

Infragravity wave generation on shore platforms: bound long wave versus breakpoint forcing

Poate, Timothy G.; Masselink, G.; Austin, Martin; Inch, Kris; Dickson, Mark; McCall, R.D.

Geomorphology

DOI: 10.1016/j.geomorph.2019.106880

Published: 01/02/2020

Peer reviewed version

Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication

Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA): Poate, T. G., Masselink, G., Austin, M., Inch, K., Dickson, M., & McCall, R. D. (2020). Infragravity wave generation on shore platforms: bound long wave versus breakpoint forcing. Geomorphology, 350, Article 106880. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2019.106880

Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

· Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.

- · You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 Infragravity wave generation on shore platforms: bound long wave versus breakpoint

2 forcing

3

4 Tim Poate*, Gerd Masselink*, Martin J. Austin¹, Kris Inch², Mark Dickson³ and

5 Robert McCall⁴

6 Correspondence to: *Coastal Processes Research Group, School of Biological and Marine

- 7 Sciences, University of Plymouth, Plymouth, UK. E-mail: <u>Timothy.poate@plymouth.ac.uk</u>
- 8 ¹School of Ocean Sciences, Bangor University, Wales.
- 9 ²Environment Agency, UK
- ¹⁰ ³School of Environment, The University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- ⁴ Deltares, Boussinesqueg 1, 2629 HV, Delft, Netherlands
- 12

14

15 Shore platforms are ubiquitous morphological features along rocky coastlines and display a 16 spectrum of forms from gently-sloping to sub-horizontal with a low tide cliff. They generally front eroding coastal cliffs and play an important natural coastal protection role by dissipating 17 wave energy, especially during energetic wave conditions. Sea-swell wave energy dissipates 18 19 during wave breaking, but the transfer of incident wave energy to lower frequencies, resulting 20 in infragravity waves, can enable significant amounts of wave energy to persist up to the 21 shoreline. This residual wave motion at the shoreline can carry out geomorphic work, for 22 example by directly impacting the cliff face, but also for removing cliff-toe debris. There are 23 two main mechanisms for generating infragravity wave motion - group bound long waves 24 and breakpoint forcing - and it is not known which of these mechanisms operate on shore 25 platforms. Here we show, using field data collected at a sloping platform in England and a 26 sub-horizontal platform in New Zealand, and supported by numerical modelling, that the 27 group bound long wave mechanism is most important on sloping platforms, whereas

¹³ Abstract

28 breakpoint forcing dominates on sub-horizontal platforms. Our results also suggest that the 29 infragravity wave motion on the sloping platform is somewhat more energetic than that on 30 the sub-horizontal platform, implying that the latter type of platform may provide better 31 protection to coastal cliffs. However, site-specific factors, especially platform elevation with 32 respect to tidal level and platform gradient, play a key role in wave transformation processes 33 on shore platforms and more field data and modelling efforts are required to enhance our understanding of these processes, especially collected under extreme wave conditions ($H_s > 5$ 34 35 m).

36

37 1. Introduction

38

39 Shore platforms exist within a continuum of forms and are typically observed as (quasi-) 40 horizontal or low gradient (tan $\beta < 0.05$) rocky surfaces that occur within or close to the 41 intertidal zone of rocky coasts and are commonly backed by cliffs (Trenhaile, 1987; Sunamura, 1992). The surface of shore platforms ranges from very smooth (like a sandy 42 43 beach) to very rough and depends on geological factors such as the lithology and stratigraphic 44 characteristics of the bed. Shore platforms are of particular interest to coastal scientists as 45 they directly control the transformation of waves propagating across its surface (e.g., Farrell 46 et al., 2009; Ogawa et al., 2011; Poate et al., 2018), and thus the amount of wave energy reaching the base of coastal cliffs. In turn, this is important in driving coastal cliff recession 47 48 rates, but rock platforms also provide key evidence for the age, inheritance and mode of 49 development of rocky coasts. Although existing across a spectrum of forms, two end-member 50 types of shore platform have been commonly described in previous studies (e.g., Sunamura, 51 1992): Type A platforms are gently sloping (tan $\beta \approx 0.01-0.05$) and usually extend into the 52 sub-tidal zone and Type B platforms are sub-horizontal with a low tide cliff or reef-type

feature, the upper part of which can sometimes be seen at low tide (Kennedy, 2016). Shore platform type appears predominantly controlled by tidal range (Trenhaile, 1987) with sloping platforms typical of large tidal environments (mean spring tidal range > 2 m) and subhorizontal platforms more common in regions with a small tidal range (mean spring tidal range < 2 m). However, the balance of rock resistance versus wave force is also highly significant (Sunamura, 1992) and sea level history and morphological inheritance also provide important controls on shore platform geometry (e.g., Stephenson et al., 2017).

60

61 Infragravity waves are low frequency (0.005–0.04 Hz; 20–200 s) waves that can dominate the 62 spectrum of water motions and sediment transport processes within the inner surf zone 63 (Bertin et al., 2018). There are two widely accepted mechanisms for the generation of 64 infragravity waves, both related to the variation in sea-swell energy induced by wave groups. 65 The first theory for infragravity wave generation was proposed by Biesel (1952), and later by 66 Longuet-Higgins and Stewart (1962) and Hasselmann (1962), who demonstrated theoretically 67 that the modulation of short wave height by wave groups induces a variation in water level 68 causing it to become depressed under groups of large waves, and enhanced where the sea-69 swell waves are smaller. This variation in water level creates a second-order wave that is 70 'bound' to the wave groups. The bound infragravity wave propagates at the group velocity 71 and has the same wavelength and period as the wave groups, but is 180° out of phase (i.e., the 72 trough of the bound infragravity wave is coincident with the largest waves in the wave 73 group). It is commonly assumed that the bound long wave is released by short-wave breaking 74 and continues to propagate to the shore as a free wave (e.g., Masselink, 1995; Inch et al., 75 2017). The second generation mechanism, proposed by Symonds et al. (1982), is the time-76 varying breakpoint in which freely propagating infragravity waves are generated as dynamic 77 set-up/down oscillations as a result of the spatially fluctuating breakpoint of different sized

78 wave groups. According to this mechanism two infragravity waves are generated, both 79 originating at the sea-swell wave breakpoint and with the same frequency as the wave groups: 80 a set-up wave propagating to the shore (in phase with wave groups) and a set-down wave 81 travelling out to sea (in anti-phase with wave groups).

82

Laboratory studies have demonstrated that the relative importance of the two generation mechanisms is largely controlled by the beach slope, with bound infragravity waves dominating on mild sloping beaches, and steeper beaches being more conducive to breakpoint generated infragravity waves (e.g., Battjes et al., 2004; Van Dongeren et al., 2007). In addition to bed slope, sea-swell wave steepness has also been shown to have an influence on the generation of infragravity waves (Baldock and Huntley, 2002; Baldock, 2012).

90

Energetic infragravity wave motions have been suggested as a mechanism to perform geomorphic work, for example by directly impacting the cliff face, and for removing cliff-toe debris (Dickson et al., 2013). Additionally, infragravity waves may increase the level of seaswell energy at the base of cliffs backing shore platforms by reducing short-wave dissipation through the increase in the local water depth under the infragravity wave crests (i.e., relatively large sea-swell waves 'ride' the infragravity wave crests). However, to date, detailed infragravity wave studies have focused primarily on sandy beaches.

98

Some of the data presented here have previously been used to quantify incident wave dissipation and platform roughness effects (Poate et al., 2016, 2018) and to model incident and infragravity wave signals (McCall et al., 2017), however, prior to these, few published studies have focused on infragravity wave transformation over rocky shore platforms.

103 Beetham and Kench (2011) undertook two field experiments on sub-horizontal shore 104 platforms in New Zealand, however, the study was relatively modest in its analysis and 105 experimental set-up as data were only collected by five pressure sensors deployed for up to 106 36 hours, and wave conditions were low-moderate with maximum offshore wave heights not 107 exceeding 1.5 m. The results of this study were mostly consistent with those from sandy 108 beaches, with infragravity wave height linearly dependent on the offshore sea-swell wave 109 height and increasing shoreward with a maximum infragravity wave height of 0.20 m close to 110 shore. Infragravity wave shoaling, quantified as the change in wave height from the platform 111 edge to the cliff toe, was strongest on the wider of the two platforms. A shoreward increase in 112 infragravity wave height and the increasing significance of infragravity energy relative to sea-113 swell energy on the inner platform, analogous to dissipative sandy beaches, has also been 114 observed on other sub-horizontal shore platforms in New Zealand and in Australia by 115 Marshall and Stephenson (2011) and Ogawa et al. (2011, 2015).

116

117 Coral reefs have a morphology that is analogous to sub-horizontal shore platforms, with a 118 relatively horizontal reef flat and a low tide reef step, and have been the subject of several 119 infragravity wave studies (e.g., Lugo-Fernandez et al., 1998; Brander et al., 2004; Pomeroy et al., 2012; Pequignet et al., 2014; Cheriton et al., 2016; Masselink et al., 2019). Coral reefs 120 121 exist primarily in microtidal regions and have a large bed roughness, and thus friction 122 coefficient, compared to sandy beaches. On a fringing reef in Western Australia, Pomeroy et 123 al. (2012) found that the water motion shoreward of the reef crest was dominated by 124 infragravity waves and that the dominant generation mechanism of the infragravity waves 125 was the time-varying breakpoint at the steep reef crest. This was supported by numerical 126 simulations and is consistent with the theory that breakpoint-generated infragravity waves are 127 more prevalent in steep sloping regimes. The efficiency of the time-varying breakpoint for

infragravity wave generation was also observed on coral reefs by Pequignet et al. (2009,
2014) and Becker et al. (2016), and in numerical modelling by Van Dongeren et al. (2013)
and Masselink et al. (2019).

131

132 Whilst a number of studies have investigated infragravity waves on sub-horizontal shore 133 platforms and similar coral reefs, there are few studies from sloping shore platforms. In a 134 study of wave transformation at five sloping shore platforms around the UK, Poate et al. 135 (2018) observed the total infragravity energy to either remain constant or decrease in the 136 shoreward direction through bed roughness. This characteristic of infragravity waves on 137 rocky platforms, generated by bound wave theory, was supported by Jager (2016), based on 138 the analysis of the field data collected on one of these sloping platforms and supported by 139 XBeach numerical modelling. Recently, an approximate 10 % increase in total infragravity 140 energy was observed across a sloping platform in a macro-tidal setting by Stephenson et al. 141 (2018); however, low-energy wave conditions, measurements at only three cross-shore 142 locations and a largely qualitative analysis limit the ability of their study to elucidate more 143 fully the geomorphic significance of infragravity waves on such platforms.

144

145 This paper investigates and compares the generation and transformation of infragravity waves 146 on contrasting sub-horizontal and sloping shore platforms. Field data from a sub-horizontal 147 platform at Leigh, New Zealand, and a sloping platform at Lilstock, UK, are analysed and 148 complimented by numerical modelling using the XBeach model (phase-resolving). The 149 specific objectives of this study are to: (1) assess the relative importance of the bound wave 150 and the time-varying breakpoint theories of infragravity wave generation on the two 151 platforms; (2) investigate and quantify the transformation of infragravity energy across the 152 platforms; and (3) discuss the geomorphic implications of the findings.

154 2. Methodology

155

156 2.1 Site description

157

158 Data presented in this paper originate from two field sites: Lilstock (LST) in Somerset, UK, 159 and Tatapouri (TAT) on the east coast of the North Island in New Zealand (Figure 1). Both 160 sites are part of a larger project looking at wave transformation across rocky platforms, with 161 data from LST presented in Poate et al. (2016, 2018) and McCall et al. (2017). LST 162 experiences macrotidal conditions, with a mean spring range of 10.7 m, and is characterised 163 by a wide (300 m), rather smooth and uniformly sloping platform (tan $\beta = 0.021$). The 164 platform at TAT has a microtidal regime with a 1.4 m mean spring range and is characterised 165 by two distinct slopes with a smooth, upper sub-horizontal section (tan $\beta = 0.0004$) that extends ~150 m before a break in slope where the profile drops away more rapidly $(\tan\beta =$ 166 0.002) over the lower 150 m. The profiles presented in Figure 1 show the surveyed intertidal 167 168 portion of the survey area. Extended profiles, highlighting the steep gradient at the edge of 169 the platform at TAT, are presented later in Section 3.3.

170

The site at LST is located on the southern side of the Bristol Channel, orientated north, making it relatively sheltered from the dominant south-westerly waves moving in from the North Atlantic. The profile itself is composed of sub-horizontal, c. 0.4-m thick mudstone beds which, through variable exposure and erosion, results in pools and shallow channels (Figure 2c). The field site at TAT is located on the east coast of the North Island exposed to the Pacific Ocean with incident swell approaching from the south-east (Ogawa et al., 2011). The wide, sub-horizontal platform is dominated by siltstone interbedded with weathered

178	sandstone, which leaves shallow pools and crevices (Figure 2a). Due to the sub-horizontal
179	bedding planes at both sites, the shore platform surfaces are relatively smooth, minimising
180	frictional wave energy dissipation during wave transformation (cf., Poate et al., 2018).
181	
182	
183	
184	2.2 Data collection
185	
186	For each site, a detailed topographic survey was undertaken across the intertidal platform
187	using RTK GPS (LST) and a total station (TAT). Each dataset was transformed onto a local
188	coordinate system as shown in Figure 1. To provide a comparison of platform roughness, the
189	standard deviation was calculated for a detrended profile using a 5-m moving window. The
190	mean value of this is presented in Figure 1 and shows that LST (0.08 m) exhibited a slightly
191	larger mean value compared TAT (0.06 m), and is hence somewhat rougher.
192	
193	Hydrodynamic data were collected over eight tides from the 8 th December 2014 at LST and
194	over six tides from the 24 th February 2016 at TAT. At each site, a linear array of RBR Solo
195	pressure sensors (15 at LST and 14 at TAT) were housed within steel tubes (0.23 m long) and
196	fixed to the platform surface using bolts or heavy weights. The sensors logged continuously
197	at 8 Hz and were evenly spaced across the platforms between the low- and high-water lines.
198	Each sensor was surveyed in position using the GPS or total station for vertical precision.
199	
200	At TAT, a 1200 kHz Teledyne Workhorse ADCP was deployed on the seabed (looking up)
201	\sim 300 m from the edge of the platform in 8–10 m water depth to measure the nearshore wave
202	climate. The ADCP was configured for burst sampling, recording 2400 samples at a rate of

2 Hz every 20 minutes. At LST, offshore wave conditions were not available and therefore
the outermost PT has been used to represent boundary conditions (when this PT was outside
the surf zone). Table 1 provides a summary of the experimental set-up and platform
morphology associated with the two field experiments.

207

208

- 209 2.3 Analysis methods
- 210

The local barometric pressure logged when each pressure sensor was exposed at low water was used to convert the absolute pressure to water surface elevation, and linear wave theory was used to correct for depth attenuation. The results presented herein are based on the analysis of ~17-min data segments (8192 data points), which provided a suitable compromise between tidal stationarity and being able to obtain representative statistical parameters. Bursts that were found to be intermittently wet and dry were excluded from analyses.

217

Auto-spectra were computed using Hanning-windowed, 50% overlapping segments of 2048 points, providing 12 degrees of freedom (Nutall, 1971) and a frequency resolution df of 0.0039 Hz. Infragravity (0.005–0.05 Hz) and sea-swell (0.05–0.33 Hz) significant wave heights (H_{inf} and H_{ss} , respectively) were calculated as

$$H_{inf} = 4 \sqrt{\int_{0.005}^{0.05} E(f) df} \qquad (1)$$

222 and

$$H_{ss} = 4 \sqrt{\int_{0.05}^{0.33} E(f) df}$$
(2)

where E(f) is the spectral density at frequency f. The transition frequency of 0.05 Hz between infragravity and sea-swell waves was selected to be consistent with most previous studies and also corresponds to the spectral valley present in the spectra for the majority of bursts. The high frequency sea-swell cut-off of 0.33 Hz corresponds to an attenuation level of >80% at the most seaward pressure sensor during high tide at LST, and thus higher frequencies could not be resolved confidently.

229

230 The infragravity wave generation mechanism at the two study sites was investigated using 231 cross-correlation analysis between the infragravity time series and the wave group envelope. 232 This technique considers the relationship between two time series with zero mean by 233 applying a time shift to one of the series and has been widely used in infragravity wave 234 research (e.g., Masselink, 1995; Janssen et al., 2003; Pomeroy et al., 2012; Ruju et al., 2012; Inch et al., 2017; Masselink et al., 2019). The infragravity and sea-swell time series (η_{inf} and 235 236 η_{ss} , respectively) were calculated using a frequency domain filter whereby the discrete 237 Fourier transformation of the total water surface elevation time series is multiplied by a filter 238 function that has a value of unity at the passband frequencies and zero at all other 239 frequencies, before undergoing an inverse Fourier transformation back into the time domain. 240 The wave group envelope A(t) was calculated following the method of List (1991) as

$$A(t) = \frac{\pi}{2} |\eta_{ss}(t)|_{low}$$
(3)

where subscript *low* indicates a low pass filter of frequency 0.05 Hz, and |..| represents the modulus. The wave group envelope reflects the modulation of sea-swell amplitude on the time scale of wave groups.

244

245 The cross-correlation is expressed as

$$r(\tau) = \frac{\langle \eta_{inf}(t)A(t+\tau) \rangle}{\sigma_{\eta_{inf}}\sigma_A}$$
(4)

where τ is a time shift, $\langle ... \rangle$ denotes a time-averaging operator, and $\sigma_{\eta_{inf}}$ and σ_A are the standard deviations of η_{inf} and A, respectively. If the infragravity waves are predominantly bound to the short-wave groups, then the cross-correlation coefficient at a time lag of zero r_0 will approach -1 because the two time series will theoretically be 180° out of phase. The 95% confidence intervals on the zero correlation, calculated following Garrett and Toulany (1981) and Jenkins and Watts (1968), are ±0.02 at LST and ±0.04 at TAT, respectively.

252

The grouped nature of the sea-swell waves is investigated further by calculating the groupiness factor *GF*, proposed by List (1991), as

$$GF = \frac{\sqrt{2var[A(t)]}}{\overline{A}(t)} \tag{5}$$

where *var* is the variance and the overbar represents the mean. The groupiness factor provides a normalised value between 0 and 1, with 1 representing maximum groupiness of the wave group envelope.

258

259 To better understand the infragravity wave characteristics on each of the platforms, it is 260 important to know the relative location of the data, within the surf zone. Throughout the TAT dataset, H_{ss} decreases from the seaward-most to the shoreward-most sensor for every data 261 262 burst. This implies that the sea-swell wave breakpoint, through all tidal stages, is located in 263 the unsurveyed ~ 20 m zone between the seaward-most sensor and the platform edge, 264 regardless of the water depth over the platform. This is consistent with visual observations 265 during the field experiment, which indicate consistent sea-swell wave breaking at the 266 platform edge (refer to Figure 2b). Therefore, it is assumed that the location of the sea-swell wave breakpoint x_b is at the platform edge, 20 m seaward of the seaward-most sensor. The 267

shoreward limit of the surf zone (x = 0) was taken as the location where the water level at the shallowest sensor intersects with the shoreline profile, and thus the normalized surf zone location x/x_b is obtained, where $x/x_b = 0$ indicates the shoreline and $x/x_b = 1$ represents the seaward edge of the surf zone.

272

At LST, visual observation of the data revealed a clear initial shoreward increase in H_{ss} due 273 274 to wave shoaling followed by a more rapid decay for the bursts close to high tide during all 275 tides. Therefore, an average breaker coefficient γ_b , defined as H_{ss}/h at the onset of short 276 wave breaking, was defined for each tide. The mean γ_b throughout all tides was 0.4. Using 277 γ_b , data are given a normalised surf zone position h/h_b , where h_b is the water depth at the sea-swell wave break point defined as $h_b = H_b/\gamma_b$, where H_b is the breaking sea-swell wave 278 279 height. Given that the profile at LST is quite linear in the region of the pressure sensors (refer 280 to Figure **1c**), it is assumed that $x/x_b = h/h_b$.

281

282 2.4 XBeach modelling

283

284 Numerical modelling is used to complement the field data analysis and help with the 285 interpretation of the results, as well as extending the parameter space beyond the conditions 286 experienced during the field experiments. Modelling of the rock shore platform 287 hydrodynamics was conducted using the phase-resolving (i.e., non-hydrostatic) variant of the 288 widely used and open-source XBeach model (Roelvink et al., 2009). For the comparison 289 between field measurments and model results, the model was set up using the surveyed intertidal profile, extending down to low water, and then extended to ensure the boundary 290 291 conditions were in 15 m water depth. For TAT, the depth at the offshore ADCP was used to 292 interpolate the bathymetry towards the platform edge where it was merged with the survey 293 data, based on local knowledge. At LST, nearshore bathymetry was extracted from United 294 Kingdom Hydrographic Office (UKHO) data, interpolated onto a regular grid and merged with the intertidal survey. When exploring the parameter space, idealised platform profiles 295 296 were used and the model domain was extended to 20 m water depth to accommodate for peak 297 wave periods of up to 14 s. The sloping platform (LST) was simply represented by a single gradient of 0.02 (1:50) extending 1000 m offshore to z = -20 m. The horizontal platform 298 299 (TAT) was represented by a 150-m wide section with a gradient of 0.005 (1:200), fronted by 300 a steep 5-m cliff with a gradient of 1, before extending offshore with the same gradient as the 301 LST platform to z = -20 m. Both idealised profiles were backed by a 5-m high cliff with a gradient of 1. The profiles were constructed to resemble the natural profiles of Lilstock and 302 303 Tatapouri, but with identical landward and seaward sections to avoid biasing the model 304 results.

305

306 The numerical model was first validated using field observations with the natural platform 307 profiles, and then used to generate an extended numerical data set for each of the field sites 308 using the idealised platform profiles. To generate the extended numerical dataset, a constant 309 water level was specified (SWL at the landward extend of the platforms; thus, at the base of the cliff) and H_o and T_p were varied, with H_o ranging from 1 to 4 m at 1-m increments and T_p 310 ranging from 6 to 14 s at 2-s increments. The purpose of these model runs was to explore the 311 H_o - T_p parameter space beyond the field dataset and further examine the relationship between 312 the infragravity wave height H_{inf} and the wave power expression $H_o^2 T_p$. In these 313 simulations, the model was run using default parameters for a duration of 30 mins, with the 314 315 initial 2 mins used to allow the model to 'spin-up'. The modelled data were also decomposed 316 into shoreward- and seaward-propagating infragravity components as was done, for example,

in a similar numerical study of infragravity wave generation across coral reef platforms byMasselink et al. (2019) using the methodology of Guza et al. (1984).

319

320 3. Results

321

322 3.1 Event summary

323

324 Wave conditions at the seaward-most sensors during the LST and TAT field experiments are 325 presented in Figure 3. At LST, the largest values of H_o were during the middle and latter half 326 of the study period, during which H_o exceeded 1 m at high tide at the seaward-most sensor, 327 with a maximum value of 1.91 m during tide 6. Peak wave periods ranged between 4 and 13 328 s, with a mean of 6.7 s. At TAT, H_o measured at the ADCP ranged between 0.59 and 1.57 m, 329 peaking during tide 1 before decreasing for the remaining tides. Maximum and minimum 330 peak wave periods were 7.8 s and 16.0 s, respectively, also peaking during tide 1. Mean H_{ss} 331 and T_p at TAT were 0.92 m and 11.8 s, respectively.

332

Maximum H_{inf} on the LST platform was 0.34 m, measured at the shallowest sensor during tide 6 when H_o at the seaward-most sensor was largest. This is almost twice as large as the maximum H_{inf} measured on the TAT platform of 0.18 m. This was also measured at the shallowest sensor, although typically H_{inf} decreases across the TAT platform, but increases across the LST platform (discussed later). Furthermore, unlike at LST where the largest values of H_{inf} tend to coincide with the most energetic offshore forcing, H_{inf} at TAT shows little response to offshore forcing.

341 To investigate the infragravity wave energy level over the complete field survey period and its relationship with the offshore wave forcing at both sites, Figure 4 shows H_{inf} 342 parameterized by the forcing parameter $H_o^2 T_p$ (following Inch et al., 2017), where H_o is the 343 344 offshore wave height. The parameter $H_o^2 T_p$ is used as it is proportional to the offshore wave 345 energy flux. To have a consistent value representing H_{inf} with which to relate to the offshore forcing conditions, H_{inf} is averaged over the surf zone (i.e., $0 < x/x_b < 1$) for each burst. To 346 obtain values of H_o , H_{ss} at the seaward-most sensor at LST during high tide conditions and 347 348 the ADCP at TAT is deshoaled to a representative offshore water depth (20 m) using linear 349 wave theory (ignoring wave refraction). Furthermore, data from LST are only included for 350 bursts where $h > 3H_{ss}$ at the seaward-most sensor to ensure that the data are well outside the 351 surf zone when deshoaled.

352

353 Data from LST show that H_{inf} is well predicted by $H_o^2 T_p$, with a linear regression revealing a coefficient of determination r^2 of 0.79 (Figure 4). There is no evidence of infragravity 354 saturation at LST as H_{inf} progressively increases with increasing $H_o^2 T_p$. These results are 355 356 consistent with the findings of Inch et al. (2017) using data from a dissipative sandy beach, 357 and other sandy beach studies that have indicated the importance of wave period in 358 parameterizing infragravity energy in the nearshore (e.g., Ruessink, 1998; Senechal et al., 359 2011; Contardo and Symonds, 2013). In contrast, H_{inf} at TAT shows a very weak and barely significant relationship with $H_o^2 T_p$ (Figure 4). The maximum $H_o^2 T_p$ value at TAT exceeds that 360 of LST; yet, the corresponding H_{inf} is over 50% smaller at 0.11 m compared to 0.26 m at 361 362 LST. There is also a strong indication that the infragravity wave motion at TAT is saturated for $H_o^2 T_p > 10$. 363

366 3.2 Infragravity generation and propagation

367

To investigate the generation and propagation of infragravity waves on the two contrasting platforms in detail, two example data bursts were selected for further analysis. The bursts that were selected have a similar level of offshore forcing (Table 2) and a good range of water depths throughout the surf zone.

372

373 Figure 5 shows the wave spectra at three different water depths on each platform, including 374 the seaward-most sensor at LST and the ADCP at TAT, for the two data bursts. The sea-swell 375 variance at LST is quite broad-banded and there is a slight decrease between $h = 5.1 \text{ m} (x/x_h)$ = 1.83) and $h = 1.8 \text{ m} (x/x_b = 0.65)$, before becoming significantly less at $h = 0.5 \text{ m} (x/x_b = 0.65)$ 376 0.19) (Figure 5a). The infragravity variance displays the reverse of this trend, with a small 377 378 increase between the two deepest sensors and a large increase to the shallowest sensor. The 379 sea-swell variance at TAT is more narrow-banded at the ADCP location where h = 10.1 m $(x/x_b = 1.77)$, but decreases and becomes less narrow-banded in shallower waters on the 380 381 platform (Figure 5b). The infragravity variance increases significantly between the ADCP 382 and the platform at h = 1.5 m ($x/x_b = 0.55$), and then increases further at low infragravity 383 frequencies (< 0.02 Hz), but decreases at high infragravity frequencies (> 0.02 Hz) at h = 0.6384 $m(x/x_b = 0.19).$

385

386

Time series of the incident waves, wave groups and infragravity waves for different locations across the shore platforms for the two data bursts are illustrated in Figure **6a** and **b**. Compared to the seaward-most sensors at LST, waves at the ADCP at TAT are narrow-

banded. clearly grouped, and fewer in number. Individual wave groups at LST can be traced 390 391 through the shoaling zone into the outer surf zone before becoming indistinguishable. At 392 TAT, while the wave groups are clear at the ADCP, the groupiness is much less defined on 393 the platform. The increasing importance of infragravity waves in shallow water is quite clear 394 at LST, but less so at TAT. Incident-wave statistics are shown in Figure 6c and demonstrate 395 that H_{ss} at TAT decreases very rapidly in the outer surf zone close to the platform edge, before decreasing steadily in the inner surf zone. In contrast, the dissipation of H_{ss} at LST is 396 397 more rapid through the surf zone. As alluded to earlier, H_{inf} increases shoreward on the LST platform, but decreases on the TAT platform, until the very inner surf zone where it increases 398 399 (Figure 6d). Infragravity energy becomes increasingly important relative to sea-swell energy 400 in shallower water on both platforms, accounting for ~25% of the total variance at the 401 shoreward-most sensors (Figure 6e).

402

403 Cross-correlation analysis was used to explore the infragravity wave generation mechanism 404 for the two data bursts at LST and TAT shown in Figure 6. The cross-correlation between the 405 wave group envelope at the seaward-most sensors (PT15 at LST and the ADCP at TAT) and 406 the infragravity signal at all locations, and between the wave group envelope and infragravity 407 signal locally are both shown in Figure 7.

408

At the seaward-most sensor on the LST platform, r_0 is significantly less than 0 indicating the presence of a bound infragravity wave that is 180° out of phase with the wave groups. However, the strongest negative correlation does not occur at zero time lag, but at a lag of 1.8 s, thus implying that the trough of the bound infragravity wave lags behind the crest of the wave group envelope. As the bound infragravity wave propagates shoreward towards the seaswell wave breakpoint, this lag grows to almost 5 s, as evidenced by the increased deviation away from the predicted lag according to the wave group celerity C_g (Figure 7a). The lag does not appear to increase further in the surf zone where the bound wave continues to propagate shoreward according to C_g , but the correlation weakens significantly in the inner half of the surf zone ($x/x_b < 0.5$). The local cross-correlation between A and η_{inf} at LST (Figure 7b) remains negative at zero time lag from the seaward-most sensor all the way to the very inner surf zone where there is some evidence of a switch from negative to positive correlation very close to shore.

422

423 At TAT, there is also clear evidence of a bound infragravity wave at the ADCP location, as 424 shown by the bar of strong negative (blue) correlation (Figure 7c). Similar to LST, the strongest negative correlation occurs at a non-zero time lag of 4 s. Due to the lack of sensors 425 426 on the platform edge, where sea-swell wave breaking occurs, as well as uncertainties 427 regarding the exact bed profile shape between the ADCP and the seaward extent of the 428 measured profile, calculation of the predicted lag was not attempted; therefore, the fate of the 429 bound infragravity wave on reaching the platform cannot be determined using the field data 430 alone and is investigated using numerical modelling later in the paper. However, in contrast to on the LST platform, the local cross-correlation between A and η_{inf} at TAT is positive at 431 all locations on the platform, indicating that the infragravity wave and the wave group are in 432 433 phase. This switch from negative to positive correlation suggests that the infragravity wave 434 motion on the platform is generated using the breakpoint-forced mechanism, operating at the 435 platform edge.

436

437

To assess whether the results from the two example data bursts presented in Figure 7 are representative for the two entire datasets, Figure 8a and b shows the local cross-correlation 440 coefficient at zero time lag for all locations and all bursts, relative to the normalized surf zone 441 position. At LST, r_0 is almost entirely negative outside of the surf zone indicating that bound 442 infragravity waves are dominant. The negative correlation increases towards the sea-swell 443 wave breaking point and decreases across the surf zone. This can be interpreted as the bound 444 infragravity waves being released as the sea-swell waves break and lose their group structure. 445 Correlation becomes positive in the inner third of the surf zone, thus supporting the previous 446 assertion that the correlation in Figure 7b looked likely to switch from negative to positive 447 close to shore. The relationship between bound infragravity waves and the sea-swell wave 448 group is further elucidated by the corresponding groupiness factors presented in Figure 8c. 449 The groupiness decreases in the outer surf zone following initial sea-swell wave breaking, 450 and coinciding with the release of the bound infragravity waves, before rising rapidly in the inner surf zone to correspond with the switch to positive r_0 . 451

452

453 The TAT data show that bound infragravity waves are prevalent at the ADCP, as indicated by 454 the predominantly negative r_0 at this location. However, on the platform r_0 is mostly positive 455 at all locations, as was also apparent in Figure 7d. This provides further evidence that 456 breakpoint-forced infragravity waves are dominant on the TAT platform as they are in phase 457 with the sea-swell wave groups. The groupiness of the sea-swell waves at TAT increases 458 significantly between the ADCP and the platform (Figure 8d), perhaps as a result of strong 459 shoaling on the platform slope. Unlike at LST, the groupiness decreases and is lowest in the 460 inner surf zone. This is likely associated with the rapid dissipation of the sea-swell waves in 461 the outer surf zone shortly after they have propagated onto the platform, as was shown in Figure 6c. 462

463

464 3.3 XBeach modelling

The field results presented thus far have provided strong evidence that bound infragravity waves are dominant on the LST platform and, with slightly more reservations, that breakpoint-forced infragravity waves dominate the platform at TAT. To investigate this further, the non-hydrostatic (i.e., phase-resolving) version of the XBeach numerical model (Roelvink et al., 2009) was used.

471 The two example data bursts of field data shown in Figures 5, 6 and 7 were used to help 472 validate the XBeach model. It is emphasised that we do not seek to provide an extensive 473 calibration of the numerical model as at both sites we do not have the appropriate wave 474 boundary conditions to force the model, nor do we have the complete bathymetry at the TAT site. Rather, the comparison, presented in Figure 9, serves to demonstrate qualitative 475 476 agreement between the field data and model results. The numerical model reproduces the 477 observed shoreward decrease in H_{ss} across the shore platform quite well at both LST and 478 TAT (Figure 9c and g). Qualitatively, there is also good agreement between modelled and 479 observed H_{inf} ; however, quantitatively the agreement is not great: H_{inf} is over-predicted by 480 around 0.07–0.10 m for LST (Figure 9d) and by 0.03–0.05 m for TAT (Figure 9h).

481

482 The modelled cross-correlation between the wave group envelope at the most seaward 483 coordinate and the infragravity time series at all locations for LST (Figure 9a) closely mimics 484 what was seen in the field data (Figure 7a). As was observed in the field data, the lag 485 associated with the strong band of negative (blue) correlation increases relative to the 486 predicted lag as it approaches the surf zone, reaching ~ 7 s at the outer edge of the surf zone. 487 This suggests that the trough of the bound wave lags behind the crest of the wave group by an 488 amount that increases as the sea-swell waves shoal prior to breaking. The local cross-489 correlation between A and η_{inf} (Figure 9b) also matches the field results (Figure 7b) very 490 well, remaining negative at zero time lag throughout the model domain up until the very inner 491 surf zone where it turns to positive (Figure **9b**). This occurs because the infragravity wave 492 crests increase the local water depth allowing for larger sea-swell waves to exist whilst the 493 smaller sea-swell waves propagate in the infragravity wave troughs.

494

495 The modelled cross-correlation between the wave group envelope at the most seaward 496 coordinate and the infragravity time series at all locations for TAT is similar to LST outside 497 the surf zone, where a band of negative correlation indicates the presence of a bound 498 infragravity wave (Figure 9e). This was also observed in the field data (Figure 7c). Also, like 499 in the model run for LST, the bound infragravity wave lags increasingly behind the predicted lag according to C_g , up to ~7 s at the platform edge. However, on reaching the shore 500 platform, the band of negative correlation associated with the bound infragravity wave 501 502 rapidly weakens, whilst a band of positive (red) correlation suddenly emerges in front of the 503 wave group and propagates towards the shore, by which time the bound infragravity waves 504 has all but disappeared (Figure 9e). As with the field data from the TAT platform (Figure 7d), 505 the local cross-correlation at zero time lag sees a rapid switch from negative to positive at the platform edge (Figure 9f), supporting the loss of the bound wave and introduction of a 506 507 breakpoint-forced infragravity wave. The outgoing infragravity wave, originating at the sea-508 swell wave breakpoint is also characteristic of the breakpoint-forced mechanism.

509

Before presenting all model results across the full parameter space ($H_o = 1-4$ m; $T_p = 6-14$ s) in the next section, Figure **10** shows the model output for an idealised sloping and horizontal platform, for $H_o = 4$ m and $T_p = 12$ s. An identical wave signal was used in these two simulations and a snapshot of the wave profiles across the topography, as well as the crossshore variation in mean sea level and significant wave height, are plotted in the upper panel 515 of Figure 10. For both platforms there is a residual wave height at the base of the cliff. The 516 two middle pairs of panels shows the incoming and outgoing infragravity wave signal, 517 derived using a lowpass filter of $T_p/4$ and the method of Guza et al. (1984), and the lower pair 518 of panels shows the cross-shore variation in the total, incoming and outgoing significant 519 infragravity wave height $H_{s.inf}$. For the sloping platform (left panels) the incoming 520 infragravity signal (assumed to be the bound long wave based on previous results) 521 progressively increases in amplitude towards the shore. Part of the incoming signal reflects at 522 the cliff, generating a less energetic outgoing infragravity signal. The infragravity motion on 523 the horizontal platform is more complex. There is still an incoming bound long wave signal, 524 but, at the submerged platform edge, the infragravity crests become troughs on the platform, 525 and the troughs become crests. As demonstrated earlier, this is the indicative of the time-526 varying breakpoint mechanism of infragravity wave generation. There are also two outgoing 527 infragravity wave signals: one originating at the submerged platform edge (outgoing time-528 varying breakpoint wave) and one at the cliff at the landwards limit of the platform 529 (reflection of the incoming time-varying breakpoint wave). The infragravity wave motion at 530 the base of the cliff on the sub-horizontal platform ($H_{s,inf} = 1.5$ m) is more energetic than that 531 on the sloping platform ($H_{s,inf} = 1.2$ m). The reduction in $H_{s,inf}$ at x = 100 m on the sloping 532 platform and x = 150 m on the sub-horizontal platform is due to standing infragravity wave 533 motion.

534

535

536

537 4. Discussion

538

539 4.1 Bound long wave versus breakpoint forcing

541 The numerical modelling results agree very well with the field data and indicate that the 542 infragravity waves on the sloping platform (LST) have characteristics akin to those observed 543 on dissipative beaches (e.g., Ruessink, 1998; Janssen et al., 2003; Inch et al., 2017), whilst 544 infragravity wave observations on the sub-horizontal platform (TAT) agree well with those 545 from steep beaches and coral reefs (e.g., Baldock, 2006; Lara et al., 2011; Pomeroy et al., 546 2012; Masselink et al., 2019). Furthermore, cross-correlation analysis between the 547 infragravity motion across the shore platform and the wave groupiness seaward of the surf 548 zone provides strong evidence that infragravity waves on the sloping platform are related to 549 bound long waves whereas those on the sub-horizontal platform are breakpoint-forced long-550 waves. The key distinguishing factor between the two mechanisms of infragravity wave 551 generation is the gradient over which the incident waves shoal and break (e.g., Battjes et al., 552 2004), with a secondary role played by the incident wave steepness (e.g., Baldock and Huntley, 2002). 553

554

Baldock (2012) proposed a useful framework to enable an evaluation of the relative importance of the two mechanism through a surf beat similarity parameter $\xi_{surfbeat}$, which combines the normalised bed slope with the wave steepness as

$$\xi_{surfbeat} = \beta_{norm} \sqrt{\frac{H_b}{L_o}} \qquad (6)$$

where L_0 is the short-wave deep-water wave length, H_b is the wave height at the sea-well wave breakpoint and β_{norm} is the normalised bed slope as proposed by Battjes et al. (2004) as

$$\beta_{norm} = \frac{h_x}{\omega_{low}} \sqrt{\frac{g}{h_b}} \tag{7}$$

where h_x and h_b are the beach slope and the depth at breaking, respectively, ω_{low} is the radian long-wave frequency, and g is the gravitational acceleration. Small and large values of $\xi_{surfbeat}$ favour the BLW and BFLW mechanism, respectively, with a $\xi_{surfbeat}$ value of 0.05–0.1 separating the two IG wave regimes (cf. Baldock, 2012, his Table 1; Contardo and Symonds, 2013, their Table **2**).

565

566 Inserting Eq. 6 into Eq. 7 yields

$$\xi_{surfbeat} = \left(1/\sqrt{2\pi}\right) \left(T_{IG}/T_p\right) \sqrt{\gamma} h_x \qquad (8)$$

567 where T_{IG} and T_p are the infragravity and incident wave period, respectively, and γ is the 568 breaker criterion H_b/h_b . Assuming a typical IG-wave period T_{IG} of 4 times the incident-wave period T_p and an irregular breaker criterion of $H_b/h_b = 0.5$, Eq. 8 reduces to $\xi_{surfbeat} \approx 1.13h_x$, 569 and $\xi_{surfbeat}$ is independent of the incident wave height or period. Finally, inserting a $\xi_{surfbeat}$ 570 571 threshold of 0.05–0.1 separating the two IG wave regimes, following Baldock (2012) and Contardo and Symonds (2013), results in a beach gradient threshold of 0.04-0.09. This 572 573 implies that the bound long wave mechanism can be expected to dominate on most sloping 574 platforms, whose platform gradient is always less than 0.1 and usually less than 0.05 575 (Trenhaile, 1999), whereas the breakpoint-forced mechanism is expected to dominate subhorizontal platforms as these generally have a very steep low tide cliff and subtidal profile 576 577 (Sunamura, 1992, Kennedy, 2015).

578

579 4.2 Which mechanism is most effective at generating infragravity waves?

580

Using data from the additional XBeach model runs with $H_o = 1-4$ m and $T_p = 6-14$ s, Figure 11 illustrates the relationship between $H_{s,inf}$ and $H_o^2 T_p$ across this wide parameter space. The LST and TAT field data are included in the plot, as well as field data collected from Perranporth Beach, Cornwall, UK, from the study by Inch et al. (2017), to provide comparison with a dissipative sandy beach. During the Perranporth field experiment, H_o ranged from 0.4 to 3.9 m and T_p varied between 6 and 20 s; thus, conditions significantly more energetic than experienced during the shore platform experiments. For all measured and modelled data sets, $H_{s,inf}$ is averaged over the zone $0 < x/x_b < 0.33$ (i.e., inner third of the surf zone), hence the notation $< H_{s,inf} >$ is used.

590

The model results for both rock platform sites are comparable and indicate that $\langle H_{s,inf} \rangle$ 591 increases rapidly for $H_o^2 T_p < 50 \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$, before increasing at a slower rate beyond this level. 592 593 This trend is replicated in the Perranporth field data, although the latter seem to plot 594 somewhat below the platform model results (note, however, that these are field measurements 595 and not model results). The field data from LST and TAT generally agree well with the model results; however, they cover a very small parameter space $(H_o^2 T_p < 230 \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1})$ and 596 597 additional data from both types of platforms under a greater range of forcing conditions is 598 required to confirm the model results.

599

The relationship between $\langle H_{s,inf} \rangle$ and $H_o^2 T_p$ shown in Figure 11 for both sites suggests that 600 601 a linear parameterization of the infragravity wave height with the offshore forcing, as has 602 often been applied in previous studies, may not be suitable. The present results agree with 603 those of Senechal et al. (2011) who found that the best statistical predictor of infragravity 604 runup on a dissipative beach with a steep foreshore slope is not a linear fit, but rather a 605 hyperbolic-tangent function. Furthermore, a non-linear fit solves a common issue experienced 606 when attempting to fit a linear line to infragravity wave height or runup in which the linear 607 line intercepts the vertical axis at a value greater than 0. This is counter-intuitive as it implies 608 that there is some infragravity energy even when there is a complete absence of offshore forcing. The non-linear curves fitted to the model results for LST and TAT, and the linear fit for Perranporth, plotted in Figure **11**, describe the model data very well, with r^2 of 0.85, 0.79 and 0.94, respectively. It must be emphasised, however, that these equations are highly sitespecific (mainly dependent on morphology and water level) and are not universally applicable.

614

615 The field observations at LST and TAT, and the supporting numerical model simulations, 616 strongly suggest that the potential for infragravity wave generation for sloping platforms is 617 similar to that for sub-horizontal platforms. This suggests that the bound long wave 618 mechanism of infragravity wave generation is as efficient as the breakpoint-forced 619 mechanism. This is in apparent contrast to the recent study of Masselink et al. (2019), who 620 applied XBeach to model wave transformation across coral reef platforms and concluded that 621 the breakpoint-forced mechanism is the more effective generator of infragravity energy, and 622 that the most energetic infragravity wave motion (normalised by incident wave motion) is generated on reef platforms with a steep fore reef slope >1/6. There is, however, a 623 624 fundamental difference between the topographic profiles of coral reef and shore platform 625 settings. Horizontal platforms are similar to coral reefs with both characterised by a (sub)horizontal platform fronted by a steep submerged cliff; however, a sloping platform 626 627 represents a continuous gradient and does not have terminating (sub)-horizontal platform. 628 Thus, in the continuously sloping platform case, any BLW is able to 'grow' as it propagates 629 across the sloping platform, whereas in the case of a coral platform fronted by a low-gradient 630 fore reef, the BLW is 'released' at the breakpoint near the seaward edge of the reef platform. 631 It is also worth pointing out that the water depth at the base of fore reefs is generally much 632 larger than at the base of the low tide cliff of sub-horizontal shore platforms. Therefore, the 633 characteristics of the infragravity wave motion arriving at the different types of platforms are

634 expected to be dissimilar. Clearly, some care has to be exercised when transferring the 635 current findings across to different coastal settings as site-specific factors play a very 636 significant role in the wave transformation and infragravity wave generation processes.

637

638 4.3 Geomorphic implications

639

640 This paper provides the first detailed comparison of the different ways in which sloping and 641 sub-horizontal shore platforms filter the wave energy available for geomorphic work 642 (erosion) at the cliff toe. A unified conceptual framework for the origin of rock platforms is 643 not yet available: Trenhaile (1987, 1999) described the critical role of tidal range (sloping 644 platforms occur mainly in larger tidal ranges and sub-horizontal platforms occur mainly in 645 micro-tidal settings), whereas Sunamura (1992) distinguished both types in micro-tidal 646 settings on the basis of incident wave force and rock resistance: larger waves/weaker rock result in erosion of the seaward edge of shore platforms and sloping platforms develop, 647 648 whereas harder rocks/weaker incident waves preserve or partially preserve the seaward edge, 649 forming sub-horizontal platforms. In the field, a clear demarcation between platform types is not always obvious and recent modelling has demonstrated that different platform types can 650 651 develop across a very broad parameter space in which wave erosion and rock weathering 652 processes variously dominate (e.g., Matsumoto et al., 2018).

653

Regardless of formative demarcation conditions and the relative importance of wave and weathering processes, our results highlight important differences in the wave regimes operating on each platform type. Comparison of wave transmission across sloping and subhorizontal platforms, that are relatively similar in width and wave exposure, but different in terms of tidal range, platform slope and the presence/absence of a steep seaward edge, suggest that sub-horizontal platforms are more effective in filtering both incident and infragravity wave energy and should therefore be characterised by lower wave energy levels at the emerged cliff toe. Results further suggest contrasting mechanisms of infragravity wave generation on sloping and sub-horizontal platforms. Overall the results are generally consistent with conceptual models of shore platform development, but add important mechanistic understanding.

665 Recent reviews of rock platform development (Trenhaile 2018, 2019) emphasise the 666 importance of both wave erosion and weathering across the full spectrum of platforms. Under 667 stable sea level conditions platforms attain states of static equilibrium, and hence stable 668 profile morphology, due to wave erosion. During times of changing sea level, sloping shore 669 platforms are thought to evolve in dynamic equilibrium through shore-parallel cliff retreat 670 and maintain their general profile shape (e.g., Challinor, 1949; Trenhaile, 1974; Walkden and 671 Dickson, 2008). Our results in a macro-tidal setting confirm that rapid tidal translation 672 exposes the entire surveyed width of the sloping platform surface to wave energy at incident 673 frequencies, and that the bound long wave mechanism dominates infragravity wave energy 674 generation on these surfaces, providing a mechanism for elevating water levels at the cliff 675 toe. Whilst this elevates the zone of maximum wave energy expenditure upwards and further 676 landwards, which increases the mechanical impact of short-period waves, enhances debris 677 removal and enlarges the spatial extent of the wetting and drying that leads to weathering, 678 rock resistance also remains important in setting the height of the cliff toe (cf. Trenhaile 679 2018). In contrast, sub-horizontal platforms are thought to have declining rates of cliff 680 recession through time (e.g., Sunamura, 1992), because platform gradients are reduced to a 681 level where wave generated shear stresses are below the erosional threshold. Continued cliff 682 recession becomes possible only through rock degradation accomplished by subaerial 683 weathering processes and debris removal by infragravity wave energy (Dickson et al., 2013).

684 Our results confirm other studies that show that sub-horizontal platforms are effective in 685 filtering incident energy (e.g., Marshall and Stephenson, 2011; Ogawa et al., 2011), and explain that the breakpoint-forced mechanism is the likely source of infragravity wave energy 686 687 on such platforms. As described above, the key distinguishing factor between the two 688 mechanisms of infragravity wave generation is the gradient over which the incident waves 689 shoal and break. Following Baldock (2012) and Contardo and Symonds (2013), the threshold 690 gradient is likely to be in the range 0.04 to 0.09. Therefore the breakpoint-forced mechanism 691 must clearly be the dominant source of infragravity wave energy on shore platforms where a 692 steep seaward edge (low-tide cliff) has been preserved as a near-vertical cliff (e.g., Dickson, 693 2006). This paper shows that on sub-horizontal platforms with partially preserved steep 694 seaward edges developed in softer rocks such as the silt- and sandstone at TAT the dominant 695 mechanism of infragravity wave generation remains breakpoint forcing.

696

697 It is interesting to contemplate that future sea-level rise may change the wave regime on sub-698 horizontal shore platforms. While the relative elevation of the platform edge compared to the 699 tidal elevation remains important, as water levels rise, wave breaking may be less constrained 700 to the seaward edge and shift to parts of the shore platform that slope more gently. Hence, 701 increased water depth will not only increase the proportion of energy at incident and 702 infragravity wave frequencies that reaches the cliff toe (because less energy will be expended 703 on the platform edge), but it is also likely to switch the dominant mode of infragravity wave 704 generation to the bound long wave mechanism.

705

706 5. Conclusion

708 This paper set out to investigate and compare the generation and transformation of 709 infragravity waves on contrasting sloping and sub-horizontal shore platforms. Using field 710 data from a sloping platform at Lilstock, UK, and a sub-horizontal platform at Leigh, New 711 Zealand, complimented by numerical modelling (XBeach model), we have assessed the 712 relative importance of the bound wave and the time-varying breakpoint theories of 713 infragravity wave generation. Field measurements of wave transformation were collected 714 over 8/6 tides, tide range of 10.7/1.4 m and peak $H_o = 1.91/1.57$ m using 15/14 platform 715 mounted pressure sensors, for sloping/sub-horizontal platforms respectively.

The numerical modelling results strongly support the field data and indicate that infragravity waves on sloping platforms have characteristics similar to those on dissipative beaches, whereas infragravity wave observations on sub-horizontal platforms, align more closely with steep beaches and coral reefs. Further cross-correlation analysis, between the infragravity motion across the shore platform and the wave groupiness seaward of the surf zone, shows that the group bound long wave mechanism is most important on sloping platforms, whereas breakpoint-forced long waves dominate on sub-horizontal platforms.

723 Further investigation shows the transformation of infragravity energy across the platforms is 724 somewhat more energetic on sloping platforms than that on sub-horizontal platforms. This 725 supports suggestions that sub-horizontal platforms provide better protection to coastal cliffs 726 than their more steeply sloping counterparts. The model results support comparable studies 727 from dissipative beaches that suggest a linear parameterization of the infragravity wave 728 height with the offshore forcing, as has often been applied in previous studies, may not be 729 suitable. The authors acknowledge that site-specific geomorphic factors including the 730 elevation of the seaward terminus of the platform and the gradient are likely to play a key 731 role in wave transformation. Further studies, where possible, should focus on in-situ field

732	measurements to capture extreme wave conditions ($H_s > 5$ m) that can then be support further
733	numerical simulations.
734	
735	Acknowledgements
736	This research was funded by EPSRC grant EP/L02523X/1, Waves Across Shore Platforms,
737	awarded to GM and MJA. We would like to thank our field and technical team: Peter
738	Ganderton, Tim Scott, Olivier Burvingt, Pedro Almeida and Kate Adams. The data on which
739	this paper is based are available from TP or via the online repository found at
740	http://hdl.handle.net/10026.1/9105.
741	
742	
743	References
744	
745	Baldock, T.E. 2006. Long wave generation by the shoaling and breaking of transient wave groups on
746	a beach. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A, 462, 1853-1876.
747	
748	Baldock, T.E. 2012. Dissipation of incident forced long waves in the surf zone – implications for the
749	concept of "bound" wave release at short wave breaking. Coastal Engineering, 60, 276-285.
750	
751	Baldock, T.E., Huntley, D.A. 2002. Long-wave forcing by the breaking of random gravity waves on a
752	beach. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A, 458, 2177-2201.
753	
754	Battjes, J.A., Bakkenes, H.J., Janssen, T.T., van Dongeren, A.R. 2004. Shoaling of subharmonic
755	gravity waves. Journal of Geophysical Research, 109, C02009.
756	

- Becker, J.M., Merrifield, M.A., Yoon, H. 2016. Infragravity waves on fringing reefs in the tropical
 Pacific: Dynamic setup. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 121, 3010-3028.
- 759
- Beetham, E.P., Kench, P.S. 2011. Field observations of infragravity waves and their behaviour on
 rock shore platforms. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*, 36, 1872-1888.
- 762
- Bertin, X., et al. (2018), Infragravity waves: From driving mechanisms to impacts, *Earth-Science Reviews*, 177, 774-799
- 765
- 766 Brander, R.W., Kench, P.S., Hart, D. 2004. Spatial and temporal variations in wave characteristics
- 767 across a reef platform, Warraber Island, Torres Strait, Australia. Marine Geology, 207, 169-184.
- 768
- 769 Cheriton, O.M., Storlazzi, C.D., Rosenberger, K.J. 2016. Observations of wave transformation over a
- fringing coral reef and the importance of low-frequency waves and offshore water levels to runup,
- 771 overwash, and coastal flooding. Journal of Geophysical Research, 121, 3121-3140.
- 772
- Contardo, S., Symonds, G. 2013. Infragravity response to variable wave forcing in the nearshore. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 118, 7095-7106.
- 775
- Dickson, M. E. (2006), Shore platform development around Lord Howe Island, southwest Pacific, *Geomorphology*, 76(3), 295-315.
- 778
- 779 Dickson, M.E., Ogawa, H., Kench, P.S., Hutchinson, A. 2013. Sea-cliff retreat and shore platform
- 780 widening: steady-state equilibrium? Earth Surface Processes and Landforms, 38, 1046-1048.
- 781
- 782 Farrell, E.J., Granja, H., Cappietti, L., Ellis, J.T., Li, B., Sherman, D.J. 2009. Wave transformation
- across a rock platform, Belinho, Portugal. Journal of Coastal Research, SI 56, 44-48.
- 784

Garrett, C.J.R., Toulany, B. 1981. Variability of the flow through the Strait of Belle Isle. *Journal of Marine Research*, 39, 163-189.

787

- Guza, R.T., Thornton, E.B., Holman, R.A. 1984. Swash on steep and shallow beaches. *Proceedings of the 19th Conference on Coastal Engineering*. ASCE, New York.
- 790
- Hasselmann, K. 1962. On the non-linear energy transfer in a gravity-wave spectrum: Part 1. General
 theory. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 12, 481-500.
- 793
- Inch, K., Davidson, M., Masselink, G., Russell, P. 2017. Observations of nearshore infragravity wave
- dynamics under high energy swell and wind-wave conditions. Continental Shelf Research, 138, 19-
- 797

796

31.

- Jager, T., 2016. Infra-gravity wave transformation across macrotidal rocky shore platforms.
 Unpublished MSc thesis, Technical University Delft, The Netherlands.
- 800
- Janssen, T.T., Battjes, J.A., Van Dongeren, A.R. 2003. Long waves induced by short-wave groups
 over a sloping bottom. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 108, 3252.
- 803
- Jenkins, G.M., Watts, D.G. 1968. Spectral analysis and its applications. Holden-Day, San Francisco.
 805
- Kennedy, D. M. (2015), Where is the seaward edge? A review and definition of shore platform
 morphology, *Earth-Science Reviews*, *147*, 99-108.
- 808
- 809 Kennedy, David M. (2016), The subtidal morphology of microtidal shore platforms and its 810 implication for wave dynamics on rocky coasts, *Geomorphology*, 268, pp. 146-158.
- 811

812	Lara, J.L., Ruju, A., Losada, I.J. 2011. Reynolds averaged Navier-Stokes modelling of long waves
813	induced by a transient wave group on a beach. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A, 467,
814	1215-1242.
815	
816	List, J.H. 1991. Wave groupiness variations in the nearshore. Coastal Engineering, 15, 475-496.
817	
818	Longuet-Higgins, M.S., Stewart, R.W. 1962. Radiation stress and mass transport in gravity waves
819	with applications to 'surf beats'. Journal of Fluid Mechanics, 13, 481-504.
820	
821	Lugo-Fernandez, A., Roberts, H.H., Wiseman Jr, W.J., Carter, B.L. 1998. Water level and currents of
822	tidal and infragravity periods at Tague Reef, St. Croix (USVI). Coral Reefs, 17, 343-349.
823	
824	Marshall. R.J.E., Stephenson, W.J. 2011. The morphodynamics of shore platforms in a micro-tidal
825	setting: interactions between waves and morphology. Marine Geology, 288, 18-31.
826	
827	Masselink, G. 1995. Group bound long waves as a source of infragravity energy in the surf zone.
828	Continental Shelf Research, 15, 1525-1547.
829	
830	Masselink, G., Tuck, M., McCall, R., van Dongeren, A., Ford, M. and Kench, P., 2019. Physical and
831	numerical modelling of infragravity wave generation and transformation on coral reef platforms.
832	Journal of Geophysical Research (Oceans) INCOMPLETE CITATION.
833	
834	Matsumoto, H., Dickson, M.E., Kench, P.S., 2018. Modelling the relative dominance of wave erosion
835	and weathering processes in shore platform development in micro- to mega-tidal settings. Earth
836	Surface. Processes and Landforms. 43, 2642-2653.

838	McCall, R., Masselink, G., Austin, M., Poate, T. and Jager, T., 2017. Modelling incident-band and
839	infragravity wave dynamics on rocky shore platforms. Proceedings Coastal Dynamics, ASCE,
840	Helsingor, Denmark, 1658-1669.
841	
842	Nutall, A.H. 1971. Spectral estimation by means of overlapped FFT processing of windowed data.
843	Naval Underwater Systems Center (NUSC) Report No. 4169. New London, Connecticut.
844	
845	Ogawa, H., Dickson, M.E., Kench, P.S. 2011. Wave transformation on a sub-horizontal shore
846	platform, Tatapouri, North Island, New Zealand. Continental Shelf Research, 31, 1409-1419.
847	
848	Ogawa, H., Dickson, M.E., Kench, P.S. 2015. Hydrodynamic constraints and storm wave
849	characteristics on a sub-horizontal platform. Earth Surface Processes and Landforms, 40, 65-77.
850	
851	Pequignet, A.C.N., Becker, J.M., Merrifield, M.A., Aucan, J. 2009. Forcing of resonant modes on a
852	fringing reef during tropical storm Man-Yi. Geophysical Research Letters, 36, L03607.
853	
854	Pequignet, A.C.N., Becker, J.M., Merrifield, M.A. 2014. Energy transfer between wind waves and
855	low-frequency oscillations on a fringing reef, Ipan, Guam. Journal of Geophysical Research, 119,
856	6709-6724.
857	
858	Poate, T., Masselink, T., Austin, M., Dickson, M., Kench, P. 2016. Observations of wave
859	transformation on macro-tidal rocky platforms. Journal of Coastal Research, SI75, 602-606.
860	
861	Poate, T., Masselink, G., Austin, M.J., Dickson, M., McCall, R. 2018. The role of bed roughness in
862	wave transformation across sloping rock shore platforms. Journal of Geophysical Research, 123, 97-
863	123.
864	

865	Pomeroy, A., Lowe, R., Symonds, G., van Dongeren, A., Moore, C. 2012. The dynamics of
866	infragravity wave transformation over a fringing reef. Journal of Geophysical Research, 117, C11022.
867	

- 868 Roelvink, D., Reniers, A., van Dongeren, A., van Thiel de Vries, J., McCall, R., Lescinski, J. 2009.
- 869 Modelling storm impacts on beaches, dunes and barrier islands. *Coastal Engineering*, 56, 1133-1152.
- 870
- Ruessink, B.G. 1998. The temporal and spatial variability of infragravity energy in a barred nearshore
 zone. *Continental Shelf Research*, 18, 585-605.
- 873
- 874 Ruju, A., Lara, J.L., Losada, I.J. 2012. Radiation stress and low-frequency energy balance within the
- 875 surf zone: a numerical approach. *Coastal Engineering*, 68, 44-55.
- 876
- Senechal, N., Coco, G., Bryan, K.R., Holman, R.A. 2011. Wave runup during extreme storm
 conditions. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 116, C07032.
- 879
- 880 Stephenson, W. J., Dickson, M. E., & Denys, P. H. (2017). New insights on the relative contributions
- 881 of coastal processes and tectonics to shore platform development following the Kaikōura earthquake.
- Earth Surface Processes and Landforms, 42(13), 2214-2220.
- 883
- 884 Sunamura, T. 1992. *Geomorphology of rocky coasts*. Wiley, New York.
- 885
- 886 Symonds, G., Huntley, D., Bowen, A.J. 1982. Two-dimensional surf beat: long wave generation by a
- time-varying breakpoint. Journal of Geophysical Research, 87, 492-498.
- 888
- Trenhaile, A.S. 1974. The geometry of shore platforms in England and Wales. Transactions of the
 Institute of British Geographers 62, 129–142.
- 891
- 892 Trenhaile, A.S. 1987. The geomorphology of rock coasts. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

- 894 Trenhaile, A.S. 1999. The width of shore platforms in Britain, Canada, and Japan. *Journal of Coastal*895 *Research*, 15, 355-364.
- 896
- 897 Trenhaile, A.S. 2018. Shore platform erosion and evolution: Implications for cosmogenic nuclide
 898 analysis, *Marine Geology*, 403, 80–92.
- 899
- Trenhaile, A.S. 2019. Hard-Rock Coastal Modelling: Past Practice and Future Prospects in a
 Changing World, *Journal of Marine Science and Engineering*, 7, 34, 1-16.
- 902
- 903 Van Dongeren, A., Battjes, J., Janssen, T., van Noorloos, J., Steenhauer, K., Steenbergen, G., Reniers,
- A. 2007. Shoaling and shoreline dissipation of low-frequency waves. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 112, C02011.
- 906
- 907 Van Dongeren, A., Lowe, R., Pomeroy, A., Trang, D.M., Roelvink, D., Symonds, G., Ranasinghe, R.
- 2013. Numerical modelling of low-frequency wave dynamics over a fringing coral reef. *Coastal*2019 *Engineering*, 73, 178-190.
- 910
- Walkden, M.J.A, Dickson, M.E. 2008. Equilibrium erosion of soft rock shores with a shallow or
 absent beach under increased sea level rise. Marine Geology 251: 75–84.
- 913

- 915 **Figure 1.** Location maps and aerial images of LST (a) and TAT (b). Red dashed lines
- 916 indicate the location of the instrument arrays across the intertidal platforms. Cross-shore
- 917 profile of the platform at LST (c) and TAT (d). Black dots are the pressure sensor locations
- 918 and the vertical black bars indicate the local tidal range. The standard deviation (std) of the
- 919 profile surface is provided as an indication of relative roughness. Note the different axis
- 920 limits. Dashed line indicates un-surveyed section of profile.
- 921 Figure 2. Site photos at low tide and high tide at TAT (a and b) and LST (c and d).
- 922 **Figure 3.** Summary wave conditions during the two field experiments: significant sea-swell
- 923 wave height H_o (a and b), peak wave period T_p (c and d), and water depth h (e and f) at LST
- 924 (left panels) and TAT (right panels). Mean depth across platform at LST = 4.2 m and TAT =
- 925 0.95 m. Data shown are from the seaward-most PT at LST and the ADCP at TAT. Vertical
- 926 dashed lines indicate burst times used for subsequent analysis. Note the different axis limits
- 927 between e and f.
- 928 **Figure 4.** Infragravity wave height H_{inf} averaged across the surf zone versus $H_o^2 T_p$ at LST
- 929 (circles) and TAT (dots). Black lines are best-fit linear regression lines with coefficients of 930 determination r^2 given in the figure.
- Figure 5. Wave spectra at three different water depths, as indicated in the figure legend, at
 LST (a) and TAT (b). Vertical dashed line indicates the transition between infragravity and
 sea-swell frequencies at 0.05 Hz. A 95% confidence bar is given in the figure.
- 934 Figure 6. Example sea-swell (black), infragravity (red), and wave group envelope (blue) time
- 935 series of 180 s for LST (a) and TAT (b). The time series are stacked from the seaward-most
- 936 (top) to the landward-most (bottom) and are offset for clarity. The horizontal dashed lines
- 937 indicate the seaward edge of the surf zone. Sea-swell wave height H_{ss} (c), infragravity wave
- 938 height H_{inf} (d), percentage of total wave variance in the infragravity band IG % (e), and
- 939 water depth h (f), versus normalized surf zone location x/x_b at LST (circles) and TAT (dots).
- 940 Vertical dashed lines indicate the sea-swell wave breakpoint at $x/x_b = 1$.
- 941 **Figure 7.** Cross-correlation between the wave group envelope at the seaward-most sensor
- 942 (PT15 at LST and the ADCP at TAT) and the infragravity time series at all sensors (a and c),
- and cross-correlation between the wave group envelope and the infragravity time series at
- 944 each sensor (b and d) at LST (top panels) and TAT (bottom panels). Vertical solid lines
- 945 indicate a time lag of 0 s and horizontal dashed lines indicate the sea-swell wave breakpoint
- 946 at $x/x_b = 1$. The dotted line in a is the predicted time lag for an incident wave propagating at
- 947 the wave group celerity C_g . Red indicates positive correlations and blue indicates negative
- 948 correlations.
- 949 **Figure 8.** Correlation coefficient at zero time lag r_0 between the wave group envelope and
- 950 the infragravity time series (a and b), and groupiness factor *GF* (c and d), versus normalised
- 951 surf zone location x/x_b for all locations during all bursts at LST (left panels) and TAT (right
- panels). Boxplots are overlain representing the data in x/x_b bins of 0.1. On each box, the
- 953 central line is the median value and the upper and lower bounds are the 75th and 25th
- 954 percentiles, respectively.

- 955 Figure 9. Cross-correlation between the wave group envelope at the most seaward coordinate
- 956 and the infragravity time series at all locations (a and e), and cross-correlation between the
- 957 wave group envelope and the infragravity time series at each location (b and f). Red indicates
- 958 positive correlations and blue indicates negative correlations. Comparison between modelled
- 959 (black dots) and measured (red dots) sea-swell wave height H_{ss} (a and g) and infragravity
- 960 wave height *H_{inf}* (g and h). Results are from XBeach-G model runs simulating LST (top
- 961 panels) and TAT (bottom panels) using the same forcing conditions as in Figure 7. Note the
- 962 different axis limits.
- 963 **Figure 10.** Numerical model results output for idealised sloping (left panels) and horizontal
- 964 (right panels) platform, for $H_o = 4$ m and $T_p = 12$ s. Idealised platform profile and cross-shore
- 965 variation in example wave profile, mean sea level and significant wave height (a and b).
- 966 Incoming and outgoing infragravity wave signal with colourmap running from -0.7 m (blue)
- 967 to +0.7 m (red), (c, d, e and f). Total, incoming and outgoing significant infragravity wave
- height $H_{s,inf}$, (g and h).
- 969 **Figure 11.** Infragravity wave height $< H_{s,inf} >$ averaged over the inner surf zone ($0 < x/x_b <$
- 970 0.33) versus $H_o^2 T_p$ for measured (markers) and modelled (lines) data at LST and TAT, and
- 971 measured data from Perranporth Beach (PPT), UK, from Inch et al. (2017).
- 972
- 973

- **Table 1.** Summary statistics for the LST and TAT field experiments.
- **Table 2.** Offshore wave conditions during two example data bursts at LST and TAT.



- 981 Figure 1





983 Figure 2

985 Table 1

Parameters		LST	TAT
Deployment data	Duration (tides)	8	6
	# PTs	15	14
	PT spacing (m)	~15	~25
	PT <i>z</i> range (min, max)	-1.46, 3.14	-1.18, -0.22
	m ODN, m NZD		
	PT <i>x</i> range (m)	225	325
Platform morphology	Intertidal platform width	325	340
	(m)		
	Bedrock	Mudstone	Siltstone
	Average $\tan\beta$ between	0.021	0.0004
	PTs		
	Mean spring tide range,	10.7, -5	1.4
	mean low water spring		
	(m)		

986 Note: PT = pressure sensor, $\tan\beta$ = slope, ODN – ordnance datum Newlyn, NZVD = New

987 Zealand Vertical Datum.



991 Figure 3



994 Figure 4

٥	0	5
1	1	J

		$H_{o}(m)$	T _p (s)	$\boldsymbol{H_o^2 T_p} (\mathrm{m^2 s^{-1}})$
	LST	0.81	11.1	7.30
	TAT	0.90	10.7	8.59
996	Table 2			



1001 Figure 5

998



1003 Figure 6



1006 Figure 7



1010 Figure 8





1013 Figure 9



200

1.5 (g)

(E) ¹ ⁴NI's</sup> H 0.5

0 [.] 0

400

400

600

600

x (m)





Outgoing IG motion

800

- H_{IG,in} - H_{IG,out}

– H_{IG,tot}

800

1000













1019 Figure 11