

A non-equilibrium system in a steady state: wind waves in the open ocean

Yves Pomeau

Department of Mathematics, University of Arizona, Tucson, USA.

Martine Le Berre

Institut des Sciences Moleculaires d'Orsay, Bat.210, 91405 Orsay, France.

(Dated: November 18, 2018)

We derive scaling laws for the steady spectrum of wind excited waves, assuming two inviscid fluids (air and water) and no surface tension, an approximation valid at large speeds. In this limit there exists an unique (small) dimensionless parameter ϵ , the ratio of the mass densities of the two fluids, air and water, independently of the wind speed. The smallness of ϵ allows to derive some important average properties of the wave system. The average square slope of the waves is of order $|\ln(\epsilon^2)|^{-1}$, a small but not very small quantity. This supports the often used assumption of small nonlinearity in the wave-wave interaction. We introduce an equation to be satisfied by the two-point correlation of the height fluctuations.

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

Wave turbulence makes a problem interesting both from the point of view of fundamental science and because it has obvious connections with real life phenomena which play a significant role in many human endeavors. Wind-excited waves provide an example of a non-equilibrium system which may be in a steady state. After many scientists, we consider below the following problem: a constant wind blowing on the horizontal surface of an infinite Ocean (in the three dimensions), and exciting, after a transient, a system of random fluctuating waves that reach a turbulent steady state. After Pierson and Moskowitz [1] this makes what is called a "fully developed sea" in the oceanographic literature. One studies the statistical properties like the variance of the surface slope as well as the strength of the impact of the waves on various structures and finally the power spectrum of the surface elevation. This has been thought about for many years [2], [3], mainly by using the weak interaction approximation, based on the (unexplained to the best of our knowledge) observation that the slope of waves is small on average. Below we approach this problem by using simple scaling ideas based on the existence of a small parameter, the ratio of the mass density of the air ρ_{air} to the mass density of water ρ_w . Let $\epsilon = \frac{\rho_{air}}{\rho_w}$ be this small ratio, about 10^{-3} . Assuming incompressibility, (and neglecting, for the moment, surface tension and viscosity), the data with a physical dimension are the acceleration of gravity g and the (uniform) wind speed U . As shown by Newton, one can make out of these two quantities a length, $\lambda = \frac{U^2}{g}$ and a time, $\tau = \frac{\lambda}{U} = \frac{U}{g}$. Here we shall use λ and τ as units of space and time, that leads to a system of equations without the physical parameters g, U [4]. This is in contrast with "ordinary" turbulence where length scales are fixed in two ways: the large scale is determined by the geometry of the flow, the diameter of a pipe for instance, although the small scale is the Kolmogorov scale where viscosity becomes important. Moreover we shall argue that, in wave turbulence, there is no step by step cascade from large to small scale where dissipation takes place.

Consider the fluctuations of the surface elevation, $\delta h(\mathbf{x}, t)$, which depends on space, i.e. on the horizontal coordinates \mathbf{x} (boldface are for vectors in the Euclidean geometrical space) and on time t . From the data, the only scaling parameters are the length λ and the time τ . Given ϵ , the fluctuations $\delta h(\mathbf{x}, t)$ may then be written as

$$\delta h(\mathbf{x}, t) = \lambda \delta H\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}}{\lambda}, \frac{t}{\tau}\right). \quad (1)$$

Therefore we expect that $\delta h(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is of order λ , and changes with respect to space and time with the typical scales λ , and τ , eventually times factors depending on ϵ only. More precisely we expect that the horizontal dependence is scaled with λ without factor depending on ϵ , at least for ϵ small, because the typical wave-length of the unstable fluctuations is of order λ . This is in qualitative agreement with the observation that, the larger the wind speed the larger is the average wave-length of the wave system, as reported for instance in [2]. Note that, if this average wave-length were much less than λ (i.e. if the surface was flat at the scale λ), this wave system would be unstable against fluctuations at wavelength of order λ , which is impossible if the wave system has reached a statistically steady state. Moreover this kind of assumption is fully consistent with the Pierson-Moscowitz spectrum where the wave period is of order τ although the amplitude is multiplied by a small numerical prefactor of order 10^{-2} explained below by a non-trivial dependence of the average wave-amplitude on ϵ [5]. Indeed the wave-height should scale like $f(\epsilon)\lambda$, where the $f(\cdot)$ function tends to zero as its argument tends to zero (if $f(0)$ would not be zero, the water-wave would keep a finite

amplitude in absence of wind, which is against common sense, because there are no waves if no instability feeds the wave system). Therefore the "scaled" stochastic function $\delta H(\mathbf{X}, T)$, with capital letters for scaled quantities, is proportional to the reducing factor $f(\epsilon)$. We shall prove that $f(\epsilon)$ is logarithmic with respect to ϵ . Assuming invariance under translation in space and time, the pair correlation $S_{\delta H}(\mathbf{X}, T; \mathbf{Y}, T + T') = \langle \delta H(\mathbf{X}, T) \delta H(\mathbf{X} + \mathbf{Y}, T + T') \rangle$ is a function of (\mathbf{Y}, T') and of ϵ only. This does not mean that it is isotropic, as one expects the direction of the wind to induce such anisotropy.

Let us now comment on the neglect of the viscosity of air and of water, and of the surface tension σ . The latter introduces a new length scale, the capillary length $\lambda_c = \sqrt{\frac{\sigma}{g\rho_w}}$. Although surface tension of real sea-water is a highly variable quantity, the capillary length is somewhere between one centimeter and one millimeter, far smaller than the length scales we are concerned with. This does not mean however that its effects are negligible: surface tension could regularize the instabilities at the shortest scales, which otherwise could lead to the development of cone-like singularities on the free surface [6], while white caps are observed instead. Here we are interested on large scale phenomena only, then capillarity effects are not considered, and the capillary length scale will be taken as zero. Here we consider high wind velocity regime, more precisely the regime above the onset of wave-breaking [7] which occurs for U_{10} around $7m/s$, (U_{10} is the wind speed measured 10 meters above the sea surface), where gravity becomes the only governing parameter of wind-wave interaction. At inferior velocities, surface tension may either dominate gravity everywhere or just make impossible the steepening leading to wave breaking [8]. Similar statements could be made about the effect of viscosity: if the Reynolds number is large, viscosity is relevant at very small scales that can be taken as simply zero.

Now we would like to discuss the possible relationship between the ideas introduced above and the one of cascade of energy. The idea of cascade of energy is prevalent in fully developed turbulence, where it is assumed that energy goes step by step from large to small scales, energy being injected at the largest scales and dissipated at the tiny Kolmogorov length set by viscosity. The application of this idea to wind-driven waves meets several difficulties. The first one is that no scale is fixed from outside by the geometry of the flow, therefore it is hard to claim that energy is "injected" at large scales only. The wind acts on each scale, as illustrated in the different models using an input source term that is linear or quasi-linear with respect to the wave-spectrum. One must note that the Kelvin-Helmholtz instability is effective from λ , defined above, down to the capillary length λ_c , the smaller length scales being the most unstable. In such a fully nonlinear problem, the process of direct cascade (from large to small scales) has no serious support. Furthermore the numerical solution of the equation of weak turbulence shows instead a drift of the peak spectrum towards larger and larger scales [9].

The reverse statement, that is that wave energy is continuously injected at small scales and cascade up to large scales is even more meaningless: at large scales viscosity is negligible and there is no dissipation (at least if "large scale" is meant in its general acception) and the energy has no way to go to in a steady statistical state (this does not apply to an initial value problem without sustained energy input). Moreover an inverse cascade is in complete contradiction with casual observation: wind waves tend to propagate along the wind direction, although, resulting from an inverse cascade, their spectrum should become isotropic after a few steps in this cascade. To conclude this discussion, a step by step cascade in any direction is not the dominant process for energy transfer across different length scales and cannot explain dissipation.

Another remark may be also relevant: the air flow above the sea surface is highly turbulent and one expects the formation of a Prandtl logarithmic layer there. The scaling parameter of such a Prandtl layer is a flux of horizontal momentum per unit area of the surface. Compared to our scaling via the wind speed, this introduces logarithmic corrections that are, most likely, hardly detectable. However this scaling via the flux of horizontal momentum, as compared to scaling via the wind speed, is not completely without consequences. Actually this flux should be the same in the water below the surface, with an horizontal momentum of the same order of magnitude as the aerial flux. The flux of horizontal momentum scales like ρu^2 , therefore the average horizontal speed underwater is of order of $U\sqrt{\epsilon}$ (U wind speed), for example a wind speed of 60 km/h should generate an underwater current of about 1.9 km/h. This prediction fully agrees with the observations, $u_{sea}/U_{10} = 0.032$ [10], and the common "3 per cent rule", i.e. that the surface current is approximately 3 per cent of the wind speed.

Having excluded dissipation by a multi-step cascade of energy as the dominant mechanism of dissipation, we are led to look at another mechanism, wave-breaking. This is known to be a strongly dissipative and fully nonlinear process, Therefore it could look impossible a priori to estimate the power lost per unit area by wave-breaking, given for instance the pair correlation of the fluctuations of height. This pair correlation assumes implicitly a smooth wave propagation, namely a singly defined $h(x, y, t)$ and a non self-crossing surface, although wave-breaking is a complex nonlinear process, requiring to account for physical effects like surface tension and viscosity. Nevertheless wave-breaking of dominant waves (whose wavelengths are near the peak of the spectrum) should be a relatively rare event, as we shall explain. Let us precise that we may also include in the breaking process the micro-breakers, or small white caps, whose density increases with the wind speed, and saturates at U_{10} around $20m/s$. In this regime, each wave of any wavelength has a white cap on its crest. Nevertheless, in the stationary state, the crest length of

breaking waves is a small fraction of the total crest length. Those white caps may replace the formation of conical or wedge-like singularity [6] of the inviscid equations. Note that white caps appear also after the breaking of a very long wave. Here we focus on the very large energy dissipation process due to wave-breaking of all waves.

Let us estimate the probability of such a process. In a single wave-breaking event, the lost energy W_{br} scales as $\rho_w U^2 \lambda^2 \sigma_{\delta h}$, i.e. the energy corresponding to a "typical" volume, $\lambda^2 \sigma_{\delta h}$ of a wave having an horizontal surface λ^2 , a height $\sigma_{\delta h}$, and propagating at velocity U (which is around the velocity reached by long waves, the peak waves, before breaking). By comparison, the kinetic energy of the wind which occupies the same volume, is smaller by a factor ϵ . The balance of energy may be obtained in the steady regime when the frequency of occurrence of wave-breaking is of order ϵ , since in this case the power lost per unit area is of the same order, $\epsilon W_{br} / \lambda^2 \tau$.

The result of these considerations is that, at a given time, the area covered by wave-breaking events is of order ϵ times the total area, independently on the wind speed. Note that this is not the proportion of area covered by foam, much bigger than the area covered by wave-breaking events in high wind conditions, because of the spreading of the foam by the wind, and because of the white caps.

Let us now estimate the ϵ -dependence of the magnitude of wave fluctuations. Given the statistics of the wave fluctuations, and because wave-breaking is a rare event, it depends on the probability of large fluctuations. Those large fluctuations are rare because of the smallness of ϵ . Said otherwise, the scaling laws for the magnitude of the fluctuations have to be amended in order to take into account this smallness: otherwise, if the magnitude of the fluctuations was such that the typical wave length and the typical wave height were both λ , the probability of occurrence of wave breaking would be of order one too, although we argued it is of order ϵ . Therefore the amplitude of the wave should be small compared to λ , to make exceptional the nonlinear evolution towards wave-breaking. This implies that, predominantly, the wave system is described by the linear approximation of the wave equations. Therefore, at a given location, and according to an idea that seems to have been stated first by Planck for the classical (Rayleigh) part of the black-body spectrum, the fluctuations of the free surface are predominantly Gaussian because they are made of a *linear* superposition of waves with a continuous distribution of frequencies. The most interesting quantity from the point of view of wave-breaking is not so much the amplitude of the wave, but its slope. Being given by a linear transformation of the amplitude it has also a Gaussian distribution. Therefore the derivative $\frac{\partial h}{\partial x} = h_{,x}$, namely the gradient of the height along x , the wind direction, has the probability distribution

$$\mathcal{P}(h_{,x}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{1/2} \sigma_x} e^{-\frac{h_{,x}^2}{2\sigma_x^2}}, \quad (2)$$

where σ_x^2 is the variance of the slope along the x direction.

Wave-breaking is a nonlinear phenomenon where the free surface becomes first vertical and then overturns. Before this happens, the slope has to reach values of order one. Indeed such a phenomenon is not described by the linear approximation for wave propagation, since it assumes the height to be a single valued smooth function of the horizontal coordinates. Nevertheless we may assume that, before the wave locally overturns, its slope gets finite (non-small) values that are at the border of applicability of the linear approximation [6]. The probability of overturning may be approximated as the tail area of the density $\mathcal{P}(h_{,x})$, assuming that the waves propagate predominantly in the wind direction),

$$\mathcal{P}_{br} = 2 \int_a^\infty \mathcal{P}(h_{,x}) d(h_{,x}) = 2 \operatorname{erfc}\left(\frac{a}{\sqrt{2}\sigma_x}\right), \quad (3)$$

where a is a parameter of order unity defining the limit slope (above which the wave breaking occurs with a finite probability), and $\operatorname{erfc}(z) = \frac{z}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_z^\infty e^{-\zeta^2} d\zeta$. In the limit of large z , $\operatorname{erfc}(z) \simeq \frac{\exp(-z^2)}{z\sqrt{\pi}}$. According to the arguments presented before the probability \mathcal{P}_{br} must be of order ϵ to ensure the balance between energy input and dissipation by wave-breaking. In the limit $\epsilon \ll \sigma_x \ll a$, this gives

$$\sigma_x \sim \frac{a}{\sqrt{\ln(\epsilon^2)}}, \quad (4)$$

This is of order 0.27 for the case of wind-waves, if one takes $a = 1$.

This behavior is quite weak, in agreement with the observation that the slope is small on average, but not very small [11]. In this respect the density of breaking events is far more sensitive to the smallness of ϵ than the wave amplitude itself. Indeed it seems difficult to change ϵ , so the prediction of an ϵ dependence of the probability of wave-breaking is hard to test. However one may think to a value of ϵ close to 1, with water and oil for instance (E.J. Wesfreid private communication), which would then yield a wave system where wave breaking is almost everywhere, a clearcut prediction of the present theory.

Let us sketch now a more quantitative approach. As has been shown since a rather long time [3], small non linearities yield a kinetic equation for wave turbulence. In this theory the interaction between waves of various wavenumber and frequencies yields a kind of Boltzmann-like theory. In the Hasselmann-expansion, written with respect to the elevation amplitude as small parameter, the nonlinear interaction between the waves appear as a serie involving successively four, six, etc..wave-interactions [12]. Actually the relation (4) proves that the ratio between the six and four wave-interaction terms is always small. Therefore using our scalings, and the small slope variance as small parameter, we infer that formally the Hasselmann-expansion can be continued order by order (even for non small waves), at the price of fastly growing complexity. There is no reason that this expansion becomes ill-defined at any finite order. This does not mean however that, even by including the kinetic terms at all orders, all the physics is captured. This is the well-known phenomenon of expansion beyond all orders [13]. Indeed the occurrence of wave breaking depends on effects transcendentally small with respect to the expansion parameter, here $(\ln \epsilon^2)^{-1/2}$. The "standard" way of getting such transcendentally small terms is by looking at the general large order term in the expansion, getting its leading order part and then summing the largest terms of each order, something perhaps doable, but surely very cumbersome in the present case.

Let us now include in a qualitative sense the dissipation due to wave-breaking, in the light of the above estimations summarized in equations (3)-(4). Using the scales variables, the steady state spectrum $N(\mathbf{K})$ of the surface elevation, which is the spatial Fourier transform of the single time correlation function $S_{\delta H}(\mathbf{X}, T; \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{Y}, T)$, writes

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int d\mathbf{Y} e^{i\mathbf{Y}\cdot\mathbf{K}} S_{\delta H}(\mathbf{Y}). \quad (5)$$

It obeys the stationary Hasselmann equation [3],

$$S_{nl}[\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{K})] + S_{in}[\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{K})] + S_{diss}[\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{K})] = 0, \quad (6)$$

where the term S_{nl} represents the exchange by nonlinear interaction between waves, S_{in} the input by the wind, and S_{diss} for the dissipation by whitecaps and wave-breaking of dominant waves.

The term S_{nl} describing the transfer across the spectrum of fluctuations due to four wave interactions writes

$$S_{nl}[\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{K})] = \int d\mathbf{K}_1 d\mathbf{K}_2 d\mathbf{K}_3 |T_{0123}|^2 \delta(\mathbf{K} + \mathbf{K}_1 - \mathbf{K}_2 - \mathbf{K}_3) \delta(\Omega + \Omega_1 - \Omega_2 - \Omega_3) \times \\ \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{K}_1) \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{K}_2) \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{K}_3) \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{K}) \left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{K}_1)} + \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{K})} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{K}_2)} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{K}_3)} \right), \quad (7)$$

where $\delta(\cdot)$ is the Dirac function. The transition matrix $T_{0123} = T(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{K}_1, \mathbf{K}_2, \mathbf{K}_3)$ has a rather complex explicit form [14], and is equal to $K^{5/2}$ times a numerical function of the ratios K/K_i , with $i = 1, 2, 3$, and of the angles between the four vectors $(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{K}_1, \mathbf{K}_2, \mathbf{K}_3)$. Moreover $\Omega = \tau\sqrt{gk}$, and $\Omega_i = \tau\sqrt{gk_i}$. The input from the wind is just $\epsilon\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{K})K_X$, where $K_X = k_x$ is the Cartesian component of (\mathbf{k}) along the wind. This simple approximation could be refined by multiplication by a function $G(\mathbf{K})$ representing in dimensionless notations the detailed dependence of the input as a function of the wave number of the waves. We just take $G = 1$ to make the exposition simpler.

An essential point of our formulation is that, in our dimensionless variables this term is small, proportional to ϵ , this smallness being a consequence of the scaling laws, not assumed from the beginning. Moreover this term is proportional to k_x to represent the angular dependence of the rate of growth of the Kelvin-Helmholtz instability, and it is also proportional to the intensity of the fluctuations because this is a linear instability.

The energy loss by wave-breaking is equal to $b'\mathcal{P}_{br}\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{K})$ because it is proportional to the small probability of this process, and it should be proportional to the spectrum itself. The numerical factor b' is of order 1, as discussed below. Using the expression (3), with $\sigma_x^2 = \int d\mathbf{K} K_X^2 \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{K})$, the balance equation (6) leads to the following integral equation for the surface elevation spectrum in steady situations,

$$S_{nl}[\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{k})] + \left(\epsilon K_X - \frac{1}{ab} \sigma_x e^{-a^2/2\sigma_x^2} \right) \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{k}) = 0, \quad (8)$$

where the constant $b = \frac{\sqrt{\pi/2}}{b'}$ is the duration of the breaking process in units of τ . There are two unknown parameters, a and b . Contrary to similar equations in the literature [15], the breaking-wave loss term is *not* proportional to a power of the amplitude of the fluctuations, it depends transcendentally on this amplitude, because wave-breaking is not found at any algebraic order in the amplitude expansion of the kinetic equations. Although g and U have been scaled out, the small dimensionless parameter ϵ remains, in particular because of the term depending transcendentally on the unknown amplitude. This integral equation yields the scaling laws for the amplitude of the fluctuations by

noticing that the first term has "conservation laws". This is a familiar property of Boltzmann-type equations, which writes $\int d\mathbf{K}F(\mathbf{K})\mathcal{S}_{nl}[\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{K})] = 0$ with $F(\mathbf{K}) = 1$, \mathbf{K} or $\Omega(K)$. Therefore one finds three relations to be satisfied by the steady spectrum :

$$\int d\mathbf{k}F(\mathbf{k})\left(\epsilon K_X - \frac{1}{ab}\sigma_x e^{-a^2/2\sigma_x^2}\right)\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{k}) = 0, \quad (9)$$

This yields the same scaling relation as derived before, if one assumes that the integration over \mathbf{K} and the multiplication by $F(\cdot)$ change the scaling in the same way in the two terms of equation (9), the one representing the input by the instability (proportional to $\epsilon k_x U$) and the one representing the loss by wave-breaking, proportional to the exponential. Notice too that, thanks to the prefactor σ_x in the dissipation part, the dissipation becomes more efficient as the amplitude of the spectrum grows. This makes likely impossible a steady (unphysical) spectrum spreading without decay to infinitely large wave numbers.

To summarize, we have introduced the idea of a physical small parameter in the wind-sea interaction, the ratio of the mass densities of the two fluids. Thanks to that, we have been able to derive scaling laws for the physically observable quantities like the mean square slope of the sea surface. This gives a basis for the derivation of an Hasselmann-type equation for the steady state spectrum, that would be valid not only for the case of weakly nonlinear turbulence, where it is generally addressed, but even for storms with very large wind velocities. We propose a fully explicit mathematical model, equation (8), for the steady spectrum of surface elevation perturbed by a constant wind. This model is valid for large wind speeds, where dissipation is mostly due to wave-breaking, although at low speeds the wave-breaking is stopped (before the overhanging of the sea surface) by capillarity effects. Indeed all this remains to be confronted with experimental results although the solution of the spectral equation remains to be studied in details in the limit ϵ small.

-
- [1] Pierson W.J. and Moskowitz L. "A proposed spectral form for fully developed wind seas based on the similiarity theory of S.A. Kitaigorodskii" , J. Geophys. Res. **69** (1964) 5181-5190 .
 - [2] Gelci R., Cazalé H. and Vassal J. "Prévision de la houle. La méthode des densités spectroangulaires", Bulletin d'information du Comité d'Océanographie et d'Etude des Côtes **9** (1957) 416 - 435.
 - [3] Hasselmann K. "On the nonlinear energy transfer in a gravity-wave spectrum, part I: general theory", J. Fluid Mech. **12** (1962) 481-500 ; "On the spectral dissipation of ocean waves due to white capping.", Boundary-Layer Meteorol. **6** (1974) 107-127; Hasselmann S., Hasselmann K. , Allender J. H. and Barnett J. P. "Computations and Parametrizations of the nonlinear energy transfer in a gravity wave spectrum. Part II", J. of Physical Oceanography **15** (1985) 1378-1391.
 - [4] Pomeau Y. "Asymptotic time behaviour of nonlinear classical field equations", Nonlinearity **5** (1992) 707-720.
 - [5] The classical Pierson-Moscowitz frequency spectrum writes $\mathcal{N}(\omega) = \frac{\alpha g^2}{\omega^5} \exp[-\beta(\omega\tau)^{-4}]$ where α is a small numerical constant, of order $8 \cdot 10^{-3}$, while the constant β is about 0.74. The amplitude of the waves, compared to λ , is measured by α . We explain the smallness of α by the smallness of the input from the wind, although β compares the average wave frequency $1/\tau$, and is therefore of order unity.
 - [6] Pomeau Y. and Le Berre M. "Topics in the theory of wave-breaking", submitted.
 - [7] Amorocho J. and DeVries J.J. "A new evaluation of the wind stress coefficient over water surfaces" J. Geophys. Res. C: Oceans Atmos. **85** (1980) 433-442.
 - [8] Longuet-Higgins M. S. "On Wave-breaking and the equilibrium spectrum of wind-generated waves", Proc. Roy. Soc. **A 310** (1969) 151-159; "On the form of the highest progressive and standing waves in deep waters", Proc. Roy. Soc. **A 331** (1969) 445-546.
 - [9] Benoit M. and Gagnaire-Renou E. "Intéractions vague-vague nonlinéaires et spectre d'équilibre pour les vagues de gravité en grande profondeur d'eau", irevue (2007) 18 ème congrès fran?ais de mécanique, S-19 Ondes et écoulements en surface libre.
 - [10] Hsu S.A. "Estimating overwater friction velocity and exponent of power-law wind profile from gust factor during storms", Journ. of waterway, Port, Coastal and ocean eng. , **129** (2003) 174-177.
 - [11] While it is difficult to compare our predictions with real systems, because we have assumed a steady state in an infinite sea, we may mention the satellite observations performed for unsteady wind-waves, averaged over the sea surface of the Earth reported by Hu Y. et al. "Sea surface wind speed estimation from space-based lidar measurements", Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss. **8** (2008) 2771-2793. They found values of σ_x around 0.23 - 0.3, for wind velocity around 10m/s to 20m/s. This result approximately agrees with measurements done in tank experiments, as reported by Wu J. "Directional slope and curvature distributions of wind waves", J. Fluid Mech. **79** (1977) 463-480.
 - [12] Three-waves interaction is not permitted by the resonance condition on the frequencies and wave-numbers, that reads $\omega(k_1) + \omega(k_2) = \omega(k_3)$ and the wave numbers $\mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2 = \mathbf{k}_3$, impossible to satisfy with $\omega(k) = \sqrt{gk}$, although the equivalent condition for the four wave interaction $\omega(k_1) + \omega(k_2) = \omega(k_3) + \omega(k_4)$ and $\mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2 = \mathbf{k}_3 + \mathbf{k}_4$ can be satisfied.
 - [13] "Asymptotics beyond all orders" Ed. by Segur H., Tanveer S. and Levine H. , Nato ASI series, Series B Physics, Vol. 284 Plenum press, New York (1991), Proceedings of a Nato ARW at La Jolla CA (Jan.1991).

- [14] Webb D. J. "Nonlinear transfer between sea waves", *Deep-sea res.* **25** (1978) 279-298.
- [15] See for example Filipot J.-F., Ardhuin F. , Babanin A. and Magne R. "Paramétrage du déferlement des vagues dans des modèles spectraux: approches semi-empirique et physique", *Xème Journées Nationales Génie Côtier*, (2008), Sophia-Antipolis, France. See also the review paper by Badulin S.I., Pushkarev A.N., Resio D. and Zakharov V.E. "self-similarity of wind-driven seas" *Nonlinear Processes in Geophysics* **12** (2005) 891-945.