. with vanishing skewness but non-trivial kurtosis).

4. Conclusion

In this study, the statistics of particle kinematics underneath nonlinear irregular waves propagating over an uneven bottom were investigated experimentally and numerically. We adopted the new formulations of orbital velocities and accelerations in the FNPF wave model Whispers3D recently derived and validated in BZM2024. Here, the numerical model was further validated against experimental results of

Part II: Statistical distributions of kinematics




Figure 10: Empirical distribution of the simulated vertical velocity $\bar{w}(z_0)$ at $z_0 = -0.048$ m at eight locations along the wave flume, and the corresponding predictions of the G and LN distributions.




Figure 11: Spatial evolution of the exceedance probability for normalized horizontal velocity $\bar{u}(z_0)$ in panel (a) and vertical velocity $\bar{w}(z_0)$ in panel (b) higher than 3. The gray areas indicate the extent of the submerged bar.

526 the non-equilibrium wave evolution over a submerged bar
 527 with steep upslope and downslope reported in Trulsen et al.
 528 (2020). We chose Run 3 of the experiments as a high-quality
 529 measurement of the horizontal particle velocity below the
 530 FSE is available. Very good agreement is achieved in tempo-
 531 ral, spectral, and statistical domains for simulated veloci-
 532 ties and accelerations compared to the corresponding mea-
 533 surements. In particular, the W3D model simulates the non-
 534 equilibrium statistics variations (asymmetry, skewness and
 535 kurtosis) induced by the rapid changes in water depth over
 536 the shoal with high fidelity.

537 With the validated model, we then investigated the statisti-
 538 cal distributions of particle kinematics for nonlinear irregu-
 539 lar waves over the uneven bottom. Considering a long time
 540 series of about 5000 waves, the PDF of both experimental
 541 measurements and W3D simulations were built for the hori-
 542 zontal and vertical components of both velocity and accelera-
 543 tion. The simulated and measured empirical distributions

are compared with the Gaussian (linear) and the log-normal
 (nonlinear) distributions. The latter was very recently pro-
 posed in Zhang et al. (2024) for positively skewed FSE sig-
 nals. Here, it is adopted for negatively skewed signals by
 flipping the distribution. The key finding of this study is that
 the LN model is capable of describing most of the nonlinear
 features accompanying wave transformations in the shoaling
 and de-shoaling zones, including non-equilibrium effects. It
 represents the empirical distributions of FSE, velocities, and
 accelerations very accurately, indicating some generality of
 this model in describing the statistics of nonlinear wave pro-
 cesses. The LN model is particularly suitable for character-
 izing the heavy tail of the distributions, which is the primary
 interest in engineering applications. Another advantage lies
 in the fact that it possesses an intrinsic skewness-kurtosis (S-
 K) relationship (15), which we have shown here to be very
 close to the second-order relationship derived by Mori and
 Kobayashi (1998). Furthermore, we have provided a very

Part II: Statistical distributions of kinematics




Figure 12: Empirical distribution of the measured and simulated horizontal $\bar{a}x(z_0)$ at $z_0 = -0.048$ m at eight locations along the wave flume, and the corresponding predictions of the G and LN distributions.




Figure 13: Empirical distribution of the simulated vertical acceleration $\bar{a}z(z_0)$ at $z_0 = -0.048$ m at eight locations along the wave flume, and the corresponding predictions of the G and LN distributions.

562 accurate approximation of this S–K relation (16) which allows a straightforward calculation of the kurtosis once the skewness is known (from either simulations or experiments).

563
564
565 As a next step of this work, in the spirit of Li et al. (2023),
566 the model will be applied to the computation of nonlinear wave loads on marine structures in variable seabed conditions, in particular on slender structures for which a Morison-type approach can be used, e.g. monopiles for offshore wind turbines. Given that the LN model shows good generality in describing the heavy tail in the statistical distributions, it is worth trying to apply this model for predicting extreme wave load probability on structures. Additional validation

574 of kinematics conditions will also be done in other conditions, in particular with multidirectional waves and multimodal seas. Besides, additional validations of the LN model against other laboratory and field measurements of FSE as well as the kinematics underneath have to be conducted, to better establish its capabilities and limitations. 575
576
577
578
579

CRediT authorship contribution statement

580
581 **Jie Zhang:** Funding acquisition, Investigation, Formal analysis, Writing – Original Draft. **Yuxiang Ma:** Resources, Writing – Review & Editing, Supervision. **Michel Benoit:** 582
583




Figure 14: Spatial evolution of the exceedance probability for normalized horizontal acceleration $\bar{a}x(z_0)$ in panel (a) and vertical acceleration $\bar{a}z(z_0)$ in panel (b) higher than 3. The gray areas indicate the extent of the submerged bar.

584 Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – Original Draft,
585 Writing – Review & Editing, Supervision.

586 Declaration of competing interest

587 The authors declare that they have no known competing
588 financial interests or personal relationships that could have
589 appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

590 Acknowledgments

591 This work was supported by the National Natural Sci-
592 ence Foundation of China (Grant No. 52101301), and the
593 China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (Grants No. 2023T160078,
594 2021M690523). The authors would like to express their grati-
595 tude to K. Trulsen, A. Raustøl, S. Jorde, and L.B. Rye for
596 making their experimental dataset of Trulsen et al. (2020)
597 open access.

598 References

599 Aggarwal, A., Chella, M.A., Kamath, A., Bihs, H., Arntsen, Ø.A., 2016. Ir-
600 regular wave forces on a large vertical circular cylinder. *Energy Procedia*
601 94, 504–516. doi:10.1016/j.egypro.2016.09.223.
602 Benoit, M., Zhang, J., Ma, Y., 2024. Kinematics of nonlinear waves over
603 variable bathymetry. Part I: Numerical modelling, verification, and val-
604 idation. *Coast. Eng.* 193, 104577.
605 Bolles, C.T., Speer, K., Moore, M.N.J., 2019. Anomalous wave statistics
606 induced by abrupt depth change. *Phys. Rev. Fluids* 4, 011801. doi:10.
607 1103/physrevfluids.4.011801.
608 Bonar, P.A.J., Fitzgerald, C.J., Lin, Z., van den Bremer, T.S., Adcock,
609 T.A.A., Borthwick, A.G.L., 2021. Anomalous wave statistics follow-
610 ing sudden depth transitions: Application of an alternative Boussinesq-
611 type formulation. *J. Ocean Eng. Mar. Energy* 7, 145–155. doi:10.1007/
612 s40722-021-00192-0.
613 Deng, Y., Zhu, C., Wang, Z., 2023. A comparative study of wave kinematics
614 and inline forces on vertical cylinders under Draupner-type freak waves.
615 *Ocean Eng.* 288, 115959. doi:10.1016/j.oceaneng.2023.115959.
616 Didenkulova, E., Didenkulova, I., Medvedev, I., 2023. Freak wave events
617 in 2005–2021: statistics and analysis of favourable wave and wind con-
618 ditions. *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.* 23, 1653–1663. doi:10.5194/
619 nhess-23-1653-2023.
620 Didenkulova, E.G., Pelinovsky, E.N., 2020. Freak waves in 2011–2018.
621 *Dokl. Earth Sci.* 491, 187–190. doi:10.1134/s1028334x20030046.

622 Didenkulova, I., Pelinovsky, E., 2016. On shallow water rogue wave forma-
623 tion in strongly inhomogeneous channels. *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.*
624 49, 194001. doi:10.1088/1751-8113/49/19/194001.

625 Elfrink, B., Baldock, T., 2002. Hydrodynamics and sediment transport in
626 the swash zone: a review and perspectives. *Coast. Eng.* 45, 149–167.
627 doi:10.1016/s0378-3839(02)00032-7.

628 Fredsøe, J., Deigaard, R., 1992. *Mechanics of Coastal Sediment Trans-
629 port. Advanced Series on Ocean Engineering: Vol. 3.* World Scientific.
630 doi:10.1142/1546.

631 Freilich, M.H., Guza, R.T., 1984. Nonlinear effects on shoaling surface
632 gravity waves. *Philos. Trans. A: Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* 311, 1–41. doi:10.
633 1098/rsta.1984.0019.

634 Fuhrman, D.R., Klahn, M., Zhai, Y., 2023. A new probability density func-
635 tion for the surface elevation in irregular seas. *J. Fluid Mech.* 970, A38.
636 doi:10.1017/jfm.2023.669.

637 Goda, Y., 2010. *Random seas and design of maritime structures*, Third
638 Edition. World Scientific Publishing Company.

639 Herrman, M.N., Kobayashi, N., Johnson, B.D., Orzech, M.D., 1997. Experi-
640 ments on surface elevation probability distribution and statistics in surf
641 and swash zones. Technical Report. Research Report No.CACR-97-01.
642 Center for Applied Coastal Research, Ocean Engineering Laboratory,
643 University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware, p. 127, 19716.

644 Klahn, M., Zhai, Y., Fuhrman, D.R., 2024. Heavy tails and probability den-
645 sity functions to any nonlinear order for the surface elevation in irregular
646 seas. *J. Fluid Mech.* 985, A35. doi:10.1017/jfm.2024.304.

647 Kobayashi, N., Herrman, M.N., Johnson, B.D., Orzech, M.D., 1998. Prob-
648 ability distribution of surface elevation in surf and swash zones. *J. Water-
649 w. Port. Coast.* 124, 99–107. doi:10.1061/(asce)0733-950x(1998)124:
650 3(99).

651 Kriebel, D.L., 1998. Nonlinear wave interaction with a vertical circular
652 cylinder: wave forces. *Ocean Eng.* 7, 597–605.

653 Lawrence, C., Gramstad, O., Trulsen, K., 2021. Variational Boussinesq
654 model for kinematics calculation of surface gravity waves over
655 bathymetry. *Wave Motion* 100, 102665. doi:10.1016/j.wavemoti.2020.
656 102665.

657 Lawrence, C., Trulsen, K., Gramstad, O., 2022. Extreme wave statist-
658 ics of surface elevation and velocity field of gravity waves over a two-
659 dimensional bathymetry. *J. Fluid Mech.* 939, A41. doi:10.1017/jfm.
660 2022.227.

661 Li, Y., Draycott, S., Zheng, Y., Lin, Z., Adcock, T.A.A., van den Bremer,
662 T.S., 2021. Why rogue waves occur atop abrupt depth transitions. *J.
663 Fluid Mech.* 919, R5. doi:10.1017/jfm.2021.409.

664 Li, Z., Tang, T., Li, Y., Draycott, S., van den Bremer, T.S., Adcock, T.A.A.,
665 2023. Wave loads on ocean infrastructure increase as a result of waves
666 passing over abrupt depth transitions. *J. Ocean Eng. Mar. Energy* 9,
667 309–317. doi:10.1007/s40722-022-00269-4.

668 Longuet-Higgins, M.S., 1952. On the statistical distributions of sea waves.
669 *J. Mar. Res.* 11, 245–265. doi:citeulike:5677786.

670 Longuet-Higgins, M.S., 1963. The effect of non-linearities on statistical

- distributions in the theory of sea waves. *J. Fluid Mech.* 17, 459–480. doi:10.1017/s0022112063001452.
- Mori, N., Kobayashi, N., 1998. Nonlinear distribution of neashore free surface and velocity, in: *Coast. Eng. Proc. (ICCE'1998)*, pp. 189–202. doi:10.1061/9780784404119.013.
- Ochi, M.K., Wang, W.C., 1984. Non-Gaussian characteristics of coastal waves, in: *Coast. Eng. Proc. (ICCE'1984)*, p. 35. doi:10.9753/icce.v19.35.
- Ostrowski, R., Stella, M., Szmytkiewicz, P., Kapiński, J., Marcinkowski, T., 2018. Coastal hydrodynamics beyond the surf zone of the south Baltic sea. *Oceanologia* 60, 264–276. doi:10.1016/j.oceano.2017.11.007.
- Shi, J., Feng, X., Toumi, R., Zhang, C., Hodges, K., Tao, A., Zhang, W., Zheng, J., 2024. Global increase in tropical cyclone ocean surface waves. *Nat. Commun.* 15, 174. doi:10.1038/s41467-023-43532-4.
- Socquet-Juglard, H., Dysthe, K., Trulsen, K., Krogstad, H.E., Liu, J., 2005. Probability distributions of surface gravity waves during spectral changes. *J. Fluid Mech.* 542, 195. doi:10.1017/s0022112005006312.
- Song, J., Wu, Y., 2000. Statistical distribution of water-particle velocity below the surface layer for finite water depth. *Coast. Eng.* 40, 1–19. doi:10.1016/s0378-3839(99)00062-9.
- Stansberg, C.T., Huse, E., Krokstad, J.R., Lehn, E., 1995. Experimental study of non-linear loads on vertical cylinders in steep random waves, in: *Proc. 5th Int. Ocean Polar Eng. Conf. (ISOPE'1995)*, The Hague, The Netherlands, 11-16 June 1995, pp. ISOPE-I-95-013.
- Sultan, N.J., Hughes, S.A., 1993. Irregular wave-induced velocities in shallow water. *J. Waterway Port Coast. Ocean Eng.* 119, 429–447. doi:10.1061/(asce)0733-950x(1993)119:4(429).
- Tayfun, M.A., Alkhalidi, M.A., 2020. Distribution of sea-surface elevations in intermediate and shallow water depths. *Coast. Eng.* 157, 103651. doi:10.1016/j.coastaleng.2020.103651.
- Trulsen, K., Raustøl, A., Jorde, S., Rye, L.B., 2020. Extreme wave statistics of long-crested irregular waves over a shoal. *J. Fluid Mech.* 882, R2. doi:10.1017/jfm.2019.861.
- Trulsen, K., Zeng, H., Gramstad, O., 2012. Laboratory evidence of freak waves provoked by non-uniform bathymetry. *Phys. Fluids* 24, 097101. doi:10.1063/1.4748346.
- Vested, M.H., Carstensen, S., Christensen, E.D., 2020. Experimental study of wave kinematics and wave load distribution on a vertical circular cylinder. *Coast. Eng.* 157, 103660. doi:10.1016/j.coastaleng.2020.103660.
- Wilson, J.F., 2002. *Dynamics of Offshore Structures*. Wiley.
- Winterstein, S.R., Haver, S., 2015. Modeling shallow water waves: truncated Hermite models and the shallow wave routine, in: *Proceedings of the ASME 34th International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering*, St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada, p. 11.
- You, Z., 2009. The statistical distribution of nearbed wave orbital velocity in intermediate coastal water depth. *Coast. Eng.* 56, 844–852. doi:10.1016/j.coastaleng.2009.04.005.
- Zelt, J.A., Gudmestad, O.T., Skjelbreia, J.E., 1995. Fluid accelerations under irregular waves. *Appl. Ocean Res.* 17, 43–54. doi:10.1016/0141-1187(94)00019-j.
- Zhang, J., Benoit, M., 2021. Wave–bottom interaction and extreme wave statistics due to shoaling and de-shoaling of irregular long-crested wave trains over steep seabed changes. *J. Fluid Mech.* 912, A28. doi:10.1017/jfm.2020.1125.
- Zhang, J., Benoit, M., Kimmoun, O., Chabchoub, A., Hsu, H., 2019. Statistics of extreme waves in coastal waters: Large scale experiments and advanced numerical simulations. *Fluids* 4, 99. doi:10.3390/fluids4020099.
- Zhang, J., Ma, Y., Benoit, M., 2024. Statistical distributions of free surface elevation and wave height for out-of-equilibrium sea-states provoked by strong depth variations. *Ocean Eng.* 293, 116645. doi:10.1016/j.oceaneng.2023.116645.
- Zheng, Y., Lin, Z., Li, Y., Adcock, T.A.A., Li, Y., van den Bremer, T.S., 2020. Fully nonlinear simulations of unidirectional extreme waves provoked by strong depth transitions: The effect of slope. *Phys. Rev. Fluids* 5, 064804. doi:10.1103/physrevfluids.5.064804.