Mesoscale Eddy - Internal Wave Coupling. III. The End of the Enstrophy

Cascade and Maintenance of Gyre Scale Potential Vorticity Gradients

Kurt L. Polzin^a, Giovanni Dematteis^{a,b}

^a Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution
^b Università di Torino, Dipartimento di Fisica

ABSTRACT: We assess a prognostic formulation of triple coherence relating to energy exchange between mesoscale eddies and the internal wavefield and compare with observations from the Sargasso Sea. This effort involves updates to a theory articulated in Müller (1976) that balances eddy induced wavefield perturbations with nonlinearity using a relaxation time scale approximation. Agreement of the prognostic formulations with data is remarkable and is consistent with eddywave coupling dominating the regional internal wave energy budget. The goodness of this effort reinforces a prior hypothesis that the character of the internal wavefield in the Sargasso Sea is set by this interaction, which, in turn, serves as an amplifier of tertiary energy inputs from larger vertical scales that characterize internal swell. Extraction of eddy energy happens at the horizontal and vertical scales that characterize baroclinic instability and potential vorticity fluxes. With this knowledge and confidence, we then speculate on the role that this coupling plays with regards to mesoscale eddy dynamics in the Southern Recirculation Gyre of the Gulf Stream. We argue that this nonlinear relaxation effectively provides a local eddy enstrophy damping consistent with potential vorticity flux observations from the Local Dynamics Experiment. This happens at spatial scales somewhat smaller than the energy extraction scale and locates the end of the potential enstrophy cascade in the spectral domain as the energy containing scale of the internal wavefield. The dynamical consequence is that mesoscale eddy - internal wave coupling is responsible for the maintenance of gyre scale potential vorticity gradients.

1. Introduction

a. Prologue

Winds and air-sea exchanges of heat and fresh water are ultimately responsible for the basin-scale currents, or general circulation of the oceans. In order to achieve a state where the energy and potential enstrophy (potential vorticity perturbations, squared) of the ocean are not continuously increasing, some form of dissipation is required to balance this forcing. While the above statement may seem obvious, little is known about how and where this dissipation occurs.

Early theories of the wind driven circulation [Stommel (1948), Munk (1950)] view the western boundary as a region where energy and vorticity input by winds in mid-gyre could be dissipated. Those theories predict Gulf Stream transports that are approximately equal to the interior Sverdrup transport [about 30 Sv, Schmitz et al. (1992)] and that are much smaller than observed Gulf Stream transports after the Stream separates from the coast [about 150 Sv, Johns et al. (1995)]. Subsequent theories of the wind driven circulation have attempted to address the role of nonlinearity and baroclinicity in increasing Gulf Stream transports above that given by the Sverdrup relation.

Hogg (1983) proposed the existence of two relatively barotropic recirculation gyres on either side of the Stream that combine to increase the total transport. The recirculation gyres are generally acknowledged to result from potential vorticity fluxes (Brown et al. 1986; Hogg 1993) generated by the meandering of a baroclinicly unstable Gulf Stream (Bryden 1982; Cronin and Watts 1997) and the potential vorticity flux divergence, ultimately relating to an absorption process. That 'absorption' process is uncertain.

An objective of this study is to develop a quantitative prognostic assessment of energy transfers between mesoscale eddies and the internal wavefield. However ambitious that might seem, the goal is far grander. The goal of this study is to articulate the role of internal waves in maintaining gyre scale potential vorticity gradients that are so crucial to Earth system behavior. Both the objective and the goal are made concrete using prior analyses of data obtained as part of the Local Dynamics Experiment (LDE) of the PolyMode III program executed in 1978-1979 and located at the south-western edge of the Southern Recirculation Gyre. Once this has been accomplished, we can assess such things as whether numerical simulations realistically capture the 'absorption' process referred to above.

b. Goal

The goal of this study is encapsulated with three distinct results. The first is the documentation by Brown et al. (1986) of statistically significant potential vorticity fluxes using the LDE array data, Section 4.c. These are directed to the SSW. The second is the documentation of background potential vorticity gradients by Robbins et al. (2000) ¹. At the level of the Brown et al. (1986) potential vorticity flux estimates, the potential vorticity gradients are essentially zonal and indistinguishable from variations in the planetary rotation rate. The third result is a simple consequence of the prior two: potential vorticity fluxes directed across potential vorticity contours imply potential enstrophy production. In order to balance this production term, one has three options: time dependence of potential enstrophy, dissipation, or nonlocal transports (triple correlations). We regard the first as unlikely. Consequences of the third are discussed in Rhines and Young (1982): in the limit of small mixing, the role of triple correlations is to transport enstrophy to the boundaries, where it is dissipated. As a consequence, potential vorticity in the gyre interior is homogenized. Since this is inconsistent with the observations of Robbins et al. (2000), we regard a balance between enstrophy production and enstrophy dissipation as far more likely. Basic scaling of the quasi-geostrophic potential vorticity equation directs us to a viscous dissipation process related to the characterization of energy exchanges between internal waves and mesoscale eddies (Polzin 2010; Brown and Owens 1981) rather than diapycnal mixing as the dominant dissipation mechanism. To be utterly clear, the logical consequence is a highly non-dualistic proposition that internal waves are fundamental to maintaining the gyre scale potential vorticity gradients which are key to Earth system behavior. The issue is one of momentum rather than mixing.

c. Objectives

The objectives of this study are (i) to provide a quantitative prognostic assessment of energy transfers between the background internal wavefield and the mesoscale eddy field that are the result of the mesoscale inducing momentum flux anomalies in the background wavefield and (ii) to compare those prognostic estimates with field data from the Local Dynamics Experiment reported in Polzin (2010). These energy transfers are made permanent through a nonlinear relaxation process. The result is nearly that of Müller (1976). However, Müller (1976)'s presentation, which

¹See also Wijffels et al. (2024b) for a gridded climatology of potential vorticity fields

invokes a perturbation expansion and variational calculus, can be substantially simplified. The essential result requires little more than algebra. We present that algebra within this Introduction to demystify the rest of the paper.

At the outset, the intent is to characterize interactions between the background internal wave spectrum and the mesoscale eddy field. The underlying description for this background is the parametric spectral representation introduced in Garrett and Munk (1972) with vertical wavenumber bandwidths of $4 \le j_* \le 20$ that vary on a regional basis (Polzin and Lvov 2011). We are *not* focused upon low mode ($1 \le j \le 2$) near inertial waves or low mode internal tides. We are focused on the analog of wind waves rather than swell in the surface wavefield. With this, we are safely within an extreme scale separated paradigm and the analysis is grounded in action conservation and ray tracing concepts. The regional spectrum is presented in Section 2.b.

For a single wave packet, the presumption of scale separated interactions implies that wave action spectral density $n(\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{r}(t)))$ is conserved along wave characteristics in space $\mathbf{r}(t)$ and wavenumber $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{r})$:

$$\frac{\partial n_3(\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{r}(t)))}{\partial t} + \dot{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{r}} n_3(\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{r}(t))) + \dot{\mathbf{p}} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} n_3(\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{r}(t))) = 0$$
(1)

in which $\mathbf{p} = (k, l, m)$ is the 3-D wavevector with $\mathbf{k} = (k, l)$ and $k_h = (k^2 + l^2)^{1/2}$. We employ subscripts to denote the dimensionality of the spectral density. We will reference a horizontally isotropic spectral density and move between 2-D and 3-D using $n_2(k_h, m) = k_h n_3(k_h, m)$. Furthermore, wave action spectral density is related to energy density as $n(\mathbf{p}) = E(\mathbf{p})/\omega$ and the change of variables between frequency and wavenumber space utilizes $n_2(k_h, m)dk_h = n_2(\omega, m)d\omega$. The factor $\dot{\mathbf{r}}$ represents the rate of refraction in physical space \mathbf{r} (advection plus group velocity) and $\dot{\mathbf{p}}$ the rate of refraction in the spectral domain. These are local functions of space, time and wavenumber. We will represent the background variables using upper case notation. Horizontal velocities are $\mathbf{U} = (U, V)$ and the background wavevector is (K, L, M). We direct the reader to Lvov and Polzin (2024) for an actual derivation of (1).

We will work with an Eulerian representation by averaging over all wave trajectories that bring wave packets to position **p** at **r** and *t*, $n(\mathbf{p};\mathbf{r},t)$:

$$\frac{\partial n(\mathbf{p};\mathbf{r},t)}{\partial t} + \dot{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{r}} n(\mathbf{p};\mathbf{r},t) + \dot{\mathbf{p}} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} n(\mathbf{p};\mathbf{r},t) = S_o - S_i + \mathcal{NL}(n(\mathbf{p};\mathbf{r},t)) + O(\frac{\ell}{\mathcal{L}}).$$
(2)

in which nonconservative processes are represented on the right-hand-side. We direct the reader to Müller and Olbers (1975) for a presentation of this radiation balance scheme and to Eden et al. (2019); Dematteis and Lvov (2021); Dematteis et al. (2022); Lvov and Polzin (2024); Polzin and Lvov (2024); Dematteis et al. (2024) for recent work on the nonlinear transfers. In order to arrive at the action conservation statement (1), there is a discard of terms representing the packet structure having a spatial scale \mathcal{L} , assumed to be large relative to the inverse wavenumber ℓ (Gershgorin et al. 2009), see also Lvov and Polzin (2024). This envelope structure has a potential vorticity signature associated with the internal wave momentum flux divergence (Bühler and McIntyre 2005). This is a key issue as concerns the role of internal waves in the mesoscale eddy potential enstrophy budget (Section 4.c) and a notable departure from Müller (1976), in which the role of such residual circulations was not realized. We do not delve into this in detail, simply pointing out that the quantitative connection appears in (e.g. Bretherton 1969b; Bühler and McIntyre 2005; Wagner and Young 2015).

We assume the internal wavefield can be represented as the sum of a quasi-stationary, quasihomogeneous isotropic component $n^{(0)}(\mathbf{p})$ and two that vary in space and time in response to eddy interactions:

$$n_3 = n_3^{(0)}(\mathbf{p}) + n_3^{(1)}(\mathbf{p};\mathbf{r},t) + n_3^{(2)}(\mathbf{p};\mathbf{r},t)$$
(3)

where $n_3^{(1)}(\mathbf{p};\mathbf{r},t) \gg n_3^{(2)}(\mathbf{p};\mathbf{r},t)$. The $n^{(0)}$ balance is attained as sources S_o and sinks S_i being connected by nonlinear interactions \mathcal{NL} . The phrases 'quasi-stationary' and 'quasi-homogeneous' imply a multiple time scale process that becomes concrete within the context of the regional and seasonal variability of the internal wavefield documented in Polzin and Lvov (2011). The intent of $n^{(1)}$ is a representation of energy transfers from eddies to waves. The conceptual role of $n^{(2)}$ is, at least in part, to acknowledge the $O(\ell/\mathcal{L})$ residual circulations on the packet scale. We substitute the decomposition (3) and include $\dot{\mathbf{p}}$ (Section 2.a.2) associated with coupling to the mesoscale. Subtracting the homogeneous $n^{(0)}$ balance from (2) provides

$$\frac{\partial n^{(1)}}{\partial t} + \dot{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{r}} n^{(1)} + \dot{\mathbf{p}} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} [n^{(0)} + n^{(1)}] \cong \mathcal{NL}(n^{(1)}; n^{(0)}).$$
(4)

We cast $\mathcal{NL}(n^{(1)}(\mathbf{p};\mathbf{r},t);n^{(0)}(\mathbf{p}))$ as a relaxation time scale (Section 3.d),

$$\mathcal{NL}(n^{(1)}; n^{(0)}) = \tau_r^{-1}(n^{(0)}) n^{(1)}$$

Assuming that

$$n^{(1)}(\mathbf{p};\mathbf{r},t) \ll n^{(0)}(\mathbf{p})$$

we rearrange (4) to obtain

$$\frac{\partial n^{(1)}}{\partial t} + \dot{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{r}} n^{(1)} - \tau_r^{-1}(n^{(0)}) n^{(1)} = -\dot{\mathbf{p}} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} n^{(0)}.$$
(5)

In Müller (1976), $n^{(0)}$, $n^{(1)}$ and $n^{(2)}$ are assumed to be an ordered expansion in terms of a small parameter relating advection to the wave phase speed, and thus $\dot{\mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{U} + \mathbf{C}_g \cong \mathbf{C}_g$ in (5). Non-local effects in (5) are addressed by representing the space-time dependence of the background in terms of its Fourier components, i.e. $e^{i[Kx+Ly+Mz-\Omega t]}$ and Fourier transforming (5). The first two terms of (5) are then cast as a propagation time scale τ_p :

$$\tau_p^{-1} = -\Omega + KC_g^x + LC_g^y + MC_g^z .$$
(6)

The mesoscale velocity gradients are then assumed, for the sake of simplicity, to be concentrated at a single scale, which unsurprisingly is proportional to the deformation radius in the quasi-geostrophic setting of the LDE. Simple algebraic manipulations then provide

$$\mathfrak{R}(n^{(1)}(\mathbf{p};\mathbf{r},t)) = -\frac{\tau_r}{1 + (\tau_r/\tau_p)^2} \,\dot{\mathbf{p}} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \, n^{(0)}(\mathbf{p}) \,. \tag{7}$$

in which \Re means the real part. Having solved for $n^{(1)}(\mathbf{p};\mathbf{r},t)$, one then engages with the polarization relations (Section 2.a.1) that relate action spectral density to the corresponding pseudomomentum fluxes, e.g.

$$\overline{uw} - \frac{f}{N^2} \overline{vb} = \int d\mathbf{p} \, k \, C_g^z \, n^{(1)}(\mathbf{p}; r, t) \tag{8}$$

which in turn gives the energy transfer with the mesoscale, $[\overline{uw} - \frac{f}{N^2}\overline{vb}]U_z$ and facilitates identification of a vertical viscosity, $[\overline{uw} - \frac{f}{N^2}\overline{vb}] = -(v_v + \frac{f^2}{N^2}K_h)U_z$.

This is the essence of Müller (1976). The assessment of energy exchange at wavenumber **p** reduces to an intensive algebraic exercise.

In our approach, the reasoning is more subtle. We note that the left-hand-side of (2) applies to a single realization of $\dot{\mathbf{r}}$ and $\dot{\mathbf{p}}$. As detailed in Section 2.b below, the eddy forcing in (5), i.e. the right-hand-side, is proportional to the deformation rate of strain. The deformation rate of strain, in turn, is independent of the sign of the velocity, such that in executing an ensemble average of (5), $\dot{\mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{U} + \mathbf{C}_g \cong \mathbf{C}_g$ and we wind up at the same place, (7).

There are two significant loose ends. The first is in the actual derivation of a relaxation time scale. We point the reader to Polzin and Lvov (2024) for instructions about how this might be executed using the Hamiltonian structures in Lvov and Polzin (2024). The second concerns tidying up the connection to potential vorticity, which can be idenitied as the $O(\frac{\ell}{\mathcal{L}})$ horizontal curl of the pseudomomentum of individual packets, $\nabla_h \times \mathbf{k} n_3^{(2)}(\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{r}(t)))$ rather than the pseudomementum flux which appears in energetics.

d. Outline

This paper is constructed as follows. In Section 2 we describe the ray tracing machinery that is behind (1) and (2) and present an intuitive notion of asymptotic system behavior in an extreme scale separated limit. Section 3 describes the elements of (7): the regional spectrum $n^{(0)}(\mathbf{p})$, propagation τ_p and relaxation time scales τ_r . Numerical evaluations and a comparison with the LDE based estimates of energy transfer from Polzin (2010) are presented in section 3.e. Regional energy and potential enstrophy budgets are discussed in Section 4. The goal of this work is addressed in Section 4.c where transfers of eddy potential enstrophy to packet scale wave momentum are estimated using a length scale dependent closure. We summarize our results in Section 5.a and attempt to frame potential implications for Earth system behavior in Section 5.b. An appendix describes alternative efforts at assessing and formulating internal wave - mesoscale eddy coupling.

2. Methods

a. The Machinery

1) POLARIZATION RELATIONS

Assuming a plane wave formulation of $a \exp^{i[\mathbf{r}\cdot\mathbf{p}-\sigma t]}$, the linearized f-plane equations of motion for 3-d velocities (u, v, w), buoyancy $b = -g\rho/\rho_0$ and pressure perturbation π can be manipulated to provide 'Polarization Relations' Müller and Olbers (1975); Polzin and Lvov (2011):

$$u = \left[\frac{k_h^2}{m^2 |\mathbf{p}|^2}\right]^{1/2} \frac{m^2(k - ifl/\sigma)}{k_h^2} a e^{i(\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{r}-\sigma t)}$$

$$v = \left[\frac{k_h^2}{m^2 |\mathbf{p}|^2}\right]^{1/2} \frac{m^2(l + ifk/\sigma)}{k_h^2} a e^{i(\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{r}-\sigma t)}$$

$$w = \left[\frac{k_h^2}{m^2 |\mathbf{p}|^2}\right]^{1/2} - m a e^{i(\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{r}-\sigma t)}$$

$$b = \left[\frac{k_h^2}{m^2 |\mathbf{p}|^2}\right]^{1/2} - \frac{imN^2}{\sigma} a e^{i(\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{r}-\sigma t)}$$

$$\pi = \left[\frac{k_h^2}{m^2 |\mathbf{p}|^2}\right]^{1/2} - \frac{(N^2 - \sigma^2)}{\sigma} a e^{i(\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{r}-\sigma t)}$$
(9)

The prefactor in these polarization relations is such that the wave amplitude *a* is normalized to represent the total energy:

$$E_k + E_v + E_p = aa^* .$$

The total energy is the sum of horizontal kinetic E_k , vertical kinetic E_v and potential E_p . We use the hydrostatic versions of these relations in this paper and an intrinsic frequency $\omega = \sigma - \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{U}$ in place of σ .

2) INTERNAL WAVE ACTION

Our interest is in small amplitude waves propagating in a larger amplitude, larger *horizontal* scale background, for which we refer the reader to Lvov and Polzin (2024) for an actual derivation of action spectral density conservation. Wave action spectral density

$$n(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{r}) = a(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{r})a^*(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{r})/\omega$$
(10)

is conserved

$$\frac{\partial n_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{r}}}{\partial t} + \nabla_{\mathbf{p}}\sigma_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{r}} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{r}}n_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{r}} - \nabla_{\mathbf{r}}\sigma_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{r}} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{p}}n_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{r}} = 0,$$

along characteristics (ray trajectories) defined by

$$\dot{\mathbf{r}}(t) \equiv \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \sigma_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{U} + \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{g}}, \tag{11}$$
$$\dot{\mathbf{p}}(t) \equiv -\nabla_{\mathbf{r}} \sigma_{\mathbf{p},\mathbf{r}},$$

in which the intrinsic frequency $\omega = \sigma - \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{U}$ plays the role of the Eulerian frequency σ in the polarization relations. The latter of equations (11) is the eikonal representation of geometric optics:

$$\dot{k} = -kU_x - lV_x - mW_x$$

$$\dot{l} = -kU_y - lV_y - mW_y$$

$$\dot{m} = -kU_z - lV_z - mW_z$$
(12)

where we neglect vertical gradients of background stratification. We will assume a horizontally nondivergent quasi-geostrophic background. The LDE moored array provides thermocline level estimates of relative vorticity and vertical shear at periods greater than one day that are small, $[R_o, F_r] = [(V_x - U_y)_{rms}/f, (U_z^2 + V_z^2)^{1/2}/N] = [0.025, 0.031]$. Thus terms in (12) involving the $O(R_o^2)$ vertical velocity are small.

In combination, (9)-(12) represent the lowest order description of internal wave - mean flow interactions. The next order contains issues relating to the neglect of the envelope structure (Gershgorin et al. 2009) and inclusion of background velocity gradients in the dispersion relation. Theoretical work has been done in the near-inertial limit (Kunze 1985; Young and Jelloul 1997; Whitt and Thomas 2013) but it is unclear how to construct a comprehensive description when the Doppler shift $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{U}$ is of similar size as the Eulerian frequency σ . See the appendix of Polzin et al. (1996a) for a preliminary discussion. The essence is that both [U,V] and $\zeta = V_x - U_y$ cannot be considered as constant unless one takes the near-inertial limit in which the Doppler shift $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{U}$ is small in comparison to ζ .

b. System Behavior

In this subsection we develop intuition concerning system behavior, leaving a comprehensive discussion of the internal wave energy equation for Section 4. Assuming a quasigeostrophic scaling for the mesoscale, a simplicity obtains in the horizontal coordinate. We write:

$$S_n = U_x - V_y$$
$$S_s = V_x + U_y$$
$$\zeta = V_x - U_y$$
$$\Delta = U_x + V_y \approx 0$$

in which in which S_n and S_s are components of the deformation rate of strain tensor, ζ is relative vorticity and Δ is horizontal divergence, assumed small relative to S_n , S_s and ζ . Energy echange occurs as the horizontal wavevector and associated stresses project onto the deformation tensor, Figure 1 of Polzin (2010). We use the polarization relations (9) to make this explicit in the energy equation:

$$-\overline{uu} U_x - \overline{vv} V_y = -(kC_g^x - lC_g^y) \frac{aa^*}{\omega} S_n/2$$

$$= -\frac{k^2 - l^2}{k_h^2 N^2 + f^2 m^2} aa^* S_n/2$$

$$-\overline{uv} U_y - \overline{vu} V_x = -(kC_g^y + lC_g^x) \frac{aa^*}{\omega} S_s/2$$

$$= -\frac{kl}{k_h^2 N^2 + f^2 m^2} aa^* S_s.$$
(13)

Assuming that the time dependence of horizontal wavenumber exceeds that of the background gradients along a ray, upon differentiation with respect to time of the eikonal equations (12) one (Jones 1969; Bühler and McIntyre 2005) arrives at

$$[\ddot{k}, \ddot{l}] = [k, l] (S_n^2 + S_s^2 - \zeta^2) .$$
⁽¹⁴⁾

which implies exponential growth and decay of horizontal wavenumber along the ray if the rate of strain variance dominates the relative vorticity variance and oscillatory solutions otherwise. While one might quibble regarding the amount of time the deformation rate of strain can be considered constant along the ray, one has arrived at an intuitive understanding why horizontal stress and horizontal strain can be correlated. See Figures 3-4 and Figures 5-6 of Polzin (2010) for observations documenting the horizontal stress-strain and vertical stress-shear relations.

In the vertical coordinate,

$$\overline{uw} - \frac{f}{N^2} \overline{bv} = k C_g^z \frac{aa^*}{\omega}$$

$$\overline{vw} + \frac{f}{N^2} \overline{bu} = l C_g^z \frac{aa^*}{\omega}.$$
(15)

The two terms in the effective stress will cancel each other in the limit that $\omega \rightarrow f$, Ruddick and Joyce (1979): transfers in the vertical coordinate emphasize high frequency waves. If the background is in thermal wind balance,

$$-\overline{uw} U_z - N^{-2} \overline{bv} B_y = k C_g^z \frac{aa^*}{\omega} U_z$$

$$-\overline{vw} V_z - N^{-2} \overline{bu} B_x = l C_g^z \frac{aa^*}{\omega} V_z$$
(16)

and $(k,l)C_g^z aa^*/\omega$ can be parsed as the vertical flux of horizontal angular momentum across an isopycnal surface (Jones 1967; Bretherton 1969a) which has a rich history in the zonal mean literature (Andrews et al. 1987; Polzin 2010) under the phrase Eliassen-Palm flux (Eliassen and Palm 1961). In contrast to that parallel shear flow paradigm, which features linear growth of vertical wavenumber in time as the horizontal wavenumber aligns with the background flow, here the vertical wavenumber is slaved to the horizontal wavenumber and thus asymptotically experiences similar exponential growth and decay.

3. The Algebra

a. Navigating Algebra in Müller (1976)

The algebra festival in Müller (1976) relating to our $n_3^{(1)}$ is presented in *ijk* notation, and factors involving the relaxation time scale are cloaked in the guise of an inverse functional,

 D^{-1} : $n_3^{(1)} \to D^{-1}[k^{\alpha} \frac{\partial}{\partial k^m} n_3^{(0)} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^m} \overline{u}^{\alpha}]$. Clarity can be obtained by straightforward evaluation of the expressions for the momentum fluxes. For the vertical coordinate:

$$\overline{uw} - \frac{f}{N^2} \overline{vb} = \int d\mathbf{p} \ k \ C_g^z \ n_3^{(1)}(\mathbf{p}; r, t)$$
substituting (7)

$$= \int d\mathbf{p} \ k \ C_g^z \ \frac{\tau_r}{1 + (\tau_r/\tau_p)^2} \ \dot{\mathbf{p}} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \ n_3^{(0)}(\mathbf{p})$$
substituting (12)

$$\dots \left[(-kU_x - lV_x)\partial_k + (-kU_y - lV_y)\partial_l + (-kU_z - lV_z)\partial_m \right] \ n_3^{(0)}(\mathbf{p})$$
and using the chain rule

$$\partial_k n_3^{(0)} = \frac{-k}{k_h} \partial_{k_h} n_3^{(0)}$$
, etc.

This will produce a series of moments involving powers of the components of the horizontal wavevector (k, l). After changing variables of integration from (k, l, m) to (k_h, m, ϕ) , it becomes obvious that only moments in even powers of both k and l survive.

Thus, by repeating the Fickian mantra that 'flux equals minus a constant times a gradient', one can systematically define the 'constants' relating cospectra $C(\mathbf{p})$ and the background gradients. As detailed in the Appendix of Müller (1976):

$$\int C_{uu}(\mathbf{p})d\mathbf{p} = -\frac{1}{2} v_h 2U_x$$

$$\int C_{uv}(\mathbf{p})d\mathbf{p} = -\frac{1}{2} v_h (V_x + U_y)$$

$$\int C_{vv}(\mathbf{p})d\mathbf{p} = -\frac{1}{2} v_h 2V_y$$

$$\int C_{uw}(\mathbf{p})d\mathbf{p} = -\frac{1}{2} v_v U_z$$

$$\int C_{vw}(\mathbf{p})d\mathbf{p} = -\frac{1}{2} v_v V_z$$

$$\int C_{ub}(\mathbf{p})d\mathbf{p} = -\frac{1}{2} K_h B_x$$

$$\int C_{vb}(\mathbf{p})d\mathbf{p} = -\frac{1}{2} K_h B_y$$
(17)

The Fickian constants are given by:

$$v_{h} = -\frac{1}{8} \int d\mathbf{p} \, \frac{\omega^{2} - f^{2}}{\omega^{2}} \, \frac{\omega \, k_{h} \, \tau_{R}}{1 + (\tau_{R}/\tau_{p})^{2}} \frac{\partial n_{3}^{(0)}(k_{h}, m)}{\partial k_{h}} \,, \tag{18}$$

and

$$v_{\nu} + \frac{f^2}{N^2} K_h = \frac{1}{2} \int d\mathbf{p} \, \frac{\omega^2 - f^2}{\omega^2} \, \frac{\omega \, k_h^2}{m} \frac{\tau_R}{1 + (\tau_R/\tau_p)^2} \frac{\partial n_3^{(0)}(k_h, m)}{\partial m} \,. \tag{19}$$

We will present evaluations of (18) and (19) in Section 3.e after defining the regional spectrum n_3^0 (Section 3.b), propagation time scales τ_p (Section 3.c) and relaxation time scales τ_r (Section 3.d)

The Fickian 'constants' (18) and (19) capture the lowest order coupling between nominally 'slow' eddies and 'fast' internal waves. While the algebra is time consuming, there is a straight forward path for considering higher order effects via introducing background spatial gradients in the dispersion relation that propagate through the eikonal relations (12) and departures from strict geostrophy such as 'gradient wind' and frontogenetic conditions. See the Appendix of Polzin et al. (1996a) for cautionary notes.

b. The Regional Spectrum

Here we introduce the regional spectrum for the Sargasso Sea, where the Local Dynamics Experiment was located. This spectrum defines the background $n^{(0)}(\mathbf{p})$ in our calculations. We do so with the intent of underscoring the hypothesis of Polzin and Lvov (2011) that variability in parametric spectral fits to internal wave frequency and vertical wavenumber reflect regional variability in the sources and dominant nonlinear mechanisms. The Sargasso Sea is south of the Gulf Stream and thus south of the east coast storm track that couples strongly to near-inertial motions. Coherent tidal propagation is moderate. See figures 45 and 47 of Polzin and Lvov (2011). The Sargasso Sea paradigm articulated in Polzin (2010) is that transfers from the mesoscale to the internal wavefield, diagnosed by direct estimates of kinetic energy transfers, can balance the observed turbulent dissipation rates inferred via finescale parameterization methods. This Sargasso Sea spectrum can thus be regarded as an end member in (tidal, atmosphere, eddy) forcing parameter space that represents the mesoscale eddy - internal wave coupling process. The point of interpretation is that coupling with the mesoscale acts as an amplifier of tertiary inputs by smaller

sources at lower vertical wavenumber than are captured by the parametric spectral fits and that these Sargasso Sea spectral parameters are characteristic of eddy-wave coupling.

We use

$$E_2^{(0)}(\sigma,m) = \frac{BE_0}{(m_*^2 + m^2)^{q/2}} \frac{C}{\sigma^{p-2r}(\sigma^2 - f^2)^r}$$
(20)

to characterize the internal wave spectrum. The factor *C* normalizes the frequency spectrum to 1.0. The factor *B* represents the normalization constant for the vertical wavenumber spectrum and the total energy is E_0 .

Frequency spectra from current meters at 616 and 839 m water depth on the center mooring of the LDE array, Figure 1, are used to document the total internal wave energy of total kinetic energy $(E_0 = 0.00192 \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-2}, \text{ and } 0.00172 \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-2}, \text{ respectively})$. Stratification profiles from CTD casts taken during the experiment provide the environmental metrics $N^2 = 1.94 \times 10^{-5} \text{s}^{-2}$ at 600 and $N^2 = 2.29 \times 10^{-5} \text{s}^{-2}$ at 825 m, and $\int_{\text{bottom}}^{\text{surface}} N(z) dz/0.00524 \text{ s}^{-1} = 1830 \text{ m}$ rather than the nominal 1300 m scale height of the GM model. Curve fitting the frequency spectra leads us to p = 1.70 and r = 1.33. We follow Dematteis et al. (2024) in regularizing the frequency integral for nominally non-integrable singularities by introducing a cutoff frequency σ_{cut} with a bandwidth of 0.09*f*. The spectral parameters are characteristic of the region and are repeatable through a plethora of observational campaigns: the Mid-Ocean Dynamics Experiment, the Internal Wave Experiment, PolyMODE I, II, and III, and the Frontal Air-Sea Interaction Experiment, as discussed in Polzin and Lvov (2011).

Data that inform spectral parameters in vertical wavenumber are not as common and often come with the caveat that they are biased due to ship-board sampling strategies that target coherent features rather than attempting to document the background internal wavefield. This is especially true of Sanford's MODE (Leaman and Sanford 1975; Polzin 2008) and LDE (Elliot and Sanford 1986) data sets. However, the gamut of data sets (including the Fine-and-Microstructure Experiment (Gargett et al. 1981), IWEX (Müller et al. 1978) and and FASINEX (Polzin et al. 1996a)) leads to a regional picture of relatively red vertical wavenumber spectra with wavenumber cut-off m_c slightly smaller than 0.1 cpm. From this regional perspective we argue for q = 2.25 and for the integral of the shear spectral density $\int_0^{m_c} 2E_k(m)dm = 2\pi/10 N^2$ at $m_c = 0.080$ cpm. We then numerically iterate to find the value of m_* that provides the total wave energy from the LDE current meter. This process leads us to $m_* = 0.0194$ m⁻¹ at 600 m, and $m_* = 0.0245$ m⁻¹ at 825 m. After



FIG. 1. 600 m LDE frequency spectra of horizontal velocity with fits. Black traces and green circles represent the observations, blue traces the parametric fits. The red circles represent the regularization of the parametric curve.

buoyancy scaling to $N_0 = 3$ cph, these are equivalent to approximately mode 14.5 (13.5 and 15.6, respectively) in our 1830 m deep ocean.

Our curve fits lead us to

GM	825	600	nominal depth [m]
2.75×10^{-5}	2.29×10^{-5}	1.94×10^{-5}	$N^2 [s^{-2}]$
30×10^{-4}	17.2×10^{-4}	19.2×10^{-4}	$E_0 [\mathrm{m}^2 \mathrm{s}^{-2}]$
2.0	2.25	2.25	q
2.0	1.70	1.70	p
0.50	1.33	1.33	r
0.0069	0.0245	0.0194	$m_{*} [m^{-1}]$
3.0	3.53	3.84	E_k/E_p

There are several points to emphasize:

• The bandwidth j_* is not 1, nor 4. It is the equivalent of mode 15. We are *not* talking about waves with horizontal group velocities of O(2) m s⁻¹, which are the internal wave equivalent of surface wave swell. The parametric fitting describes internal waves with horizontal group velocities of O(0.1) m s⁻¹ that will be strongly modulated by interaction with the LDE

mesoscale velocities of O(0.1) m s⁻¹. The parametric spectral model describes the internal wave equivalent of wind waves.

• The vertical wavenumber / frequency power laws are *not* in the combination p = q. Thus, unlike the GM76 model, the 3-d action spectrum, $n_3^{(0)}(m, k_h) \propto m^{p-q} k_h^{-p-2}$, is *not* independent of vertical wavenumber. This leads to efficient vertical coupling of high frequency internal waves with thermal wind shear.

c. Propagation Time Scales

vertical scale H

Munk (1966) buoyancy scales to N = 3 cph to determine $H = 1300/\pi$ m just west of San Diego. Using the same approach in the Sargasso Sea provides something closer to H = 1830m/ $\pi = 580$ m.

horizontal scale L

Owens (1985) estimates a zero crossing of the transverse velocity correlation function of 100 km from the LDE current meter data. The longitudinal velocity correlation function falls off more slowly and thus the longitudinal length scale is not resolved. We will use L = 100 km.

<u>Timescale Ω </u>

The primary concern as regards the timescale Ω is the propensity to set up a resonance in which the group velocity of the internal wave equals the phase speed of the background, $\Omega = \mathbf{K} \cdot \mathbf{C}_g$. The importance of a resonance is that it provides a very long timescale over which energy exchanges can occur. While observed mesoscale phase speeds are small, on the order of 2 cm s⁻¹ (McWilliams 1976), this resonance has been identified (Polzin 2008) in the context of Sanford's data from the MODE experiment (Leaman and Sanford 1975), slightly to the south. Time dependence is greater at the LDE site in conjunction with what were identified as Topographic Rossby Waves (Price and Rossby 1982) and the resonance is, without doubt, of some relevance to sustaining the near-inertial wave field. However, the presence of a resonance is not the primary concern, *per se*, in this paper. The issue is that the resonance is damped via a nonlinear relaxation process and we are currently focused on identifying and documenting that damping.

d. Relaxation Time Scales

1) VERTICAL RELAXATION TIME SCALE

The relaxation time scale in vertical coordinate is identified by Müller (1976). This is a Bragg scattering process (Polzin and Lvov 2024) in which interaction of a wave with either shear or density variations of half the vertical wave scale and much larger horizontal scale transfer wave energy and momentum into a second wave of similar frequency, similar horizontal wavenumber and similar vertical wavenumber magnitude, but opposite sign. This reverses the sign of the group velocity and momentum flux in (16) and represents a direct damping of the energy exchange. This also happens to be the fastest nonlinear time scale (Polzin and Lvov 2024). For the GM76 spectrum, $\tau_r^{-1} = 2k_h E_o m_*/N$, in which $E_o m_*$ is the high vertical wavenumber asymptote of the shear spectral density.

Using Appendix C of Polzin and Lvov (2024) we generalize τ_r to

$$\tau_r = \frac{N^2 [m_*^2 + 4m^2]^{q/2}}{\pi m (2m)^2 B E_0 (\sigma^2 - f^2)^{1/2}} \,. \tag{21}$$

in which B is the normalization constant of the vertical wavenumber spectrum.

2) HORIZONTAL RELAXATION TIME SCALE

The relaxation time scale in horizontal coordinate is more difficult to identify. From the polarization relations (9), flipping the sign of horizontal wavenumber has no impact on the sign of the horizontal pseudo-momentum flux and thus nonlinear interactions that accomplish this do not represent a relaxation mechanism. Similarly, resonant interactions are dominated by co-linear horizontal wavenumbers (Dematteis and Lvov 2021) such that little energy is exchanged between triads in horizontal azimuth. It is with this knowledge that we offer the following conjecture: Since the 3-d action spectrum has significant horizontal wavenumber gradients, i.e. $n^{(0)}(\mathbf{p}) \propto k_h^{-4}m^0$ (this is GM76), small excursions of a wave packet in horizontal wavenumber that conserve the 3-D action spectral density will represent significant perturbations in spectral density.

Horizontal eddy-wave exchanges represent a source of wave energy throughout the vertical wavenumber - frequency domain rather than a sink. We therefore divide the nonlinear transfers at wavenumber **p** into positive and negative contributions, and assign the relaxation time scale τ_r



FIG. 2. Numerical evaluations of relaxation time scales τ_r following Dematteis et al. (2024). The frequency coordinate is divided into subdomains of f - 2f, 2f - 5f and 5f - N with caricatures of the resonant manifold depicting the dominant nonlinear transfer mechanisms.

to those negative, or loss, contributions, figure 2. These are calculated following methodology presented in Dematteis et al. (2024). We interpret the patterns as a loss at frequencies $2f \le \sigma \le 5f$ to $f \le \sigma \le 2f$ via PSI, loss at $f \le \sigma \le 2f$ to $\sigma^2 \gg f^2$ via ES and a local interaction at $\sigma \ge 5f$. Connectivity in the spectral domain is indicated in figure 2 by depictions of the relevant pieces of the resonant manifold. We are in the process of providing approximate analytic expressions for the numerical estimates.

e. Data Comparison

1) The Horizontal Dimension

In the hydrostatic approximation, the horizontal viscosity becomes:

$$v_{h} = -\frac{1}{8} \int d\mathbf{p} \, \frac{\omega^{2} - f^{2}}{\omega^{2}} \, \frac{\omega \, k_{h} \, \tau_{R}}{1 + (\tau_{R}/\tau_{p})^{2}} \frac{\partial n_{3}^{(0)}}{\partial k_{h}} \,, \tag{22}$$

in which k_h represents the magnitude of the horizontal wavevector components, $k_h = (k^2 + l^2)^{1/2}$

The relation between the 2-D energy spectrum, Section 3.b, and a 3-D isotropic action spectrum dictates:

$$n_3^{(0)}(m,\omega) = E_2^{(0)}(m,\omega)/k_h\omega, \qquad (23)$$

so that

$$\frac{\partial n_3^{(0)}}{\partial k_h} = \frac{N^3 B C m^{-3}}{(m_*^2 + m^2)^{q/2}} \frac{1}{(\sigma^2 - f^2)^{r+1/2}} (\frac{1}{\sigma^2})^{(2-r+p/2)} [-\sigma^2 (2+p) + f^2 (2-2r+p)] . \tag{24}$$

Regularization (see section 3.b) for frequencies $\sigma \leq \sigma_{cut}$ is handled by

$$\frac{\partial n_3^{(0)}}{\partial k_h} = E_2^{(0)}(m, \sigma_{\text{cut}}) \frac{\partial}{\partial k_h} (\frac{1}{k_h \sigma} \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial k_h})$$

We evaluate (24) by integrating over horizontal azimuth, in which

$$\int d\mathbf{p} \to \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi \, k_h \, dk_h dm$$

and then transform from (k_h, m) space to (σ, m) space:

$$\nu_{h} = -\frac{1}{8} \int d\sigma dm \frac{m^{3}}{N^{3}} (\sigma^{2} - f^{2})^{3/2} \frac{\tau_{r}}{1 + (\frac{\tau_{r}}{\tau_{p}})^{2}} \frac{\partial n_{3}^{(0)}}{\partial k_{h}} .$$
(25)

Numerical evaluation returns

$$\nu_h \cong 50 \text{ m}^2 \text{s}^{-1} \tag{26}$$

for Sargasso Sea parameters.

We integrate over vertical wavenumber and compare the cumulative frequency integral of (25) with the observed coherence functions normalized by the respective rate of strain, Fig. 3. In this instance semidiurnal frequencies make a significant contribution to the shear component of the stress – rate of strain relation (Polzin 2010). These contributions are assumed to be associated with low-vertical modes that are not described by the parametric fits (20). Thus, the comparison is made by excluding semi-diurnal frequencies from the cumulative integrals of the observed coherence functions. The observations are adjusted through this gap so as to aid the eye. In so doing, the 'observed' frequency integrated estimates of horizontal viscosity of 50 m² s⁻¹ agree with theoretical estimates using a length scale of L = 100 km. We begin integration of the observed coherence functions at $\sigma = 0.7f$ rather than at f. This includes some covariance at frequencies $\sigma < f$ associated with Doppler smearing that is not included in the numerical assessments of (25) which utilize the intrinsic frequency ω . This Doppler smearing along the frequency axis exceeds that associated with modulation of the near-inertial waveguide by relative vorticity by an order of magnitude. These two differences in methodology result in figure 3 having a slightly different appearance in comparison with figure 3 of Polzin (2010)

Uncertainty estimates are presented in Polzin (2010) for the stress–strain regressions. They are far larger than the O(10-20%) mismatch between data and theory and render explanations of slight apparent disparities between data and theory to be speculative, at best.

2) THE VERTICAL DIMENSION

In the hydrostatic approximation, the effective vertical viscosity becomes:

$$v_{\nu} + \frac{f^2}{N^2} K_h = \frac{1}{2} \int d\mathbf{p} \, \frac{\omega^2 - f^2}{\omega^2} \, \frac{\omega \, k_h^2}{m} \frac{\tau_R}{1 + (\tau_R/\tau_p)^2} \frac{\partial n_3^{(0)}(k_h, m)}{\partial m} \,. \tag{27}$$

For the parametric spectral representation (20),

$$\frac{\partial n^{(0)}}{\partial m} = N^2 BC \left(\frac{1}{m^2(\sigma^2 - f^2)}\right)^r \frac{m^p}{(m_*^2 + m^2)^{q/2}} \left(\frac{1}{m^2 \sigma^2}\right)^{1 - r - p/2} \left[\frac{-qm}{(m_*^2 + m^2)} + \frac{p}{m} - 2\frac{f^2}{\sigma^2} \frac{(1 - r + p/2)}{m}\right]$$
(28)



FIG. 3. Cumulative integrals of the spectral functions $-sgn(S_n)[P_{u''u''} - P_{v''v''}]$ (blue dots) and $-2sgn(S_s)C_{u''v''}$ (red dots), divided by rate of strain $\overline{|S_n|}$ and $\overline{|S_s|}$, to provide estimates of the horizontal viscosity v_h . Blue and red dots are connected by grey shading and the mean is represented as black dots. Over plotted as cyan lines are Sargasso Sea based estimates for the corresponding viscosity estimate using (25) with parameters estimated at 600 and 825 m. These estimates employ an eddy scale of L = 100 km. The vertical black lines delineate frequencies of f, 2f and 5f.

Regularization (see section 3.b) for frequencies $\sigma \leq \sigma_{cut}$ is handled by

$$\frac{\partial n_3^{(0)}}{\partial m} = \frac{\partial}{\partial m} \left(\frac{1}{k_h \sigma} \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial k_h} E_2^{(0)}(m, \sigma_{\text{cut}}) \right)$$

We similarly integrate over horizontal azimuth and transform to (σ, m) space to obtain:

$$v_{\nu} + \frac{f^2}{N^2} K_h = \frac{1}{2} \int d\sigma dm \; \frac{\left[\omega^2 - f^2\right]^2 m^3}{N^4} \frac{\tau_R}{1 + (\tau_R/\tau_p)^2} \frac{\partial n_3^{(0)}}{\partial m} \;. \tag{29}$$

Numerical evaluation for the Sargasso Sea spectral parameters provides $v_v + \frac{f^2}{N^2}K_h = 2.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$. After integration of (29) over vertical wavenumber, direct comparisons with the cumulative contributions to the frequency integral (figure 6 of Polzin (2010)) are presented in figure 4.

The observed contributions (figure 4) are negative at near-inertial frequencies and trend positive at high frequency, indicating near-inertial wave energy loss to the mean flow consistent with critical layer behavior and energy gain within the continuum, $\sigma^2 >> f^2$. The observed contributions at high frequency are consistently positive at $\sigma > 10$ cpd.

The frequency domain summary in figure (4) is a result of subtractive cancellation in the integrand of (29), with positive coherence indicating wave extraction of energy from the mean flow at large $(m < m_*)$ vertical scales and energy loss to the mean flow at smaller $(m > m_*)$ vertical scales, figure 5. We interpret this sensitivity to m_* as symptomatic of the fundamental role of wave-mean interactions in setting the character of the internal wave spectrum in the Sargasso Sea. It provides a conceptual underpinning of why the observed lowest-order description of oceanic internal wave spectra (20) can be consistent with separability in vertical wavenumber and frequency.

In summary, the ability of the prognostic estimates to capture both the qualitative and quantitative character of the observations is remarkable given the following: (1) The prognostic estimates are based upon a 2-d vertical wavenumber intrinsic frequency spectrum inferred from two 1-d spectra assuming separability in vertical wavenumber and Eulerian frequency. (2) Vertical velocity was inferred from a 1-d (vertical) temperature balance. Contamination by both vertical and horizontal Doppler shifting is unconstrained. Both issues could be addressed from a single mooring by higher resolution temperature measurements and higher precision 3-D acoustic travel time current meters at higher vertical resolution.

4. Budgets

We invoke a Reynolds decomposition of the velocity $[\mathbf{u} = (u, v, w)]$, buoyancy $[b = -g\rho/\rho_o$ with gravitational constant g and density ρ] and pressure $[\pi]$ fields into a quasi-geostrophic 'mean' (in upper case) and small amplitude internal wave (in lower case) perturbations on the basis of a time scale separation: $\psi \rightarrow \Psi + \psi$ with an explicit averaging timescale $\overline{\psi} \rightarrow \tau^{-1} \int_0^\tau \psi dt$ much longer than the internal wave time scale but smaller than the eddy time scale. We will also require a



FIG. 4. Cumulative integrals of the spectral function $-sgn(\overline{u}_z)[C_{u''w''} - fC_{v''b''}/N^2]/(\overline{u}_z^2)^{1/2} - sgn(\overline{v}_z)[C_{v''w''} + fC_{u''b''}/N^2]/(\overline{v}_z^2)^{1/2}$, to provide estimates of the vertical viscosity $(v_v + \frac{f^2}{N^2}K_h)$. Over plotted as thick lines are prognostic estimates (29) derived from current meters at 600 and 825 m water depth.

further time (or ensemble) average which , in practice, is the record length mean. This average is represented as $\langle \ldots \rangle$.

a. Internal Wave Energy

The linear internal wave energy equation is [Müller (1976)]:

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + U \cdot \nabla_{h}\right)\left(E_{k} + E_{p}\right) + \nabla \cdot \overline{\pi \mathbf{u}} = -\overline{uu}U_{x} - \overline{uv}U_{y} - \overline{vu}V_{x} - \overline{vv}V_{y} - \overline{uw}U_{z} - N^{-2}\overline{bu}B_{x} - \overline{vw}V_{z} - N^{-2}\overline{bv}B_{y}$$

Direct evaluation (Polzin 2010) of the horizontal stress - horizontal rate of strain terms returns an energy transfer rate of 3×10^{-10} W kg⁻¹. Similar evaluation of vertical stress - vertical shear returns an energy transfer rate of 1×10^{-10} W kg⁻¹. This energy transfer rate is an O(10)% contribution



FIG. 5. The integrand of (29) multiplied by vertical wavenumber *m* and frequency σ . The sign transition (white contour) is associated with change in sign of the gradient of the background spectrum, $\partial_m n_3^{(0)}(\mathbf{p})$, which in turn is determined by the bandwidth m_* in the non-rotating ($\sigma^2 \gg f^2$) limit. The sign after integration over vertical wavenumber is sensitive to the interplay between the bandwidth m_* and the non-dimensional ratio τ_r/τ_p , such that the zero crossing of the cumulative viscosity in figure (4) requires accurate specification of both. If, for example, one used the GM76 model, the comparison in figure (4) is unrealistic. See figures 42 and 43 of Polzin and Lvov (2011).

to the mesoscale eddy energy budget presented in Bryden (1982), in which production through baroclinic instability and the rate of work against the mean are the leading order terms, at some $3.3 \pm 1.7 \times 10^{-9}$ and $1.5 \pm 0.9 \times 10^{-9}$ W/kg, respectively. The energy transfer *into* the internal wavefield, however, is in balance with internal wave dissipation inferred from finescale metrics, (Polzin 2010).

b. Potential Vorticity

The linear quasigeostrophic potential vorticity equation is [Müller (1976)]:

$$(\partial_{t} + U\partial_{x} + V\partial_{y})(\partial_{x}^{2}\Phi + \partial_{y}^{2}\Phi + \partial_{z}[\frac{f^{2}}{N^{2}}\partial_{z}\Phi] + \beta y) = \\\partial_{x}[\partial_{x}\overline{vu} + \partial_{y}\overline{vv} + \partial_{z}(\overline{vw} + \frac{f}{N^{2}}\overline{bu})] \\ -\partial_{y}[\partial_{x}\overline{uu} + \partial_{y}\overline{uv} + \partial_{z}(\overline{uw} - \frac{f}{N^{2}}\overline{bv})] + \mathcal{H}$$
(30)

in which \mathcal{H} represents modification of the mean buoyancy profile through diabatic processes, Φ is the geostrophic streamfunction ($\Phi = \Pi/f$ with Coriolis parameter f) and pressure Π is defined in the absence of the internal wavefield. For parcels that do not make excursions into the mixed layer, $\mathcal{H} = \partial_z \frac{f}{N^2} \partial_z (K_\rho \langle B_z \rangle)$. In the background wavefield, $K_\rho \cong 5 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$. Scaling terms on the right-hand-side of (30) using this diapycnal diffusivity and the viscosity operators identified in the previous section along with estimates of vertical shear, deformation rate of strain and the first baroclinic deformation radius for a lateral scale, one finds that terms involving internal wave momentum are one to two orders of magnitude larger than that involving the dipaycnal process. Diabatic effects are thus excluded from consideration below and the issue will be revisited in the Discussion.

The issue here is the linkage of $O(\frac{\ell}{\mathcal{L}})$ potential vorticity signatures on $n_3^{(2)}$, i.e. $\nabla_h \times \mathbf{k} n_3^{(2)}(\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{r}(t)))$, with gyre scale dynamics. This is made concrete in the discussion of a potential enstrophy budget in the following subsection.

c. Potential Enstrophy

Including a schematic representation of eddy-eddy nonlinear transfers as " \mathcal{NL} ", the eddy potential enstrophy budget is obtained by first decomposing the low frequency field into mean $\langle Q \rangle$ and mesoscale eddy components Q'. Multiplying (30) by the quasigeostrophic perturbation potential vorticity and averaging returns:

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{D}{Dt}\langle Q'^2\rangle + \langle \mathcal{NL}\rangle + \langle \mathbf{U}'Q'\rangle \cdot \nabla_h \langle Q\rangle = -\langle Q' \left[-\partial_x \nabla \cdot \int d\mathbf{p} \, n(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{x}, t) \, l \, \mathbf{C_g} + \partial_y \nabla \cdot \int d\mathbf{p} \, n(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{x}, t) \, k \, \mathbf{C_g} \right] \rangle$$
(31)

in which $\frac{D}{Dt}$ represents the material derivative following the (geostrophic flow) and ∇_h is the 2-D horizontal gradient operator.

If closure of mesoscale eddy - internal wave coupling through flux gradient relations can be justified, in which $-2\overline{uv} = v_h(V_x + U_y)$, $-\overline{uw} = v_vU_z$, $-\overline{uu} = v_hU_x$, $-\overline{vv} = v_hV_y$, $-\overline{ub} = K_hB_x$, and $-\overline{vb} = K_hB_y$, considerable simplification results. The right-hand-side of the enstrophy equation, using the thermal wind relation and integrating by parts, can be rewritten as:

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{D}{dt}\langle Q^{\prime 2}\rangle + \langle \mathbf{U}^{\prime}Q^{\prime}\rangle \cdot \nabla_{h}\langle Q\rangle + \langle \mathcal{NL}\rangle = -\frac{1}{2}\nu_{h}[\langle \zeta_{x}^{\prime 2} + \zeta_{y}^{\prime 2}\rangle + \frac{f_{o}^{2}}{\langle B_{z}\rangle}\langle \zeta_{z}^{\prime 2}\rangle] - [\nu_{v} + \frac{f^{2}}{N^{2}}K_{h}][\langle \zeta_{z}^{\prime 2}\rangle + \frac{1}{\langle B_{z}\rangle}\langle B_{xz}^{\prime 2} + B_{yz}^{\prime 2}\rangle]$$
(32)

We are now in a position to ask how the generation of internal wave pseudomomentum by eddywave coupling can be cast as a nonconservative term in the eddy enstrophy budget and thereby be linked to potential vorticity dynamics. Brown et al. (1986) use the LDE array data to estimate the eddy thickness $[\eta' = f_0(\rho'/\langle \rho_z \rangle)_z]$ and relative vorticity (ζ') fluxes:

$$\langle \mathbf{U}'\eta' \rangle = (-0.79 \pm 0.53, -1.45 \pm 0.71) \times 10^{-7} \text{ m s}^{-2}$$

 $\langle \mathbf{U}'\zeta' \rangle = (-1.57 \pm 1.51, 1.95 \pm 1.54) \times 10^{-8} \text{ m s}^{-2}.$

Thickness fluxes exceed relative vorticity fluxes by an order of magnitude. A map of planetary vorticity on the potential density $\sigma_{\theta} = 27.0$ surface in Robbins et al. (2000) implies $\nabla_h \langle Q \rangle \cong (0, \beta) = (0, 2 \times 10^{-11} \text{ m}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1})$ at the level of the current meter data (the density surface is at approximately 700 m and the current meters are located at approximately 630 m for these potential vorticity flux estimates), so that

$$\langle \mathbf{U}'Q' \rangle \cdot \nabla_h \langle Q \rangle \cong -2.5 \times 10^{-18} \,\mathrm{s}^{-3}$$

The LDE array was specifically designed to estimate terms in the quasigeostrophic potential vorticity equation with mooring spacing to optimally sample the deformation scale horizontal velocity gradients. The right-hand-side of the potential enstrophy balance, though, concerns second derivatives of horizontal velocities that are dominated by significantly smaller horizontal and vertical length scales than give rise to the surprisingly robust estimate of the wave stress - deformation rate of strain covariances in figure 3, i.e. L = 100 km, which in turn is greater than the

deformation radius associated with the first baroclinic mode, $L_d = \frac{N}{f}H = 40$ km, using the height scale *H* identified earlier.

To estimate the associated potential enstrophy dissipation rates, we utilize a satellite altimetry based estimate of surface geostrophic velocity from AVISO. We take one snap shot of that field over a 10 degree by 10 degree area centered on the LDE array to create a horizontal wavenumber spectrum of horizontal velocity. This is taken as a spectral shape whose amplitude is normalized to the sub-inertial velocity variance of the LDE currents at 600 m, 0.017 m² s⁻². We then extend this spectrum, which we refer to as 'AVISO-extended' to a 1 km scale by assuming the kinetic energy spectrum falls off in proportion to K_h^{-3} , figure 6.

In Section 3 our efforts were focused on the transfer of energy. Those efforts utilized single horizontal and vertical scales. Here we take a more nuanced approach and utilize a length scale dependent horizontal viscosity $v_h(\tau_p^{-1} = C_g^h K_h)$ in (6) and (18) in order to assess the dissipation of enstrophy. Representing enstrophy dissipation in the spectral domain, we find

$$\frac{1}{2}\nu_h[\langle \zeta_x^{\prime 2} + \zeta_y^{\prime 2} \rangle + \frac{f_o^2}{\langle B_z \rangle} \langle \zeta_z^{\prime 2} \rangle] \rightarrow \int_0^{K_h} 2\nu_h(K_h^\prime) K_h^{\prime 4} E_1(K_h^\prime) dK_h^\prime$$
(33)

$$\rightarrow 2\nu_h(K_h) K_h^5 E_1(K_h) \tag{34}$$

where $E_1(K_h)$ represents the 1-d horizontal spectrum of eddy kinetic energy. Empirical scalings of $\zeta^2 \cong 2K_h^2 E_1(K_h)$ and $\frac{f_o^2}{\langle B_z \rangle} \partial_z^2 \cong \nabla_h^2$ have been invoked.

Our expectation is that this spectral dissipation metric should be similar to the downscale enstrophy transfer rate $\gamma^{1/3}$ at the envelope scale \mathcal{L} of the energy containing near-inertial waves. Observational metrics of such packet structure are minimal. Physical intuition suggests a relatively large bandwith $\Delta \mathbf{p}$ associated with the envelope, e.g. $\Delta \mathbf{p} \cong \mathbf{p}$, so that a Fourier uncertainty principle

$$\Delta \mathbf{r} \cdot \Delta \mathbf{p} \geq 1/2$$
suggests
(35)

 $\mathcal{L} k_h \stackrel{>}{\sim} 1/2$ (36)

Thus our expectation is that the eddy enstrophy dissipation scale should be similar to the energy containing scale of the near-inertial field, i.e. similar to $2\pi/\lambda_h(\sqrt{2}f, m_*)$. The 'AVISO-extended'

estimate is an order of magnitude smaller than the enstrophy production estimate at this horizontal length scale of the energy containing near-inertial internal wavefield, figure 7.

The AVISO product is understood to have similar constraints on horizontal resolution as the LDE moored array, e.g. Arbic et al. (2013), with the consequence that the AVISO-extended estimate of enstrophy dissipation is biased low. To address this limitation we consider that dimensional analysis of the enstrophy cascade regime (Charney 1971) leads to

$$E_1(K_h) = A \ \gamma^{2/3} \ K_h^{-3} \tag{37}$$

in which γ is the rate at which potential enstrophy is transferred to smaller scales. We take A = 2.9 from a numerical study of stratified quasi-geostrophic turbulence (Vallgren and Lindborg 2010) and find, after setting the downscale transfer rate γ to be equal to the estimated potential enstrophy production rate, $\gamma = 2.5 \times 10^{-18} \text{ s}^{-3}$, that the enstrophy cascade regime intersects the AVISO spectrum at the deformation scale, figure 6. We therefore repeat the process of extending the AVISO spectrum, which we refer to as AVISO-modified, and create a modified enstrophy dissipation function, figure 7. So constructed, the horizontal potential enstrophy dissipation rate is half the potential enstrophy production rate at the horizontal length scales characterizing the energy containing near-inertial internal waves!

In order to demonstrate that this quite remarkable result is not simply the result of one *ad hoc*. assumption piled upon another, we perform a consistency check. We directly compare the nonlinear relaxation timescale with that characterizing the potential enstrophy cascade, $A/\gamma^{1/3}$, in figure 8. We find that the time scale for nonlinear interactions to relax perturbations at the energy containing scales of the near-inertial field is shorter than the downscale enstrophy transfer rate.

Formulating a corresponding scale dependent estimate of the vertical viscosity is more complex. Halving the height scale H decreases the propagation time scale τ_p , which in turn significantly reduces the positive contributions to the effective vertical viscosity coming from relatively large vertical wavelengths, figure 5. This tendency could be offset by minor frequency dependent changes to the vertical bandwith m_* and use of a non-hydrostatic dispersion relation. Observational constraints here are minimal.



FIG. 6. (black trace) Horizontal wavenumber spectrum of geostrophic velocity from AVISO, extended to higher horizontal wavenumber as a k^{-3} power law. (red trace) Horizontal wavenumber spectrum for the enstrophy cascade regime using the production estimate to set the downscale transfer rate γ . (green trace) Horizontal wavenumber spectrum of geostrophic velocity from AVISO, modified within the enstrophy cascade regime. These three traces are overlie each other. Slow manifold Energy and enstrophy cascade paradigms are depicted with bold arrows. Transfer of energy from the mesoscale eddy field to the internal wavefield through extreme scale separated interactions is depicted with a smaller weighting. We argue that the potential enstrophy cascade, which nominally occurs without energy transfers, ends at the energy containing scales of the internal wavefield as submesoscale eddy potential vorticity is traded for internal wave psuedomomentum. This energy containing scale is located by the sign post.

5. Summary and Discussion

a. Summary

A modified version of the mesoscale eddy-internal wave coupling mechanism described by Müller (1976) is used to predict an effective horizontal viscosity of 50 m² s⁻¹ and an effective vertical viscosity of 2.5×10^{-3} m² s⁻¹. The model requires specifying a stationary isotropic homogeneous background spectrum, which is then perturbed through mesoscale eddy interactions.



FIG. 7. Estimates of enstrophy dissipation. Half of the enstrophy production rate is located on the vertical axis by the red pentagram. The green and blue lines attempt scale dependent estimates of the potential enstrophy dissipation using the 'extended' and 'modified' versions of the AVISO spectrum. These scales are differentiated from the spatial scales characterizing energetics, L = 100 km in the horizontal and $L_d = \frac{N}{f}H$ in the vertical. The 'modified' scale dependent dissipation estimate is approximately equal to half the production rate at the horizontal wavelength of the energy containing scale of the near-inertial field. This approximate equality is interpreted as, "The End of the Enstrophy Cascade'.

Subtle regional variability in background spectra are documented in Polzin and Lvov (2011). This includes high wavenumber - high frequency power laws, vertical wavenumber bandwidth and the inertial peak. The model - data comparison presented here requires engaging with this variability. Having done so, the modified theory is in remarkable agreement with energy exchanges between waves and eddies at the energy containing scales of the eddy field in the Local Dynamics Experiment.



FIG. 8. A contour plot of horizontal nonlinear relaxation time scales (figure 2) with the enstrophy cascade time scale $A/\gamma^{1/3}$ represented by the white contour and the energy containing scale of the vertical wavenumber spectrum represented as the white vertical line. The nonlinear relaxation time scale is shorter than the enstrophy cascade time scale to the right of the white contour. An approximate equivalence of these time scales within the energy containing part of the near-inertial field (m_*) is interpreted as indicating a dynamical linkage of the fast (gravity dominated) and slow (rotationally dominated) manifolds.

The LDE was a large multi-investigator program resulting in a broad swath of work on eddy energetics and eddy dynamics (Kamenkovich et al. 1986). This body of work allows us to enquire rather than speculate about the consequences. The most significant result is a statistically significant estimate of potential vorticity fluxes directed across mean potential vorticity gradients. This implies potential enstrophy production with an attendant cascade of potential enstrophy to smaller scales. We have estimated a length scale dependent wave-eddy coupling, and our work implies the transfer of eddy vorticity to internal wave pseudomomentum at the energy containing scale of the internal wavefield. This remarkable result provides a dynamical rationale for locating the end of the enstrophy cascade at the energy containing scale of the near-inertial field. These dynamics likely dictate the regional m_* , whereas energetics determine the spectral density Bm_* and high wavenumber cutoff m_c .

This study comes with many caveats:

- The LDE array does not spatially resolve the enstrophy gradient variance.
- The maximum observational record length for the LDE array data discussed in Section (c) is 15 months, but failure of certain instruments reduces the usable record length to 225 days. Stable estimates of time mean quantities typically require averaging periods of order 500 days (Schmitz 1977). The mean quantities quoted here represent record length means with associated record length uncertainties. See Bryden (1982) and Brown et al. (1986) for further discussion of these uncertainties, who note that the available 15 month estimates are consistent with the 225 day record means (to within uncertainty). Any differences do not change the interpretation presented here.
- The estimated wave-eddy coupling will respond to variability in the amplitude and spectral characteristics of the background internal wavefield. Characterization of spectral variability in response to spatial/temporal variations of sources and sinks is an open question, Polzin and Lvov (2011).
- The characterization of wave-eddy coupling through a flux gradient relation applies only to quasigeostrophic flows in which the flow field is horizontally nondivergent to *O*(Rossby number squared). Spatially symmetric flow structures such as rings and jets are not coupled in the same manner.

b. Implications

1) Mesoscale Dynamics

Potential vorticity is conserved in the absence of diabatic processes and friction - (Ertel 1942; Haynes and McIntyre 1987). The dominant intellectual prejudice in Physical Oceanography is to regard frictional processes as being essentially diabatic in nature and sufficiently weak within the oceanic interior that potential vorticity modification following a parcel occurs only at the boundaries. Within this eddy only paradigm, we have a robust understanding of nonlinear transfers from baroclinic to baroropic eddies and an upscale (inverse) energy cascade coinciding with a downscale (forward) potential enstrophy cascade. (e.g Charney 1971; Rhines 1979; Salmon 1998). On the other hand, if mesoscale eddies are coupled to the internal wavefield as described here, then the enstrophy cascade can be short-circuited. One relevant question is, "at what scale does mesoscale eddy - internal wave coupling compete with nonlinearity on the slow manifold?" An answer using an idealized 2-layer quasi-geostrophic model in a LDE setting (Arbic et al. 2013) is that a horizontal viscosity of 40 m² s⁻² can quantitatively impact nonlinear energy transfers at the deformation scale. A further answer here is that potential enstrophy dissipation occurs at the energy containing scales of the internal wavefield.

This statement should give the reader pause. It begs for further numerical investigation using regional models nested with larger - scale (global) numerical simulations with realistic tides, topography and atmospheric forcing.

Our assessment of implications is made concrete by the LDE being located in the Southern Recirculation Gyre of the Gulf Stream. Similar implications likely attend to standing meanders of the Antarctic Circumpolar Current (Thompson and Garabato 2014; Marshall et al. 2017) and represent a fundamental departure from the zonal mean paradigm of earth system behavior.

2) GENERAL CIRCULATION ISSUES

In a one-dimensional vertical advection - vertical diffusion balance of the buoyancy equation, diapycnal diffusivities of $O(1 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1})$ are required to balance the upwelling of some 30×10^6 m³ s⁻¹ Bottom and Deep Waters produced in polar regions, Munk (1966). There may be sufficient diapycnal mixing above topographically rough regions driven by internal wave breaking (Polzin et al. 1997) or associated with topographically constrained passages (Polzin et al. 1996b; St.Laurent and Thurnherr 2007) to upwell Deep and Bottom waters to Intermediate Water levels (1000-2000 m water depth over much of the World's Oceans). However, diapycnal mixing is sufficiently weak, $O(1 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1})$, over much of the thermocline region [e.g. Ledwell et al. (1993)], that advocacy of a diapycnal advection-diffusion balance is difficult to defend.

Something must give, and a conceptual paradigm that supplants the vertical advection – vertical diffusion balance is that of Luyten et al. (1983), in which mean streamlines coincide with mean potential vorticity contours, with streamlines consisting of Rossby wave trajectories. A competing

hypothesis is that, if one takes the ideal fluid limit of an adiabatic and inviscid interior and considers the effect of mesoscale eddies, potential enstrophy will be advected to the boundaries in association with nonlinear transport terms and dissipated there. The net result is a gyre interior with small mean potential vorticity gradients, Rhines and Young (1982). Such behavior is characteristic of idealized eddy-resolving models in this limit (Wilson and Williams 2004; Cessi and Ierley 1995; Fox-Kemper and Pedlosky 2004). A tentative generalization of such model behavior is that eddy fluxes typically are along, rather than across, mean potential vorticity contours, and that the mean tends to a state of potential vorticity homogenization, in which the down gradient potential vorticity flux contribution to the enstrophy budget is small. A counter point to this model behavior is McCartney (1982)'s characterization of potential vorticity increase and water mass modification of Mode Waters along likely advection paths rather than the corresponding interpretations of McDowell et al. (1982) and Keffer (1985). Robbins et al. (2000), which concerns eddy ventilation of North Atlantic Central Water, is quite informative in this context.

These ideas and concepts are ripe for exploration with the availability of expanding climatologies from Argo (Whalen et al. 2018; Pollmann 2020; Wijffels et al. 2024a; Hersh et al. 2025), moored current meter (Le Boyer and Alford 2021; Dematteis et al. 2024) and EM-profiling (Girton 2025) data bases.

3) CLIMATE

One perspective of climate change is that temporal trends at increasingly longer time scales represent increasingly smaller imbalances in the equations of motion. If true, can we really claim to understand how the climate system works if GCMs are simply tuned to today's conditions and do not address the proper sub-grid scale physics? What happens to the behavior of the general circulation as the thermocline tightens, the eddy scale decreases, or the rms eddy velocity increases? What are the phenomenological linkages between internal waves and eddies; and the consequences for eddy dynamics? These ideas and concepts are ripe for exploration with comparisons of regional characterizations of the internal wavefield with those from high resolution regional models (Pan et al. 2020) and the internal workings of those models (Skitka et al. 2024).

Acknowledgments. Much of the intellectual content of this paper evolved out of discussions with R. Ferrari several decades ago. The manuscript benefited from similarly dated discussions with Brian Arbic, Rob Scott and a review provided by Peter Rhines. Salary support for this analysis was provided by NSF through OCE-2319144 and OCE-2232439 (NOPP), and the Henry M. Stommel Chair in Oceanography. An early version of this work was submitted to JPO in 2009 and returned without review by the Chief Editor, with the opinion that the substantive dynamical issue was in the degradation of the near-inertial waveguide by reversals in the sign of potential vorticity. This opinion is inconsistent with the quasi-geostrophic setting of the LDE.

Data availability statement. No data were created for this paper. Just reruns of the classics.

APPENDIX A

Other Assessments

a. Observations

Observational assessments of internal wave - mesoscale eddy energy exchanges from moored arrays are provided in Cusack et al. (2020) (the Drake Passage as part of DIMES), Savage et al. (submitted) (the NE Atlantic as part of OSMOSIS) and Jing et al. (2018) (the Gulf of Mexico). These lack quality vertical wavenumber domain information to ground the analysis pursued here.

b. Theory

1) Müller (1976)

The Sargasso Sea observations and our theoretical estimates of the vertical exchange coefficient are both much smaller than Müller's prediction of $v_v + \frac{f^2}{N^2}K_h \approx 0.45 \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$, which was originally repudiated by observations presented in Frankignoul (1976) and Ruddick and Joyce (1979), and is more than two oders of magnitude larger than that provided in Polzin (2010).

Müller's large estimate is a product of (at least) three compounding issues:

 Use of a non-hydrostatic dispersion relation, which appears to be inconsistent with a vertical modal structure (Pinkel 1975) at large vertical scales and potential linkage to super-buoyancy, transient nonlinear interactions at smaller vertical scales.

- 2. Assuming the eddy interactions were local in space/time, i.e. $\tau_r \ll \tau_p$
- 3. Characterizing the relaxation time as being independent of vertical wavenumber and frequency, even though the Bragg scattering process was identified as the crucial relaxation physics.

2) Ruddick and Joyce (1979)

Ruddick and Joyce (1979) note that Müller (1976)'s zeroth order wavefield is specified as the isotropic universal (GM) model in an Eulerian frequency coordinate. They argue that the relaxation process could very well be toward an equilibrium spectrum with an intrinsic frequency coordinate. This appears to have some parallels with our Introduction. Using the 'Induced Diffusion' piece of the resonant manifold, they obtain a solution to the radiation balance equation that is a combination of thermodynamic equilibrium $n_3^{(0)}(\mathbf{p}) \propto k_h / |m|$ and non-equilibrium no-flux $n_3^{(0)}(\mathbf{p}) \propto k_h^{-x} m^0$ solutions. There are decided issues with the 'Induced Diffusion' mechanism that are discussed at length in Lvov and Polzin (2024) and Polzin and Lvov (2024). Note that the Sargasso Sea spectrum, which we promote as representing an wave-eddy end-member of forcing space, is inconsistent with $n_3^{(0)}(\mathbf{p}) \propto k_h^{-x} m^0$.

3) WATSON (1985)

The genesis of Watson (1985) is a recognition that there is no mechanism in the resonant interaction scheme of McComas and Müller (1981) for transporting energy within the high vertical wavenumber ($100 \ge \lambda_v \ge 10$ m) near-inertial ($f < \omega \le 2f$) frequency band toward even higher vertical wavenumber. The intent of Watson (1985) was to formulate a radiation balance representation of wave–mean interactions in this band to transport action to a sink at $\lambda_v < 10$ m through the cumulative effects of near-inertial wave refraction in the mesoscale fields. This refractive limit is more recently pursued in many GFD oriented publications (Savva and Vanneste 2018; Kafiabad et al. 2019; Dong et al. 2020; Savva et al. 2021; Dong et al. 2023; Cox et al. 2023).

A key objective for such refractive models is the identification of a diffusivity tensor D_{ij} in wavenumber space:

$$D_{ij}(\mathbf{p}) = \int_{t-\tau}^{t} \langle \dot{\mathbf{p}}_i(\mathbf{r}(t)) \dot{\mathbf{p}}_j(\mathbf{r}(t')) \rangle dt' \to \tau_c \langle \dot{p}_i \dot{p}_j \rangle$$
(A1)

that hinges upon the time integration converging to a correlation time scale τ_c . This correlation time scale arguably coincides with our propagation time scale τ_p . See Lvov and Polzin (2024)

for a description of how transport equations are developed from (1) and a Taylor series expansion involving backwards integration along ray-trajectories, rather than the Eulerian formulation (2).

All these refractive models ignore the importance of resonance conditions (Polzin 2008) which require fundamental modification of transport equations (Lvov and Polzin 2024, Section 3.2.4) and (Polzin and Lvov 2024, Section 1.b) in this high wavenumber limit. Such resonance conditions are highly problematic for internal waves described by the parametric representation (20) and the relevance of such resonances is underscored by the oceanographic community's very first look at the 10 meter vertical structure of the horizontal velocity field, (Leaman and Sanford 1975; Polzin 2008).

Our understanding is that near-inertial energy is transported to higher frequency in association with a Bragg scattering branch of the resonant manifold, figure 2. To reiterate: what we are after here is analogous to the development of a surface wind wave field rather than the propagation of surface swell. Such refractive models the applicable only to internal swell in a linear (i.e. $\tau_r/\tau_p \gg 1$) limit.

4) The Bounce

As formulated, these models assume a constant buoyancy frequency. Waves are free to propagate in the vertical and will terminate an interaction event on a time scale $\tau_p = H/C_g^z$. Waves of sufficiently high frequency, however, will encounter turning points where their intrinsic frequency approaches that of the local stratification rate N(z). Curiously, the negative vertical stress - vertical shear correlation occurs for waves that potentially encounter a buoyancy frequency turning point, figure 4. The presence of turning points and a boundary can give rise to a variant of the wave capture scenario.

In a deformation strain horizontal wavenumber magnitude asymptotically increases. Vertical wavenumber undergoes either an increase or decrease, but at both surface reflection or turning point there will be a sign change and opposing time evolution of the vertical wavenumber. Over many reflections and turning points, horizontal wavenumber magnitude increases, the vertical wavenumber remains nearly constant and consequently the intrinsic frequency increases. Such a wave will become progressively trapped in regions of higher and higher buoyancy frequency. A high frequency wave reported in Joyce and Stalcup (1984) may represent such an event. It

is not clear that this phenomenology is appropriately represented in (19). The relevance of this mechanism as damping for upper ocean frontogenetic conditions (Yu et al. 2024) is palpable.

References

- Andrews, D. G., J. R. Holton, and C. B. Leovy, 1987: *Middle Atmosphere Dynamics*. Academic Press, Orlando, 1–489 pp.
- Arbic, B. K., K. L. Polzin, R. B. Scott, J. G. Richman, and J. F. Shriver, 2013: On eddy viscosity, energy cascades, and the horizontal resolution of gridded satellite altimeter products. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, **43** (2), 283–300.
- Bretherton, F. P., 1969a: Momentum transport by gravity waves. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, **95** (404), 213–243.
- Bretherton, F. P., 1969b: On the mean motion induced by internal gravity waves. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, **36** (**4**), 785–803.
- Brown, E. D., and W. B. Owens, 1981: Observations of the horizontal interactions between the internal wave field and the mesoscale flow. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **11**, 1474–1480.
- Brown, E. D., W. B. Owens, and H. L. Bryden, 1986: Eddy-potential vorticity fluxes in the Gulf Stream Recirculation. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **16**, 523–1531.
- Bryden, H. L., 1982: Sources of eddy energy in the Gulf Stream Recirculation Region. J. Mar. *Res.*, **40**, 1047–1068.
- Bühler, O., and M. E. McIntyre, 2005: Wave capture and wave-vortex duality. J. Fluid. Mech., 534, 67–95.
- Cessi, P., and G. R. Ierley, 1995: Symmetry-breaking multiple equilibria in quasigeostrophic, wind driven flows. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **25**, 1996–1205.
- Charney, J. G., 1971: Geostrophic turbulence. Journal of Atmospheric Sciences, 28 (6), 1087–1095.
- Cox, M. R., H. A. Kafiabad, and J. Vanneste, 2023: Inertia-gravity-wave diffusion by geostrophic turbulence: the impact of flow time dependence. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 958, A21.

- Cronin, M., and D. R. Watts, 1997: Eddy-mean flow interaction in the gulf stream at 68° w. part i: eddy energetics. *Oceanographic Literature Review*, **44** (7), 659–659.
- Cusack, J. M., J. A. Brearley, A. C. N. Garabato, D. A. Smeed, K. L. Polzin, N. Velzeboer, and C. J. Shakespeare, 2020: Observed eddy–internal wave interactions in the southern ocean. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, **50** (10), 3043–3062.
- Dematteis, G., A. Le Boyer, F. Pollmann, K. L. Polzin, M. H. Alford, C. B. Whalen, and Y. V. Lvov, 2024: Interacting internal waves explain global patterns of interior ocean mixing. *Nature Communications*, **15** (1), 7468.
- Dematteis, G., and Y. V. Lvov, 2021: Downscale energy fluxes in scale-invariant oceanic internal wave turbulence. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, **915**, A129.
- Dematteis, G., K. Polzin, and Y. V. Lvov, 2022: On the origins of the oceanic ultraviolet catastrophe. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, **52** (**4**), 597–616.
- Dong, W., O. Bühler, and K. S. Smith, 2020: Frequency diffusion of waves by unsteady flows. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 905, R3.
- Dong, W., O. Bühler, and K. S. Smith, 2023: Geostrophic eddies spread near-inertial wave energy to high frequencies. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, **53** (**5**), 1311–1322.
- Eden, C., F. Pollmann, and D. Olbers, 2019: Numerical evaluation of energy transfers in internal gravity wave spectra of the ocean. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, **49** (**3**), 737–749.
- Eliassen, A., and E. Palm, 1961: On the transfer of energy in stationary mountain waves. Geophys. Publ., **22**, 1–23.
- Elliot, B. A., and T. B. Sanford, 1986: The subthermocline lens D1: Part 2, Kinematics and dynamics. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **16**, 549–561.
- Ertel, H., 1942: Ein neuer hydrodynamischer Wirbelsatz. Meteorol. Z., 59, 277–281.
- Fox-Kemper, B., and J. Pedlosky, 2004: Wind-driven barotropic gyre I: Circulation control by eddy vorticity fluxes to an enhanced removal region. *J. Mar. Res.*, **62** (2), 169–193.
- Frankignoul, C., 1976: Observed interation between oceanic internal waves and mesoscale eddies. *Deep-Sea Res.*, 23, 805–820.

- Gargett, A., P. Hendricks, T. Sanford, T. Osborn, and A. Williams, 1981: A composite spectrum of vertical shear in the upper ocean. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, **11** (9), 1258–1271.
- Garrett, C., and W. Munk, 1972: Space-time scales of internal waves. *Geophys. Fluid Dyn.*, **2**, 225–264.
- Gershgorin, B., Y. V. Lvov, and S. Nazarenko, 2009: Canonical hamiltonians for waves in inhomogeneous media. *Journal of mathematical physics*, **50** (1).
- Girton, J., 2025: Sampling quantitative internal wave distributions squid. URL https://www.apl. uw.edu/project/project.php?id=squid.
- Haynes, P. H., and M. E. McIntyre, 1987: On the evolution of vorticity and potential vorticity in the presence of diabatic heating and frition or other forces. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **44**, 828–841.
- Hersh, C., S. Wijffels, G. Gebbie, and G. Forget, 2025: The long lives of subducted spice and vorticity anomalies in the subtropical oceans. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, **55** (2), 131–153.
- Hogg, N. G., 1983: A note on the deep circulation of the western North Atlantic: Its nature and causes. *Deep-Sea Res. I*, **30**, 945–961.
- Hogg, N. G., 1993: Toward parameterization of the eddy field near the gulf stream. *Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers*, 40 (11-12), 2359–2376.
- Jing, Z., P. Chang, S. DiMarco, and L. Wu, 2018: Observed energy exchange between lowfrequency flows and internal waves in the gulf of mexico. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, 48 (4), 995–1008.
- Johns, W. E., T. J. Shay, J. M. Bane, and D. R. Watts, 1995: Gulf Stream structure, transport, and recirculation near 68°W. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **100**, 817–838.
- Jones, W. L., 1967: Propagation of internal gravity waves in fluids with shear flow and rotation. *J. Fluid. Mech.*, **30**, 439–448.
- Jones, W. L., 1969: Ray tracing for internal gravity waves. J. Geophys. Res., 74, 2028–2033.
- Joyce, T. M., and M. C. Stalcup, 1984: An upper ocean current jet and internal waves in a Gulf Stream Warm Core Ring. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **89**, 1997–2003.

- Kafiabad, H. A., M. A. Savva, and J. Vanneste, 2019: Diffusion of inertia-gravity waves by geostrophic turbulence. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, **869**, R7.
- Kamenkovich, V. M., A. S. Monin, A. D. Voorhis, and A. R. Robinson, 1986: *The Polymode Atlas*.Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution.
- Keffer, T., 1985: The ventilation of the World's Ocean: Maps of the potential vorticity fields. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **15**, 509–523.
- Kunze, E., 1985: Near-inertial wave propagation in geostrophic shear. Journal of Physical Oceanography, 15 (5), 544–565.
- Le Boyer, A., and M. H. Alford, 2021: Variability and sources of the internal wave continuum examined from global moored velocity records. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, **51** (9), 2807–2823.
- Leaman, K. D., and T. B. Sanford, 1975: Vertical energy propagation of inertial waves: a vector spectral analysis of velocity profiles. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **80**, 1975–1978.
- Ledwell, J. R., A. J. Watson, and C. S. Law, 1993: Evidence for slow mixing across the pycnocline from an open-ocean tracer-release experiment. *Nature*, **364**, 701–703.
- Luyten, J. R., J. Pedlosky, and H. Stommel, 1983: The ventilated thermocline. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **13**, 292–309.
- Lvov, Y. V., and K. L. Polzin, 2024: Generalized transport characterizations for short oceanic internal waves in a sea of long waves. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, **987**, A43.
- Marshall, D. P., M. H. Ambaum, J. R. Maddison, D. R. Munday, and L. Novak, 2017: Eddy saturation and frictional control of the antarctic circumpolar current. *Geophysical research letters*, **44** (1), 286–292.
- McCartney, M. S., 1982: The subtropical recirculation of Mode Waters. *J. Mar. Res.*, **40** (suppl.), 427–464.
- McComas, C. H., and P. Müller, 1981: The dynamic balance of internal waves. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **11**, 970–986.

- McDowell, S., P. Rhines, and T. Keffer, 1982: North atlantic potential vorticity and its relation to the general circulation. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **12**, 1417–1436.
- McWilliams, J. C., 1976: Maps from the Mid-Ocean Dynamics Experiment: Part I. Geostrophic streamfunction. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **6**, 810–827.
- Müller, P., 1976: On the diffusion of momentum and mass by internal gravity waves. *J. Fluid. Mech.*, **77**, 789–823.
- Müller, P., and D. J. Olbers, 1975: On the dynamics of internal waves in the deep ocean. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **80**, 3848–3860.
- Müller, P., D. J. Olbers, and J. Willebrand, 1978: The iwex spectrum. J. Geophys. Res., 83, 479–500.
- Munk, W., 1950: On the wind-driven circulation. J. Meteor., 7, 79–93.
- Munk, W., 1966: Abyssal recipes. *Deep-Sea Res.*, 13, 207–230.
- Owens, W. B., 1985: A statistical description of the vertical and horizontal structure of eddy variability on the edge of the Gulf Stream Recirculation. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **15**, 195–205.
- Pan, Y., B. K. Arbic, A. D. Nelson, D. Menemenlis, W. Peltier, W. Xu, and Y. Li, 2020: Numerical investigation of mechanisms underlying oceanic internal gravity wave power-law spectra. *Journal* of Physical Oceanography, **50** (9), 2713–2733.
- Pinkel, R., 1975: Upper ocean internal wave observations from flip. Journal of Geophysical Research, 80 (27), 3892–3910.
- Pollmann, F., 2020: Global characterization of the ocean's internal wave spectrum. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, **50** (7), 1871–1891.
- Polzin, K., and Y. Lvov, 2024: A one-dimensional model for investigating scale-separated approaches to the interaction of oceanic internal waves, submitted, J. Physical Oceanopgraphy.
- Polzin, K. L., 2008: Mesoscale eddy–internal wave coupling. part i: Symmetry, wave capture, and results from the mid-ocean dynamics experiment. *Journal of physical oceanography*, **38** (11), 2556–2574.

- Polzin, K. L., 2010: Mesoscale eddy–internal wave coupling. part ii: Energetics and results from polymode. *Journal of physical oceanography*, **40** (**4**), 789–801.
- Polzin, K. L., J. M. T. abd J. R. Ledwell, and R. W. Schmitt, 1997: Spatial variability of turbulent mixing in the abyssal ocean. *Science*, **276**, 93–96.
- Polzin, K. L., and Y. V. Lvov, 2011: Toward regional characterizations of the oceanic internal wavefield. *Reviews of geophysics*, **49** (**4**).
- Polzin, K. L., N. S. Oakey, J. M. Toole, and R. W. Schmitt, 1996a: Finestructure and microstructure characteristics across the northwest Atlantic Subtropical Front. J. Geophys. Res., 101, 14111– 14121.
- Polzin, K. L., K. G. Speer, J. M. Toole, and R. W. Schmitt, 1996b: Intense mixing of Antarctic Bottom Water in the equatorial Atlantic Ocean. *Nature*, **380**, 54–57.
- Price, J. F., and H. T. Rossby, 1982: Observations of a barotropic planetary wave in the western north atlantic. *J. Mar. Res.*, **40** (suppl.), 543–558.
- Rhines, P. B., 1979: Geostrophic Turbulence. Ann. Rev. Fluid Mech., 11, 401–441.
- Rhines, P. B., and W. R. Young, 1982: A theory of the wind driven circulattion. i. Mid-ocean gyres. *J. Mar. Res.*, **40** (suppl.), 559–596.
- Robbins, P. E., J. F. Price, W. B. Owens, and W. J. Jenkins, 2000: The importance of lateral diffusion for the ventilation of the lower thermocline in the Subtropical North Atlantic. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **67**, 67–89.
- Ruddick, B. R., and T. M. Joyce, 1979: Observations of interaction between the internal wavefield and low-frequency flows in the north atlantic. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **9**, 498–517.
- Salmon, R., 1998: *Lectures in Geophysical Fluid Dynamics*. Oxford University Press, New York, 1–378 pp.
- Savage, A., A. Waterhouse, J. MacKinnon, X. Yub, A. Naveira Garabato, D. Evans, E. Frajka-Williams, and L. Thomas, submitted: Observations of upper ocean kknetic energy transfers between near-inertial internal waves and low-frequency dynamics. J. Phys. Oceanogr.

- Savva, M. A., H. A. Kafiabad, and J. Vanneste, 2021: Inertia-gravity-wave scattering by threedimensional geostrophic turbulence. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, **916**, A6.
- Savva, M. A., and J. Vanneste, 2018: Scattering of internal tides by barotropic quasigeostrophic flows. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, **856**, 504–530.
- Schmitz, W. J., 1977: On the deep general circulation in the western North Atlantic. *J. Mar. Res.*, **35**, 21–28.
- Schmitz, W. J., J. D. Thompson, and J. R. Luyten, 1992: The Sverdrup circulation for the Atlantic along 24°. J. Geophys. Res., 97, 7251–7256.
- Skitka, J., B. K. Arbic, Y. Ma, K. Momeni, Y. Pan, W. R. Peltier, D. Menemenlis, and R. Thakur, 2024: Internal-wave dissipation mechanisms and vertical structure in a high-resolution regional ocean model. *Geophysical Research Letters*, **51** (17), e2023GL108039.
- St.Laurent, L. C., and A. M. Thurnherr, 2007: Intense mixing of lower thermocline water on the crest of the Mid–Atlantic Ridge. *Nature*, **448**, 680–683.
- Stommel, H., 1948: The westward intensification of wind-driven ocean currents. *Trans. Amer. Geophys. Union*, 29, 202–206.
- Thompson, A. F., and A. C. N. Garabato, 2014: Equilibration of the antarctic circumpolar current by standing meanders. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, **44** (7), 1811–1828.
- Vallgren, A., and E. Lindborg, 2010: Charney isotropy and equipartition in quasi-geostrophic turbulence. *Journal of fluid mechanics*, **656**, 448–457.
- Wagner, G., and W. Young, 2015: Available potential vorticity and wave-averaged quasigeostrophic flow. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, **785**, 401–424.
- Watson, K. M., 1985: Interaction between internal waves and mesoscale flow. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, 15, 1296–1311.
- Whalen, C. B., J. A. MacKinnon, and L. D. Talley, 2018: Large-scale impacts of the mesoscale environment on mixing from wind-driven internal waves. *Nature Geoscience*, **11** (**11**), 842–847.
- Whitt, D. B., and L. N. Thomas, 2013: Near-inertial waves in strongly baroclinic currents. *Journal* of *Physical Oceanography*, **43** (**4**), 706–725.

- Wijffels, S., G. Gebbie, and P. Robbins, 2024a: Resolving the ubiquitous small-scale semipermanent features of the general ocean circulation: A multiplatform observational approach. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, **54** (**12**), 2503–2521.
- Wijffels, S. E., G. A. Gebbie, and P. E. Robbins, 2024b: Mesoscale ocean circulation atlas [data set].Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26025/1912/70491.
- Wilson, C., and R. G. Williams, 2004: Why are eddy fluxes of potential vorticity so difficult to parameterize? *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, **34**, 142–155.
- Young, W., and M. B. Jelloul, 1997: Propagation of near-inertial oscillations through a geostrophic flow. *J. Mar. Res.*, **55**, 735–766.
- Yu, X., R. Barkan, and A. C. Naveira Garabato, 2024: Intensification of submesoscale frontogenesis and forward energy cascade driven by upper-ocean convergent flows. *Nature Communications*, 15 (1), 9214.