AMERICAN
METEOROLOGICAL
SOCIETY

Journal of Physical Oceanography

EARLY ONLINE RELEASE

This is a preliminary PDF of the author-produced manuscript that has been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication. Since it is being posted so soon after acceptance, it has not yet been copyedited, formatted, or processed by AMS Publications. This preliminary version of the manuscript may be downloaded, distributed, and cited, but please be aware that there will be visual differences and possibly some content differences between this version and the final published version.

The DOI for this manuscript is doi: 10.1175/JPO-D-18-0020.1

The final published version of this manuscript will replace the preliminary version at the above DOI once it is available.

If you would like to cite this EOR in a separate work, please use the following full citation:


© 2018 American Meteorological Society
Horizontal Dispersion of Buoyant Materials in the Ocean Surface Boundary Layer

Jun-Hong Liang*, Xiaoliang Wan
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA, USA

Kenneth A. Rose
Horn Point Laboratory, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science, Cambridge, MD, USA

Peter P. Sullivan
National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, CO, USA

James C. McWilliams
University of California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

*Corresponding author address: Jun-Hong Liang, Department of Oceanography and Coastal Sciences, Center for Computation and Technology, & Coastal Studies Institute, Louisiana State University Baton Rouge, LA, 70803, USA.

E-mail: jliang@lsu.edu
Abstract

The horizontal dispersion of materials with a constant rising speed under the exclusive influence of ocean surface boundary layer (OSBL) flows is investigated using both three-dimensional turbulence-resolving Lagrangian particle trajectories and the classical theory of dispersion in bounded shear currents generalized for buoyant materials. Dispersion in the OSBL is caused by the vertical shear of mean horizontal currents and by the turbulent velocity fluctuations. It reaches a diffusive regime when the equilibrium vertical material distribution is established. Diffusivity from the classical shear dispersion theory agrees reasonably well with that diagnosed using three-dimensional particle trajectories. For weakly buoyant materials that can be mixed into the boundary layer, shear dispersion dominates turbulent dispersion. For strongly buoyant materials that stay at the ocean surface, shear dispersion is negligible compared to turbulent dispersion. The effective horizontal diffusivity due to shear dispersion is controlled by multiple factors including wind speed, wave conditions, vertical diffusivity, mixed layer depth, latitude, and buoyant rising speed. With all other meteorological and hydrographic conditions being equal, the effective horizontal diffusivity is larger in wind-driven Ekman flows than in wave-driven Ekman-Stokes flows for weakly buoyant materials, and is smaller in Ekman flows than in Ekman-Stokes flows for strongly buoyant materials. The effective horizontal diffusivity is further reduced when enhanced mixing by breaking waves is included. Dispersion by OSBL flows is weaker than that by submesoscale currents at a scale larger than 100 m. The analytic framework will improve subgrid scale model in realistic particle trajectory models using currents from operational ocean models.
1. Introduction

The transport and dispersion of dissolved and particulate materials in the ocean, such as salts, gases, marine organisms, and various marine pollutants, determine the pathways and the concentration of those materials, respectively. Some particulate materials, such as spilled oil, marine debris and some marine organisms are positively buoyant and are confined in the ocean surface boundary layer. Understanding the transport and dispersion of oceanic buoyant materials is therefore important to marine environment, ocean ecology and the earth’s climate.

Material transport and dispersion are more commonly and naturally understood in a Lagrangian reference frame than in an Eulerian reference frame. Material transport can easily be quantified using an ensemble of trajectories from a large number of individual particles, while material dispersion and mixing are usually understood using the ensemble of particle pair displacements. Assume the separation of any two particles with trajectories $X_1$ and $X_2$ initially separate by $D_0$ is $D(t, D_0) = D_0 + X_1 - X_2$, the relative dispersion of two particles initial separated by $D_0$ is defined by [e.g., Özgökmen et al. 2012; Romero et al. 2013; Poje et al. 2014; Kamenkovich et al. 2015],

$$D^2(t, D_0) = \langle D(t, D_0) \cdot D(t, D_0) \rangle$$

(1)

For anisotropic flows, the relative dispersion is often defined in two dimensions $(i,j)$ as a tensor $D^2_{ij}(t, D_0) = \langle D_i(t, D_0)D_j(t, D_0) \rangle$ whose trace is the total relative dispersion $D^2(t, D_0) = D^2_{11} + D^2_{22}$. The relative diffusivity tensor is defined as,

$$\kappa_{ij}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{dD^2_{ij}(t, D_0)}{dt}$$

(2)
It is obvious from Equation (2) that $\kappa$ is a constant when $D^2$ grows linearly with time and is otherwise a time dependent variable. Because of its importance in a range of environmental and geophysical problems in both the atmosphere and the ocean, material dispersion has been studied extensively using theoretical techniques, laboratory measurements, in-situ observations, and computer simulations, after the seminal work by Richardson [1926]. It is now understood that dispersion in natural environment is primarily caused by turbulent flows and by sheared mean currents. When the kinetic energy spectrum is steep with a slope smaller than or equal to -3, such as in the enstrophy cascade regime, dispersion is nonlocal due to strong turbulent strain fields and $D^2$ grows exponentially with time [Bennett 1984]. Within the inertial subrange with the famous -5/3 slope in the kinetic energy spectrum, $D^2$ grows with $t^3$ and is in the Richardson regime [Batchelor 1950]. When particles are close so that their relative velocity is constant, $D^2$ is proportional to $t^2$ and is in the ballistic regime. When particles are far from each other so that the respective velocities of different particles are uncorrelated, dispersion is caused purely by random walk. $D^2$ grows with $t$ and is in the diffusive regime [e.g., Davidson 2004]. For particles in transversely sheared mean current, $D^2$ grows as $t^3$ when particles can extend in an infinite domain [e.g., Bennett 1987; LaCasce 2008]. When particles are confined in a transversely sheared mean current, such as in a pipe or in an open channel, $D^2$ grows with $t$ [e.g., Taylor 1953; Fischer et al. 1979].

The theoretical principles have been used to understand and explain dispersion data from Lagrangian observing platforms in the ocean, such as drifters and floats [e.g., Davis 1991; Lumpkin et al. 2017], and from Lagrangian particle trajectories in realistic ocean model solutions. These studies cover the Atlantic ocean [e.g., Lumpkin and Elipot 2010], the Pacific ocean [e.g., Kirwan et al. 1978], and a number of marginal seas such as the Gulf of Mexico [e.g.,
LaCasce and Ohlmann 2003], the Adriatic sea [Haza et al. 2008]; the Gulf of La Spezia [e.g.,
Haza et al. 2010], the Nordic sea [Koszalka et al. 2009], and the Liguro-Provençal basin
[Schroeder et al. 2011]. Those studies identify three distinct regimes for the evolution of particle
dispersion: when particle pair separation is below the deformation radius, viz. the enstrophy
injection scale, typically a few tens to a hundred kilometer depending on latitudes [Chelton et al.
1998], dispersion is nonlocal and $D^2$ grows exponentially with time. When particle separation is
larger than the deformation radius and smaller than a few hundred kilometers, $D^2$ is in the
Richardson regime and grows with $r^3$. When particle separation is larger than a few hundred
kilometers, particle motions are uncorrelated and $D^2$ grows linearly with time.

Horizontal particle dispersion at scales smaller than about 10 km were not studied until recently,
partly because the physical processes at these scales, i.e., submesoscale and turbulent flows, were
not well elucidated. Recent studies [e.g., Ohlmann et al. 2012; Romero et al. 2012; Poje et al.
2014; Beron-Vera and LaCasce 2016; D’Asaro et al. 2018] show that submesoscale motions are
important in dispersion, although these studies still differ in whether the dispersion is local in the
Richardson regime or is nonlocal with exponential growth in time.

A critical process missing in the abovementioned studies is three-dimensional small-scale
boundary layer currents. While the effect of boundary layer turbulence is inherent to many
dissolved and particulate oceanic substances, drifters and floats used for dispersion study are
usually advected by two-dimensional horizontal velocities at a fixed density surface or close to
the air-sea interface. In numerical studies, existing studies of particle dispersion rely on particles
advected by velocity fields from regional ocean models that do not resolve boundary layer
turbulence and have a horizontal resolution of hundreds of meters to a few kilometers. Smaller-
scale motions are represented by horizontally homogeneous and isotropic random motions. To
the best knowledge of the authors, there are only a few papers studying the effect of small scale oceanic processes on dispersion. Wang et al. [2018] examined the effect of internal wave on horizontal dispersion and found that $D^2$ grows with $t^{1.5}$. While studying the transport and dispersion by convective turbulence, Mensa et al. [2015] noted that a weak wind forcing can greatly enhance dispersion in convective turbulence. However, surface ocean boundary layer currents is dominated by winds and waves over much of the global ocean [e.g., Belcher et al. 2012; D’Asaro et al. 2014], and no existing study has focused on the effect of wind- and wave-driven boundary layer current on horizontal material dispersion. One of the possible reasons is that boundary layer current is usually studied with large eddy simulation models that are configured on a computation domain of 100s of meters in horizontal directions [e.g., Skyllingstad and Denbo 1995; Tejada-Martinez and Grosch 2007] and therefore cannot be used to study material evolution over sufficiently large areas.

The purposes of this study are (1) to derive the analytic depth-averaged effective horizontal diffusivity for materials with a constant buoyant rising speed under the exclusive influence of ocean surface boundary layer flows; (2) to determine the respective importance of shear dispersion and turbulent dispersion in the ocean surface boundary layer; and (3) to study the effect of meteorological, geographic, and water-column conditions on horizontal dispersion of oceanic buoyant materials. The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents a computational model and an analytic model for horizontal dispersion of buoyant materials with the detailed derivation of the analytic model in the appendix; section 3 presents results from both models and compares the two models; and section 4 is a summary and discussion.

2. Model Description
The study is based on two models: a large eddy simulation model with Lagrangian particles that generates particle trajectories in ocean surface boundary layer turbulence and an analytic model of effective diffusivity for depth-averaged material concentration based on shear dispersion theory.

### 2.1 Large Eddy Simulation Model with Lagrangian Particles

#### 2.1.1 Model Description

The modeling framework is based on the National Center for Atmospheric Research – Large Eddy Simulation (NCAR-LES) model for the simulation of ocean surface boundary layer. The model equations [e.g., Craik and Leibovich, 1976; McWilliams et al. 1997; Suzuki and Fox-Kemper, 2016] and the numerical techniques [e.g., Sullivan et al. 1996 and Sullivan and Patton 2011] are documented in previous publications and are not repeated here. The model has been used to study boundary layer turbulence driven by different surface meteorological and lateral large-scale flow forcings [e.g., Sullivan and McWilliams, 2010; Sullivan et al., 2012; Hamlington et al., 2014; Sullivan and McWilliams, 2017] and to study the evolution of different tracers [e.g., Liang et al. 2011, 2012 and 2013; Brunner et al. 2015; Kukulka and Brunner 2015; Smith et al. 2016], and produces solutions that agree well with observations [e.g., Kukulka et al. 2009; Liang et al. 2017].

The location of buoyant Lagrangian particles is calculated by solving a set of ordinary differential equations for the trajectory of each individual particle,

\[ dx = (u_r + u_{st} + w_b k)dt + dx_s \]  

where \( x \) is the Lagrangian trajectory, \( u_r \) is the resolved velocity interpolated from the LES solutions of resolved velocity, \( u_{st} \) is the wave-phase-averaged Stokes drift, \( w_b \) is the buoyant rising speed, \( k \) is the unit vector in the vertical direction, and \( dx_s \) is the displacement due to sub-grid motions. In the current study, the sub-grid scale displacement \( dx_s \) is calculated following the random
displacement model (RDM) by Wilson [2015] that has been shown to be consistent with the Eulerian diffusion equation for material concentrations,

\[ dx_{s,i} = \frac{\partial k_{s,i}}{\partial x_i} dt + \left(2k_{s,i}\right)^{1/2} d\xi_i \]  

(4)

where \( k_{s,i} \) is the sub-grid scale tracer diffusivity from the LES model; \( d\xi_i \) is a Gaussian white noise with variance \( dt \); and subscript \( i \) indicates spatial dimension. The contribution from sub-grid-scale motion is negligible except close to the surface where turbulence is poorly resolved. The Lagrangian model embedded in the parallelized framework of the NCAR-LES model has been successfully applied to simulate the evolution of gas bubbles in the upper ocean using 8 million Lagrangian particles [Liang et al. 2017]. Previously, Lagrangian particle models have also been used with large eddy simulation to study dispersion in the atmosphere [e.g., Weil et al. 2004], and boundary layer turbulence [Harcourt and D’Asaro, 2010] and vertical mixing in the ocean [Kukulka et al. 2012a].

2.1.2 Lateral boundary conditions for Lagrangian particles

In most turbulence-resolving simulations of geophysical turbulence, domain periodicity has to be assumed in both horizontal dimensions. Since turbulence requires time and distance to develop, domain periodicity allows the computation of turbulence at relatively low computational cost and permits the study of turbulence evolution over a relatively long time period. While the computational domain has a finite size, the doubly periodic boundary implies an infinitely large horizontal domain and horizontal homogeneity at the scale of the computational domain for both the flow and tracers. Numerically, periodic boundary conditions facilitate the use of spectral methods that are more accurate than finite volume or finite different methods. While turbulence-resolving simulations in a doubly periodic domain have achieved considerable in geophysical...
turbulence, particularly in the study of vertical processes in boundary layers, the finite-size domain, usually hundreds of meters in the ocean to a few kilometers in the atmosphere, is a major obstacle to the study of material dispersion in the ocean that usually requires a large domain and a long integration.

In order to circumvent the finite-size domain limitation, Matheou and Bowman [2016] developed a recycling method for tracer dispersion modeling in atmospheric boundary layer. The method was later generalized to simulate tracer evolution in oceanic boundary layer by Chen et al. [2016]. In this method, the periodic boundary conditions are retained for turbulence computation. Tracers are allowed to evolve out of the finite domain and are advected by periodic (recycling) turbulence fields. While the method does not require a large computation domain for turbulence, the computation domain for tracer is determined by the spatial extents the simulated material occupies. In this study, the recycling method is applied to Lagrangian particles. Compared to the two previous studies, the application of recycling method in Lagrangian particles does not require additional computing time when particles spread, therefore, offers a more powerful approach to studying material dispersion.

2.1.3 Model Configuration

The model is configured in a domain of 300 m × 1200 m × 150 m with 160 × 640 × 96 grid points. Wind speed at 10 m height ($U_{10}$) is set to 10 m/s in the positive $x$ direction for the two primary experiments. Additional experiments with $U_{10} = 5$ and 15 m/s will also be presented for comparison. The mixed layer is initially 30 m deep. Two simulations, with and without non-breaking surface gravity wave (Stokes drift) forcing, are performed. The Stokes drift due to surface gravity waves is calculated as [e.g., Sullivan et al. 2007; Harcourt and D’Asaro 2008] $\mathbf{u}_{st}(z) =$
\[ 2 \int_0^\pi \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} k \omega F(\omega, \theta) e^{2|kz|} d\omega d\theta, \]

where \( F(\omega, \theta) \) is the equilibrium wave directional spectrum proposed by Donelan et al. [1985] and later modified by Alves et al. [2003]. For each set of forcing conditions, a spin-up simulation without Lagrangian particles was first carried out for more than 1 day, followed by a run with Lagrangian particles for about 10 days. In each simulation, there are eight groups of Lagrangian particles, each group with different buoyancy rising speeds, i.e., [1 2 4 8 10 20 40 80] mm/s.

### 2.2 Analytic Model for Horizontal Effective Diffusivity by Sheared Boundary Layer Currents

We seek an analytic expression for asymptotic effective horizontal diffusivities in the ocean surface boundary layer flows. The study of one-dimensional horizontal dispersion by shear current originates from Taylor [1953] who first derived an analytic solution for dispersion in a pipe. The analysis was extended to dispersion for atmospheric boundary layer flows [Saffman 1962], for open-channel flows [e.g., Fischer et al. 1979], and for a variety of steady and unsteady oceanic currents [e.g., Young et al. 1982; Young and Jones 1991]. The effective horizontal dispersion coefficient for depth-averaged material concentration in vertically bounded flows with two horizontal dimensions can be written as [Esler and Ramli 2017],

\[ K_{eff} = \left( \frac{\langle G_1^2/k_v \rangle + \langle k_H \rangle}{\langle G_1 G_2/k_v \rangle} \langle G_1 G_2/k_v \rangle \frac{\langle G_2^2/k_v \rangle + \langle k_H \rangle}{\langle G_2^2/k_v \rangle} \right) \quad (5) \]

where \( G_i = \int_{-h}^0 \{ u_i(z') - \langle u_i \rangle \} dz' \), the angle bracket is the depth average defined as \( \langle g \rangle = \frac{1}{h} \int_{-h}^0 g dz \), and \( k_v \) and \( k_H \) are the vertical and horizontal diffusivity, respectively, which may include the effects from both molecular Brownian motions and turbulent fluctuation in the respective directions. Here, depth-averaged material concentration is advected by current...
and is dispersed following the effective diffusivity $K_{\text{eff}}$. In equation (5), dispersion due to shear and that due to turbulent fluctuation are in the first and the second terms of the diagonal elements, respectively. According to equation (5), strong vertical shear of horizontal velocity and small effective vertical diffusivity are favorable conditions for strong shear dispersion. While equation (5) can be applied to neutrally buoyant materials in the ocean surface boundary layer, we here generalize the theory for oceanic materials with constant buoyant rising speeds.

2.2.1 Effective Horizontal Diffusivity for Buoyant Particles

Using the assumption for a random displacement model [e.g., Rodean 1996], the governing equation for the probability density function of particle concentration ($p(x, t)$) at location $x$ and time $t$ is given by the Fokker-Planck equation in two horizontal dimensions [Rodean 1996; Esler and Ramli 2017],

$$\frac{\partial p}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial p}{\partial y} + w_b \frac{\partial p}{\partial z} = \nabla_h \cdot \left( \begin{pmatrix} k_{xx}^{\text{tur}} & k_{xy}^{\text{tur}} \\ k_{xy}^{\text{tur}} & k_{yy}^{\text{tur}} \end{pmatrix} \right) \nabla_h p + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( k_v \frac{\partial p}{\partial z} \right)$$

(6)

where $\nabla_h = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} i + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} j$. Here, the primary difference from Esler and Ramli [2017] is the addition of the fourth term on the left hand side of the equation representing the buoyant rising effect. Horizontal turbulent diffusivity ($k_{\text{H}}$) in Esler and Ramli [2017] is also generalized to $k_{xx}^{\text{tur}} k_{xy}^{\text{tur}}$ and $k_{yy}^{\text{tur}}$, because horizontal velocity fluctuation in ocean boundary layer turbulence is anisotropic. The effective horizontal diffusivity for depth-averaged material concentration based on Equation (6) can be derived using multiscale expansions and the method of moments [e.g., Saffman 1962] as (see Appendix A),

$$K_{\text{eff}} = \begin{pmatrix} -\langle (u - \bar{u}) M \rangle + \langle k_{xx}^{\text{tur}} F \rangle & -\langle (u - \bar{u}) N \rangle + \langle k_{xy}^{\text{tur}} F \rangle \\ -\langle (v - \bar{v}) M \rangle + \langle k_{xy}^{\text{tur}} F \rangle & -\langle (v - \bar{v}) N \rangle + \langle k_{yy}^{\text{tur}} F \rangle \end{pmatrix}$$

(7)
where the angle bracket is the depth average. In each component of $K_{eff}$, the two terms represent
the effect of shear dispersion and turbulent dispersion, respectively. $F$, $M$, and $N$ are depth-
dependent shape functions for mean concentration, and the perturbation concentrations in $x$ and $y$
directions,

$$F(z) = C \exp \left( w_b \int_{-h}^{z} \frac{ds}{k_v(s)} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (8a)

$$M(z) = F(z) \int_{-h}^{z} \frac{\psi_u(s)}{F(s) k_v(s)} ds$$  \hspace{1cm} (8b)

$$N(z) = F(z) \int_{-h}^{z} \frac{\psi_v(s)}{F(s) k_v(s)} ds$$  \hspace{1cm} (8c)

where $C$ is a constant to ensure $\langle F \rangle = 1$, $\psi_u(s) = \int_{-h}^{z} (u(s) - \bar{u}) F(s) ds$, and $\psi_v(s) = \int_{-h}^{z} (v(s) - \bar{v}) F(s) ds$. Overbar in the above equations indicate averages weighted by $F$,

$$\bar{u} = \langle uF \rangle$$  \hspace{1cm} (9a)

$$\bar{v} = \langle vF \rangle$$  \hspace{1cm} (9b)

The mathematical derivation of (7) and (8) is presented in Appendix A. For neutrally buoyant
tracers ($w_b = 0$), $F$ is a constant with depth, and equations (7) to (8) reduce to equation (5) (see
Appendix A). Equations (7) to (9) are valid when $\langle F \rangle = 1$. $\langle F \rangle$ can equal to any positive value
when the expression for $K_{eff}$ is more generally written as equation (A10).

Equations (7) to (9) form a theoretical framework to describe the evolution of buoyant materials
under the exclusive influence of boundary layer currents. According to the framework, a patch of
buoyant materials with a constant buoyant rising speed $w_b$ move at velocities $(\bar{u}, \bar{v})$ determined
by equation (9), and spread at a rate ($K_{eff}$) calculated with equations (7) and (8). The depth-
averaged effective horizontal diffusivity (equation (7)) and velocity (equation (9) are only
accurate after the vertical profile of material concentration follows the equilibrated profile \( F(z) \) (equation 8(a)). The time-scale for the establishment of \( F(z) \) can be estimated as \( L_v^2/k_v \) where \( L_v \) is the smaller of the boundary layer depth and \( k_v/w_b \). When \( k_v/w_b \) is smaller than the boundary layer depth \( (h_{bl}) \), the time scale is proportional to \( k_v/w_b^2 \) and decreases with increasing \( w_b \).

When \( k_v/w_b \) is larger than or equal to \( h_{bl} \), the time-scale for the establishment of \( F(z) \) is independent of \( w_b \). Assume \( h_{bl} = 30 \) m, and \( k_v \sim 0.1 \) m\(^2\)/s, the time scale is 9000 s when \( k_v/w_b \geq h_{bl} \), and is smaller than 9000 s when \( k_v/w_b < h_{bl} \).

### 2.2.2 Diagnosis of Shear-induced Effective Diffusivity Using a One-dimensional Ocean Model

In this study, we use equation (7) to assess the effect of meteorological, geographic, and water-column conditions on horizontal dispersion of buoyant materials due to the vertical shear of boundary layer currents. When considered only the effective horizontal diffusivity due to the vertical shear of horizontal boundary layer current, equation (7) reduces to

\[
K_{eff} = \begin{pmatrix}
-\langle (u - \bar{u})M \rangle & -\langle (u - \bar{u})N \rangle \\
-\langle (v - \bar{v})M \rangle & -\langle (v - \bar{v})N \rangle
\end{pmatrix}
\]  

\[
(10)
\]

The remaining unknowns in equation 10 are mean horizontal velocities \( (u \) and \( v) \). In this study, we will present results using mean horizontal boundary layer currents from the LES model described in section 2.1 and from a one-dimensional (1-D) model with parameterized turbulent mixing effect. In a 1-D model, horizontal velocities in the ocean surface boundary layer are calculated as,

\[
f k \times (u + u_{st}) = \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial \tau}{\partial z}
\]

\[
\tau = \rho k_v \frac{\partial u}{\partial z}
\]

\[
(11)
\]

\[
(12)
\]
Here, \( f \) is the Coriolis parameter [e.g., Cushman-Roisin and Beckers, 2011]. When wave effect is not considered, \( u_{st} = 0 \) and vertical diffusivity \( (k_v) \) is calculated by the K-Profile Parameterization (KPP) [e.g., Large et al. 1994],

\[
k_v = c_1 u_* h_{bl} G(\sigma)
\]

(13)

where \( c_1 = 0.4 \) is the von Karman constant; \( u_* \) is the ocean-side friction velocity; \( h_{bl} \) is the boundary layer depth that is chosen to be the smaller of the Ekman depth \( (h_{ek} = 0.7u_*/f) \) and the mixed layer depth; and \( G(\sigma) = \sigma(1 - \sigma)^2 \) is the shape function with \( \sigma = -z/h_{bl} \).

According to equation (13), vertical diffusivity is controlled by friction velocity and boundary layer depth.

When wave effect is considered, \( u_{st} \neq 0 \) and \( k_v \) is calculated as [McWilliams and Sullivan 2000; McWilliams and Huckle 2006],

\[
k_v = c_1 \varepsilon(L_{at}) u_* h_{bl} (G(\sigma) + G_{brk}(\sigma))
\]

(14)

\( \varepsilon(L_{at}) = (1 + 0.08/(1 + L_{at}^4))^{1/2} \) is an enhancement factor proposed by McWilliams and Sullivan (2000) to account for the effect of Langmuir turbulence with \( L_{at} = \sqrt{u_*/u_{st}(0)} \), which is the turbulent Langmuir number [McWilliams et al. 1997]; \( G_{brk}(\sigma) = H(\sigma_0 - \sigma) \frac{(\sigma_0 - \sigma)^2}{2\sigma_0^2} \) is a shape function proposed by McWilliams and Huckle [2006] to account for enhanced mixing near the ocean surface due to breaking wave, with \( \sigma_0 = 0.05 \) and \( H \) the Heaviside step function.

Equation (14) reduces to equation (13) when \( G_{brk}(\sigma) = 0 \) and \( L_{at} = \infty \). Six experiments are carried out to explore the effect of buoyant rising speed, wind, wave, stratification, and vertical diffusivity on effective horizontal diffusivity and the parameters of the experiments are listed in Table 1.
Equations (8) to (11) are discretized in the vertical direction \( z \) into a set of linear equations. Horizontal velocities from equation (11) are plugged into equations (8) and (9). Numerical solutions for \( F, M, \) and \( N \) can be obtained efficiently using either interactive commercial software such as MATLAB or the Linear Algebra PACKage (LAPACK) available in both FORTRAN and C++.

3 Results

3.1 Large Eddy Simulation of Lagrangian Particles with a Constant Rising Speed

3.1.1 Phenomenology

Upper ocean turbulent flows have been extensively studied in the past few decades using observational and numerical techniques [e.g., Plueddemann et al. 1996, Smith 1998, Sullivan and McWilliams 2010; D’Asaro 2014 and the references therein]. Here, we show only profiles of mean current and turbulent velocity variance (Fig. 1) to facilitate the discussion of horizontal material dispersion. In both simulations (Ekman turbulence and Langmuir turbulence), the surface current is to the right of the wind. The horizontal current rotates clockwise and weakens with increasing water depth (Figs. 1(a) and 1(b)). The vertical shear of downwind current is weaker in the upper few meters in Ekman turbulence than in Langmuir turbulence, primarily due to the fast decay of the wave-phase-averaged Stokes drift in the upper few meters when the wave effect is included. In the rest of the boundary layer, vertical shear of both downwind and crosswind currents is stronger in Ekman turbulence than in Langmuir turbulence, since vertical mixing by locally shear-driven turbulence is weaker than by wave-driven non-local Langmuir cells. Horizontal velocity variances are also distinctly different between Ekman turbulence and Langmuir turbulence, consistent with previous studies [e.g., Li et al. 2005]. Downwind velocity
variance is larger than crosswind velocity variance in Ekman turbulence (Fig. 1(c)). In Langmuir turbulence, crosswind velocity variance dominates downwind velocity variance in much of the boundary layer because of the counter-rotating downwind coherent vortices (Fig. 1(d)). Vertical velocity variance is larger in Langmuir turbulence than in Ekman turbulence. The mean material concentration decreases with depth due to buoyant rising and the material penetration decreases with increasing buoyant rising speed (Figs. 1(e) and 1(f)). For material of the same buoyant rising speed, its concentration decays faster in Ekman turbulence than in Langmuir turbulence.

The horizontal locations of particles three days after they are released at a region of $300\times300m$ centered at the origin in an Ekman boundary layer are shown in Fig. 2. Particles of different buoyant rising speeds are depicted in different colors. Lagrangian particles are able to travel for tens of kilometers in horizontal directions, much larger than the size of a computational domain without incurring additional computational resources. This demonstrates the capability of the model to study horizontal upper ocean dispersion. Particles of all buoyant rising speeds are advected in both the downwind and crosswind to the right of the wind. Both the downwind and crosswind movement are faster for particles of larger buoyant rising speed. This is because particles with stronger preferred upward motion spend more time in the upper portion of the boundary layer where both downwind and crosswind velocity is stronger. The dependence of particle transport is consistent with previous large eddy simulation studies with Eulerian concentration model [e.g., Yang et al. 2015].

Horizontal particle dispersion in the Ekman boundary layer is strongly anisotropic for all buoyant rising speeds. However, the anisotropy decreases when $w_b > 4 \text{ mm/s}$. The major axis of dispersion is about $30^\circ$ to the right of the wind, and rotates towards the downwind direction. For the four selected buoyant rising speeds, dispersion decreases with increasing $w_b$. The dispersion
is uniform horizontally for weakly buoyant particles (the left inset of Fig. 2). When $w_b$ increases, the effect of convergence and divergence by the two-dimensional horizontal turbulent currents becomes evident (the middle and right insets of Fig. 2) and particles aggregate into patches and streaks, though the streaks and patches are not as evident as in Langmuir turbulence. This is consistent with Sundermeyer et al. [2014] that shows surface material is aligned in streaks without significant wave forcing.

In a wave-driven Langmuir boundary layer, particles also move along and to the right of the wind (Fig. 3). Displacement in both the downwind and the cross-wind directions is smaller than in Ekman currents when for weakly buoyant particles ($w_b < 40$ mm/s) that can be mixed into the boundary layer. The mean horizontal current is weaker in wave-driven boundary layer except close to the surface when Stokes drift dominates (Fig. 1(a) and 1(b)). Strongly buoyant particles ($w_b \geq 40$ mm/s) move farther in the downwind direction than in an Ekman boundary layer because they stay at the surface and are advected primarily by the Stokes drift.

The dispersion of particles with similar buoyant rising speeds in a Langmuir boundary layer is visually less anisotropic than in an Ekman boundary layer. For strongly buoyant particles ($w_b = 40$ mm/s), dispersion along the major axis is close to that along the minor axis. The difference in spreading rate among particles of different buoyant rising speeds is not visually evident in the instantaneous snapshots and will be quantified in the next subsection. The major axis of dispersion is also about $30^\circ$ to the right of the wind and rotates counter-clockwise towards the direction of the wind. Three dispersion patterns, the diluted plume, the blurred plume and the fingered plume have been identified by Yang et al. [2014] who also developed a regime diagram matching the drift-to-buoyancy parameter ($D_b = u_{st}/w_b$) with the dispersion patterns. The three patterns are shown in the insets of Fig. 3 with parameter $D_b$ equal to 215.6, 21.6 and 5.4,
respectively. The relation between parameter $D_b$ and the dispersion pattern is in agreement with
the study by Yang et al. [2014]. Weakly buoyant particles ($w_b = 5$ mm/s $D_b = 215.6$) are
primarily under the influence of three-dimensional boundary layer currents and they evenly
disperse horizontally (the left insect of Fig. 3). Moderately buoyant particles ($w_b = 10$ mm/s $D_b =
21.6$) are partially influenced by two-dimensional horizontal boundary layer currents (the middle
insect of Fig. 3), displaying a blurred pattern. Strongly buoyant particles ($w_b = 40$ mm/s $D_b = 5.4$)
are aggregated in the convergence streaks of two-dimensional horizontal currents (the right inset
of Fig. 3). The streaks are stronger and horizontally more separated in the cross-wind direction in
a Langmuir boundary layer than those in an Ekman boundary layer.

3.1.2 Horizontal Relative Dispersion and Diffusivity

To quantify the dispersion, the time evolution of particle pair relative displacement and the
asymptotic horizontal diffusivity are studied (Figs. 4 and 5). Particle pairs are tracked if their
initial separation is less than 1 meter. Figure 4(a) plots the time evolution of relative
displacement square $D^2$ in major and minor axes, respectively, for 80,000 particle pairs in an
Ekman boundary layer. Relative dispersion ($D^2$) undergoes an initial exponential growth regime
for the first tens of seconds. After approximately 100 seconds, $D^2$ grows with $t^2$, implying a
ballistic dispersion regime. For weakly buoyant particles ($w_b \leq 4$ mm/s), $D^2$ grows with $t^{1.0}$ after
about $10^4$ seconds. For particles of larger buoyant rising speeds ($w_b = 10$ and 40 mm/s), the
diffusive dispersion regime starts earlier, at around 3000 seconds. An examination of the vertical
profile time series shows that the asymptotic diffusive regime is reached when the vertical
material profile is equilibrated.

To study the relative importance of the mean horizontal current and the turbulent velocity
fluctuation, the displacement due to horizontally averaged velocity and turbulent velocity are
respectively calculated. For the weakly buoyant particles ($w_b \leq 4$ mm/s), $D^2$ (dominated by $D^2_{\text{major}}$) under the sole influence of horizontal currents grows approximately with $t^2$ between $10^2$ seconds to about $10^4$ seconds after the initial exponential growth. During this period, particles are not bounded by the mixed layer and the ballistic dispersion regime is due to unbounded shear dispersion. When the equilibrium vertical distribution is reached ($t > 10^4$ seconds), $D^2$ growth is diffusive, consistent with the theory of bounded shear dispersion. The transition to the diffusive regime is earlier for particles with larger buoyant speed. This is qualitatively consistent with the discussion in section 2.2.2 that the theoretical time scale required to establish an equilibrated vertical profile decreases with increasing buoyant rising speed. Relative dispersion ($D^2$) due to the vertical shear of mean currents changes significantly with $w_b$ and spans a few orders of magnitude (Fig. 4(b)). Similar to the time evolution of $D^2$ due to mean current, $D^2$ due to horizontal turbulent velocity also undergoes an initial exponential growth and then a ballistic growth before reaching the asymptotic diffusive regime in which turbulent velocity for different particles is uncorrelated (Fig. 4(c)).

In the diffusive regime, the absolute diffusivity (Fig. 4(d)) is half of the relative diffusivity given by Equation (2) [e.g., LaCasce 2008]. The diffusivity in major ($K_{\text{major}}$) and minor ($K_{\text{minor}}$) directions, and the direction of the major axis of dispersion ($\theta$) can be calculated as [e.g., Oh et al. 2000],

\[
K_{\text{major}} = K_{xx}cos^2(\theta) + K_{yy}sin^2(\theta) + K_{xy}sin(2\theta) \tag{14a}
\]

\[
K_{\text{minor}} = K_{xx}sin^2(\theta) + K_{yy}cos^2(\theta) - K_{xy}sin(2\theta) \tag{14b}
\]

\[
tan2\theta = \frac{2K_{xy}}{K_{xx} - K_{yy}} \tag{14c}
\]
The diffusivity in the major axis ($K_{\text{major}}$) is about 6.2 m$^2$/s and is more than 15$u^*h_{bl}$ at $w_b = 2$ mm/s. It is the largest among all $w_b$ considered (solid black line in Fig. 4(d)). The diffusivity in the minor axis ($K_{\text{minor}}$) is about one order of magnitude smaller than $K_{\text{major}}$. The ratio between $K_{\text{major}}$ and $K_{\text{minor}}$ is 68 when $w_b = 4$ mm/s, the largest among the selected $w_b$, and is around 12 at $w_b = 40$ mm/s. The direction between the major axis of dispersion and wind ($\theta_{\text{major}}$) is approximately 26.5º for $w_b = 1$ mm/s and decreases to about 5º for large $w_b$ ($\geq$ 10 mm/s) (Fig. 4(e) black line). The diffusivity calculated with equation (10) using mean currents and diagnosed vertical diffusivity from the LES-particle simulation (green lines in Figs. 4(d) and 4(e)) agrees reasonably well with those calculated with the particle statistics from the LES simulations (red lines in Figs. 4(d) and 4(e)), showing the ability of reduced physics model in accurately predicting horizontal dispersion due to vertical shear of boundary layer currents. The variability of both $K_{\text{major}}$, $K_{\text{major}}$ and $\theta_{\text{major}}$ with $w_b$ due to turbulent horizontal velocity is relatively small compared to the variability due to mean current shear. The angle between $K_{\text{major}}$ and $U_{10}$ ($\theta_{\text{major}}$) is small (~ 5º to the right of the wind). When $w_b$ is smaller than about 10 mm/s, $K_{\text{major}}$ by mean current is larger than that by turbulent horizontal velocity. For strongly buoyant particles, $K_{\text{major}}$ and $\theta_{\text{major}}$ are dominated by horizontal turbulent velocity.

Figures 5(a) to 5(c) plot the time evolution of relative dispersion for 80,000 particle pairs in a Langmuir boundary layer. Similar to in an Ekman boundary layer, dispersion in a Langmuir boundary layer reaches the asymptotic diffusive regime at around $10^3$ to $10^4$ seconds. Before the diffusive regime, relative dispersion undergoes an exponential growth stage and a power law growth stage with a power close to 2.

The asymptotic absolute diffusivity $K_{\text{major}}$ increases with $w_b$ and reaches its maximum of 2.2 m$^2$/s (or about $6u^*h_{bl}$) when $w_b = 20$ mm/s. Both the absolute and the normalized maximum
horizontal diffusivity is smaller in a Langmuir boundary layer than in an Ekman boundary layer. Dispersion is less anisotropic in a Langmuir boundary layer than in an Ekman boundary layer. The largest $K_{major}/K_{minor}$ is less than 15 when $w_b = 20$ mm/s (Fig. 7(d)). When $w_b = 40$ mm/s, $K_{major}/K_{minor}$ is less than 1.5. The ratio increases toward $w_b = 80$ mm/s. The angle between $K_{major}$ and $u_{10}$ also is to the right of the wind when $w_b \leq 20$ mm/s and is to the left when $w_b > 20$ mm/s. When $w_b = 80$ mm/s, $\theta_{major}$ is about 80º to the left of the wind (Fig. 7(e)). Similar to the total relative dispersion, the relatively dispersion due to mean horizontal current also reach the asymptotic diffusive regime after $10^3$ to $10^4$ seconds. The total dispersion and diffusivity are dominated by the shear-induced diffusivity when $w_b \leq 20$ mm/s. When $w_b = 40$ mm/s, the contribution from the shear of mean current and that from turbulent velocity fluctuation are comparable. Particles with $w_b = 80$ mm/s cannot be mixed into the boundary layer and dispersion is dominated by turbulent velocity fluctuation.

While equation (10) reasonably predicts the effective horizontal diffusivity due to the vertical shear of mean boundary layer currents, the relation between diffusivity due to turbulent fluctuating velocity and the effective diffusivity due to turbulence is still un-decided. Therefore, four additional experiments were carried out using the LES-particle model driven by wind ($U_{10}$) of 5 and 15 m/s, with and without Stokes drift forcing. Other initial and boundary layer conditions are the same as the two experiments with $U_{10} = 10$ m/s. Similar to when $U_{10} = 10$ m/s, the effective diffusivity due to horizontal turbulent velocities ($K^{tur}$) is small compared to diffusivity due to shear (not shown). In an Ekman boundary layers, $k^{tur}$ is scaled by $u_*L_0$ with $u_*$ the atmospheric friction velocity and $L_0$ the unit length. When $w_b$ is large ($w_b > 20$ mm/s) and shear dispersion is negligible, the mean of $K^{tur}_{major}$, $K^{tur}_{minor}$ and $\theta^{tur}_{major}$ are (Figs. 6(a) and 6(b)).
\[ K_{\text{major}}^{\text{tur}} = 26.5 u_* L_0 \] (15a)

\[ K_{\text{minor}}^{\text{tur}} = 1.9 u_* L_0 \] (15b)

\[ \theta_{\text{major}}^{\text{tur}} = -4.1^\circ \] (15c)

In a Langmuir boundary layer, the effective diffusivity due to horizontal turbulent velocities \( (K^{\text{tur}}) \) is scaled by \( \sqrt{u_*^2 u_{st}(z = 0)} L_0 \). When \( w_b > 20 \text{ mm/s} \), the mean of \( K_{\text{major}}^{\text{tur}} \), \( K_{\text{minor}}^{\text{tur}} \) and \( \theta_{\text{major}}^{\text{tur}} \) are (Figs. 6(c) and 6(d)),

\[ K_{\text{major}}^{\text{tur}} = 15.6[u_*^2 u_{st}(z = 0)]^{1/3} L_0 \] (16a)

\[ K_{\text{minor}}^{\text{tur}} = 1.9[u_*^2 u_{st}(z = 0)]^{1/3} L_0 \] (16b)

\[ \theta_{\text{major}}^{\text{tur}} = 81.7^\circ \] (16c)

When the wind direction is given, equations (15) and (16) can be used together with equation (14) to estimate the effective diffusivity tensor due to turbulent velocity fluctuation.

### 3.2 Horizontal Effective Diffusivity from a 1-D Column Model

In this section, we use the analytic model derived in section 2.2 (equations (8) to (11)) to study how meteorological, geographic, and water-column conditions influence the dispersion of buoyant materials by the vertical shear of horizontal boundary layer currents.

#### 3.2.1 Horizontal Dispersion of Buoyant Materials in an Ekman Layer

We first consider an ocean surface Ekman layer driven by a steady wind located at 10 m above the ocean surface of 10 m/s \( (U_{10} = 10 \text{ m/s}) \) at 45ºN (simulation S1 in Table 1). For an Ekman layer bounded by rotation (unstratified, Fig. 7), the vertical shear of downwind current is much stronger near the surface than within the boundary layer, while the vertical shear of the crosswind current is relatively uniform within the boundary layer (Fig. 7(a)). Concentration
decreases with water depth for positively buoyant materials and the concentration decays faster for materials of larger buoyant rising speeds ($w_b$). Horizontal dispersion is highly anisotropic for materials of all buoyant rising speeds ($w_b$): the ratio between the diffusivity in the major axis ($K_{major}$) and that in the minor axis ($K_{minor}$) is about 20 when $w_b = 0.5 \text{ mm/s}$ and increases monotonically to more than 1,000 when $w_b > 11 \text{ mm/s}$. The diffusivity in the minor axis decreases monotonically with increasing buoyant rising speed. The diffusivity in the major axis increases with increasing buoyant rising speed and reaches the maximum, close to 12 m$^2$/s, at $w_b = 3.5 \text{ mm/s}$ (Fig. 7(c)). At this buoyant rising speed, materials concentrate at the depths where the vertical shear of downwind speed is the largest (Fig. 1(b)). When $w_b > 3.5 \text{ mm/s}$, $K_{major}$ decreases with increasing $w_b$. The major axis of dispersion is about 45º to the right of the wind for the smallest rising speeds ($w_b = 0.5 \text{ mm/s}$), and rotates towards the direction of the wind with increasing buoyant rising speed (Fig. 7(d)). The influence of the vertical shear of cross-wind current ($v$) decreases when $w_b$ increases, since the shear in $v$ is relatively uniform in the boundary layer.

### 3.2.2 Effect of Water-Column Stratification

For an Ekman layer bounded by stratification (Simulation S2 in Table 1 and Fig. 8), vertical viscosity and diffusivity ($k_v$) is smaller (Eqn. 13) than in Simulation S1, therefore, velocity shear is stronger and material concentration decreases faster than in unstratified Ekman layer (Figs. 8(a) and 8(b)). Similar to in an unstratified Ekman layer, dispersion is strongly anisotropic (Fig. 8(c)) and $K_{major}/K_{minor}$ is about twice as large as in unstratified Ekman layer. The effective horizontal diffusivity in both the major and minor axis is smaller than in an unstratified Ekman layer, however, the diffusivity normalized by $u_* h_{bl}$ is slightly larger than in an unstratified Ekman layer. For $w_b > 0.5 \text{ mm/s}$, diffusivity decreases monotonically with increasing $w_b$. The
The major axis of dispersion is also to the right of the wind (Fig. 8(d)). The misalignment of the major axis of dispersion with wind is smaller than in unstratified Ekman layer, implying a relatively larger influence by downwind current shear than by crosswind current shear.

3.2.3 Effect of Vertical Diffusivity

Vertical diffusivity \((k_v)\) is a major uncertainty in ocean models and solutions from sensitivity experiments with a doubled \(k_v\) by setting \(c_1 = 0.8\) in equation (13) are also presented (Simulation S3 in Table 1 and Fig. 9). The vertical shear of both downwind and crosswind horizontal currents with a doubled \(k_v\) is weaker than with the standard \(k_v\) value (Figs. 9(a) versus 7(a)). For material of the same \(w_b\), concentration decays slower when \(k_v\) is larger (Figs. 9(b) versus 7(b)). Similar to the previous two experiments with standard \(k_v\) values (Simulations S1 and S2), dispersion is strongly anisotropic: \(K_{major}/K_{minor}\) is about 25 when \(w_b = 0.5\ mm/s\). Although \(K_{major}/K_{minor}\) also increases with increasing \(w_b\), the increase is slower in simulation S3 than in S1 and S2. \(K_{major}/K_{minor}\) becomes larger than 1,000 for \(w_b > 15\ mm/s\). For weakly buoyant materials \((w_b < 8\ mm/s)\) when they can be mixed into the boundary layer in both simulations S1 and S3, effective horizontal diffusivity with doubled \(k_v\) is smaller than with the standard \(k_v\) value because of weaker shear and larger vertical diffusivity. Maximum horizontal diffusivity in the major axis is smaller than 2 m\(^2\)/s, much smaller than that with the standard \(k_v\) value \((> 11\ m^2/s)\). Materials with \(w_b \geq 8\ mm/s\) can be mixed into the boundary layer by the larger \(k_v\) in simulation S3 but not in simulation S1, horizontal diffusivity is larger in simulation S3 than in Simulation S1.

3.2.4 Effect of Latitude

The sensitivity of horizontal diffusivity to latitude is investigated through comparing two solutions at 15°N (Simulation S4 and Fig. 10) and at 45°N (Fig. 7) with all other conditions the
same. Here we set the mixed layer depth at 15ºN the same as the Ekman depth at 45ºN for the ease of comparison because the Ekman depth is deeper at 15ºN than at 45ºN. Vertical shear of horizontal currents in both downwind and crosswind directions is evidently stronger at 15ºN than at 45ºN (Figs. 10(a) versus 7(a)). The vertical profiles for materials of the same buoyant rising speed at the two different latitudes are the same (Figs. 10(b) versus 1(b)) because vertical diffusivity is the same. The effective horizontal diffusivity is larger at 15ºN than at 45ºN in both the major and minor directions (Figs. 10(c) versus 1(c)) due to the stronger current shear at 15ºN.

The $K_{major}/K_{minor}$ is more than larger at 15ºN than at 45ºN for all buoyant rising speeds. The misalignment of the major axis of dispersion with wind is smaller at 15ºN than at 45ºN, implying a relatively larger influence by downwind current shear than by crosswind current shear.

3.2.5 Effect of Non-breaking Surface Gravity Waves

Non-breaking surface gravity waves directly modify horizontal current through the Stokes-Coriolis term [e.g., Polton et al. 2005]. When with a substantial along-wind component, they also interacts with the currents and generate Langmuir circulation that penetrates the boundary layer [e.g., D’Asaro 2014], resulting in vertical diffusivity larger than in shear-driven Ekman turbulence through the boundary layer [e.g., McWilliams and Sullivan 2000]. Breaking waves impact the vertical profiles of horizontal currents and vertical diffusivity, mainly close to the surface [e.g., McWilliams et al. 2012]. The effects of non-breaking surface gravity waves are represented by the Stokes drift ($u_{st}$ in equation (11)) and by the enhanced vertical diffusivity ($\varepsilon(La)$ in equation (14)). We here consider only one scenario when wave is in equilibrium with the wind (Simulation S5 in Table 1). In the real ocean, waves can be of any magnitude and in any direction [e.g., van Roekel et. al. 2012; McWilliams et al. 2014]. Those scenarios can also be studied with the analytic framework.
Under the influence of non-breaking surface gravity waves, the Lagrangian downwind current decays faster in the upper few meters, and is more uniform inside the boundary layer than in Ekman layer (Figs. 11(a) versus 7(a)). The vertical shear of crosswind current is weaker throughout the boundary layer with wave than without. Materials of the same buoyant rising speed decay slower with depth with wave than without (Figs. 11(b) versus 7(b)), since vertical diffusivity is larger in a wave-driven boundary layer current than in an Ekman layer. Similar to in an unstratified Ekman layer, horizontal dispersion in a wave-driven boundary layer is highly anisotropic (Figs. 11(c) versus 7(c)). The $K_{major}/K_{minor}$ is about 24 when $w_b = 0.5$ mm/s and increases with increasing $w_b$. The increase in $K_{major}/K_{minor}$ with $w_b$, however, is slower than without wave. Horizontal diffusivity in the major axis increases with increasing $w_b$ for weakly buoyant materials. The buoyant rising speed when $K_{major}$ reaches maximum is about 13 mm/s with wave, larger than that in an Ekman layer, since vertical diffusivity is larger in wave-driven turbulence. The maximum horizontal diffusivity is smaller than in an Ekman layer. The misalignment of the major axis of dispersion with wind is smaller in a Langmuir boundary layer than in an Ekman boundary layer (Figs. 11(d) versus 7(d)), again implying a relatively larger influence by downwind current shear than by crosswind current shear.

### 3.2.6 Effect of Breaking Surface Gravity Waves

When the enhanced near-surface mixing due to breaking waves is included with non-breaking waves in the model (Simulation S6), the near-surface vertical shear of horizontal current reduces (Figs. 12(a) versus 11(a)). Buoyant materials penetrate deeper into the boundary layer with the inclusion of breaking waves than without breaking wave effect (Figs. 12(f) versus 11(b)). Horizontal diffusivity is smaller with breaking waves than without breaking wave (Figs. 12(c) and 2(c)), since the vertical shear of horizontal currents is weaker and vertical diffusivity is
larger. While $K_{\text{major}}/K_{\text{minor}}$ is larger with breaking wave than without when $w_b = 5 \text{ mm/s}$, the increase in $K_{\text{major}}/K_{\text{minor}}$ is slower than without breaking waves. When $w_b$ is greater than 3 mm/s, $K_{\text{major}}/K_{\text{minor}}$ is smaller with breaking waves included with non-breaking waves than without breaking waves, indicating weaker dominance of vertical shear of downwind current with breaking waves. The misalignment between the major axis of dispersion with wind is slightly larger with breaking waves included for all buoyant rising speeds considered (Figs. 12(d) versus 2(d)).

4. Discussion

4.1 Importance of Shear Dispersion by Ocean Surface Boundary Layer Currents to Spilled Oil and Ocean Plastic

Dispersion by the vertical shear of horizontal boundary layer currents is an order of magnitude larger than that by turbulent velocity fluctuations in wind- and wave-driven boundary layers, but it is only important for materials that are able to be mixed into the boundary layer by turbulence (eqn. 8 and results in section 3.2). That is when $k_v/w_b$ is comparable to the depth of the boundary layer ($h_{bl}$). For an Ekman layer, $k_v$ scales with $u_\ast h_{bl}$ with $u_\ast$ the atmospheric friction velocity [e.g., Large et al. 1994]. The ratio between $k_v/w_b$ and $h_{bl}$ becomes $u_\ast/w_b$. Friction velocity $u_\ast$ is 6 mm/s when $U_{10} = 5 \text{ m/s}$ following the drag law of Large and Pond (1981), implying that shear dispersion by boundary layer current is significant when $w_b$ is about 6 mm/s or smaller at this wind speed. When the wind is stronger, materials with a larger $w_b$ can suspend in the boundary layer and be dispersed by the sheared current. There are two important pollutants in the ocean, including marine plastic and spilled oil, which usually have buoyant rising speed of a few mm/s. Many marine plastic debris are weakly buoyant with a rise speed of that range [e.g., Reisser et al. 2015]. They are observed to be distributed well into the ocean surface boundary
layer [e.g., Kukulka et al. 2012b; Reisser et al. 2015]. After an oil spill event, chemical dispersants are usually applied to break oil slicks into small droplets of a hundred microns or less in diameter [e.g., Li and Garrett 1998], so that the small oil droplets can suspend in the water column and be degraded by bacteria [e.g., Joye et al. 2016]. For oil droplets with density ($\rho_{oil}$) of 850 kg/m$^3$ and a diameter ($d_{oil}$) of 100 $\mu$m, $w_b$ is 0.95 mm/s using the Stokes’ law ($w_b = (\rho_{water} - \rho_{oil})g d_{oil}^2/(18\mu_{water})$). Shear dispersion in the ocean surface boundary layer is therefore important for both ocean plastic and oil droplets.

### 4.2 Importance of Dispersion by Ocean Surface Boundary Layer Flows

Simulations in this study show that the horizontal diffusivity due to boundary layer processes is at the order of $10^0$ to $10^1$ m$^2$/s for a wind speed of 10 m/s located at 10 m height, with the variability influenced by latitude, boundary layer depth, bottom stratification, wave conditions, and particle buoyant rising speed. Dispersion due to geostrophic mesoscale ocean processes undergoes exponential growth when particle separation is smaller than the size of mesoscale eddies (from a few kilometers to tens of kilometers), i.e., $D^2(t) = exp(\lambda t)$ so that $dD^2(t)/dt = \lambda D^2(t)$ with an exponent $\lambda$ at the order of $2\times10^{-7}$ to $10^{-6}$ [Young et al. 1982]. Therefore, the scale that diffusivity due to boundary layer current is larger than that due to mesoscale processes at a scale of 1 km to 10 km. A recent observational study [Poje et al. 2014] shows that dispersion by submesoscale currents can be an order of magnitude larger than that by mesoscale flows. The effective diffusivity increases with horizontal scale of the material and is larger than 10 m$^2$/s when scale is larger than a hundred meter or so (Fig. 6 in Poje et al. 2014). The horizontal dispersion due to boundary layer currents is likely dominated by submesoscale and mesoscale currents at a scale larger than 100 m.
4.3 Parameterization of Buoyant Material Dispersion in the Ocean Surface Boundary Layer

With advances in computing technology and computational methods, current predictive ocean models usually resolve submesoscale currents [e.g., Haza et al. 2016; Barkan et al. 2017] but not boundary layer processes. Lagrangian particle tracking models [e.g., North et al. 2011; Thyng and Hetland 2014] driven by velocity fields from predictive ocean models usually use subgrid scale model that does not include boundary layer currents and is independent to buoyant rising speed. The analytic model in section 2.2.1 can be used to mechanistically determine sub-grid scale velocity in those models: the effective horizontal diffusivity is first calculated using equations (7) to (9) and (14) to (16), and the subgrid scale displacement is then related to the diffusivity using a random displacement model [e.g., Griffa 1996]

Horizontal diffusivity due to turbulent velocity fluctuation are important for strongly buoyant materials, although they are an order of magnitude smaller than that due to shear dispersion for weakly buoyant materials. It is given for Ekman turbulence \( \left( \alpha_t = \infty \right) \) and for Langmuir turbulence driven wave in equilibrium with wind \( \left( \alpha_t \approx 0.3 \right) \). In the realistic ocean, the characteristic of turbulence is influenced by forcing not included here such as other combination of wind and wave forcing, surface buoyancy flux [e.g., Li et al. 2005; Belcher et al. 2012], the angle between wind and wave [e.g., van Roekle et al. 2012], and wind direction [e.g., Liu et al. 2018]. A relationship more generic than equations (15) and (16) will only be possible through a systematic study that involves comprehensive survey of LES solutions under different meteorological and hydrographic conditions. Future studies will also be carried out to investigate how boundary layer currents and submesoscale currents together modulate horizontal material dispersion.
4.4 Dispersion of Buoyant Materials with Different Rising Speed ($w_b$) by Ocean Surface Boundary Layer Flows

This study focuses on the dispersion of particles with the same buoyant rising speed. Particles with different buoyant rising speeds move at different advection velocities (Equation (9) and Figs. (2) and (3)) because they occupy different portion of the water column. The differential advection separates particles with different buoyant rising speeds more than dispersion does.

5. Summary

Two different approaches are used to understand and quantify the effect of ocean surface boundary layer flows on the dispersion of materials with a constant upward buoyant speed. The first approach employs a three-dimensional Lagrangian particle tracking model driven by turbulent velocity fields from a large eddy simulation model. Model solutions are used to calculate time-dependent relative dispersion and asymptotic horizontal diffusivity. The second approach generalizes the classical theory on dispersion in a bounded shear flow to materials which experience a constant upward buoyant velocity, and computes the asymptotic depth-averaged effective horizontal diffusivity for any combination of horizontal currents, vertical diffusivity and buoyant rising speed.

The particle trajectory solutions show that particles of different buoyant rising speeds move and spread in different directions at different rates because they occupy different depths of the water column. Effective horizontal diffusivity is larger in an Ekman boundary layer than in a Langmuir boundary layer for weakly buoyant particles that can be mixed into a boundary layer by both types of turbulence. For buoyant particles that could be mixed into the boundary layer by Langmuir turbulence but not by Ekman turbulence, horizontal dispersion is stronger in a Langmuir boundary layer than in an Ekman boundary layer. Dispersion is anisotropic. In an Ekman boundary layer,
the major axis of dispersion is about 30º to the right of the wind for weakly buoyant particles and
rotates towards the direction of the wind with increasing buoyant rising speed. In a Langmuir
boundary layer, the major axis of dispersion is also about 20º to the right for weakly buoyant
particles. However, it is approximately 80º to the left of the wind for strongly buoyant particles
because of the strong cross-wind velocity fluctuation associated with Langmuir cells. Dispersion
experiences an exponential growth and a ballistic regime, before transitioning to the asymptotic
diffusive regime. The asymptotic regime is established when material distribution in the vertical
direction reaches equilibrium. The effective diffusivity from shear dispersion theory agrees
reasonably well with diffusivity calculated using 3D particle trajectories. For weakly buoyant
materials that could be mixed into the boundary layer, shear dispersion dominates turbulent
dispersion. For strongly buoyant materials that cannot be mixed into the boundary layer, turbulent
dispersion dominates.

Using the shear dispersion theory with a Reynolds-averaged ocean model, we demonstrated that
the variability of shear-driven effective horizontal diffusivities to buoyant rising speed, wind, wave,
stratification, latitude, vertical mixing, and breaking waves. For particles with small buoyant rising
speed that can be mixed into boundary layer by turbulence, a deep boundary layer, weak vertical
mixing, and low latitude favors horizontal dispersion by the vertical shear of boundary layer
currents. For particles that are able to be mixed into the boundary layer by both shear-driven
Ekman turbulence and wave-driven Langmuir turbulence, horizontal dispersion is stronger in
Ekman turbulence than in Langmuir turbulence. For particles that can only be mixed into the
boundary layer by Langmuir turbulence but not by Ekman turbulence, horizontal dispersion is
stronger in Langmuir turbulence than in Ekman turbulence. Horizontal dispersion is also sensitive
to latitude and vertical mixing. Vertical mixing determines horizontal dispersion by controlling
both the vertical shear of horizontal velocity and the amount of materials that could be mixed into
the boundary layer. While the KPP parameterization for vertical diffusivity \( k_v \) is used in section
3.2.2, other parameterizations for \( k_v \) [e.g., Kantha and Clayson 1994; Umlauf and Burchard 2003;
Harcourt 2013] can also be applied with equations (10) to (12) to calculate the effective horizontal
diffusivity. Recent efforts in improving parameterization of vertical mixing [e.g., Harcourt 2015;
Sinha et al. 2015; Reichl et al. 2016; Li and Fox-Kemper 2017; Taylor 2018] also improve the
prediction of horizontal dispersion in ocean models.
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Appendix A: Derivation of Equation (7).
We start from the Fokker-Planck equation for the probability density function of particle concentration \( p(x,t) \) at location \( x \) and time \( t \) (equation 4),

\[
\frac{\partial p}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} + v \frac{\partial p}{\partial y} + w_b \frac{\partial p}{\partial z} = \nabla_h \cdot \left( \begin{pmatrix} k_{xx}^{\text{tur}} & k_{xy}^{\text{tur}} \\ k_{yx}^{\text{tur}} & k_{yy}^{\text{tur}} \end{pmatrix} \right) \nabla_h p + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( k_v \frac{\partial p}{\partial z} \right)
\]  

(A1)

subject to no flux boundary conditions: \( w_b p - \kappa_v p_z = 0 \) at \( z = 0, -h \). We then perform the following coordinate transformation,

\[
\begin{align*}
\xi &= x - \bar{u} t \\
\eta &= y - \bar{v} t \\
\tau &= t
\end{align*}
\]

With respect to the new coordinates, Equation (A1) can be written as

\[
p_\tau + (u - \bar{u})p_\xi + (v - \bar{v})p_\eta + (w_b p)_z = \nabla_h \cdot \left( \begin{pmatrix} k_{xx}^{\text{tur}} & k_{xy}^{\text{tur}} \\ k_{yx}^{\text{tur}} & k_{yy}^{\text{tur}} \end{pmatrix} \right) \nabla_h p + (k_v p_z)_z
\]  

(A2)

where \( \nabla_h \) is the differential of a variable in horizontal dimensions. Let \( \xi = \epsilon \xi, \eta = \epsilon \eta, \tau = \epsilon^2 \tau \), where \( \epsilon \ll 1 \) is the ratio between the vertical and horizontal characteristic scales [Esler and Ramli 2017]. Equation (A2) can be rescaled as

\[
\epsilon^2 p_\tau + \epsilon(u - \bar{u})p_\xi + \epsilon(v - \bar{v})p_\eta + (w_b p)_z = \epsilon^2 \nabla_h \cdot \left( \begin{pmatrix} k_{xx}^{\text{tur}} & k_{xy}^{\text{tur}} \\ k_{yx}^{\text{tur}} & k_{yy}^{\text{tur}} \end{pmatrix} \right) \nabla_h p + (k_v p_z)_z
\]

Since the physical meaning of \( (\xi, \eta, \tau) \) is the same as that of \( (\xi, \eta, \tau) \), we will use \( (\xi, \eta, \tau) \) for the rescaled equation, i.e.,

\[
\epsilon^2 p_\tau + \epsilon(u - \bar{u})p_\xi + \epsilon(v - \bar{v})p_\eta + (w_b p)_z = \epsilon^2 \nabla_h \cdot \left( \begin{pmatrix} k_{xx}^{\text{tur}} & k_{xy}^{\text{tur}} \\ k_{yx}^{\text{tur}} & k_{yy}^{\text{tur}} \end{pmatrix} \right) \nabla_h p + (k_v p_z)_z
\]  

(A3)

Substituting the ansatz \( p = p_0 + \epsilon p_1 + \epsilon^2 p_2 + \cdots \) into equation (A3), we obtain a power series in terms of \( \epsilon \). Equation of order \( \epsilon^0 \) is,
\[w_{b}p_{0z} = (k_{v}p_{0z})_{z}.\]

subject to boundary conditions \(w_{b}p_{0} - \kappa_{v}p_{0z} = 0\) at \(z = 0, -h\). We can assume that \(p_{0} = \bar{P}(\xi, \eta, \tau)F(z)\), where \(F(z)\) satisfies the following equation,

\[w_{b}F = (k_{v}F)_{z}\] (A4)

subject to the boundary conditions

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ w_{b}F - k_{v}F_{z} &= 0, \text{ at } z = 0 \\
\{ w_{b}F - k_{v}F_{z} &= 0, \text{ at } z = -h
\end{align*}
\] (A5)

Equation of order \(\varepsilon\) is

\[(u - \bar{u})p_{0\xi} + (v - \bar{v})p_{0\eta} + w_{b}p_{1z} = (k_{v}p_{1z})_{z}.\] (A6)

We can assume that \(p_{1} = \bar{P}_{\xi}M(z) + \bar{P}_{\eta}N(z)\) and obtain the following two equations for \(M\) and \(N\), respectively,

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ (u - \bar{u})F + w_{b}M_{z} &= (\kappa_{v}M_{z})_{z} \\
\{ (v - \bar{v})F + w_{b}N_{z} &= (\kappa_{v}N_{z})_{z}
\end{align*}
\] (A7)

subject to no flux boundary conditions similar to equation (A5). By the definition that \(\bar{u} = \frac{\langle uF \rangle}{\langle F \rangle}\) and \(\bar{v} = \frac{\langle vF \rangle}{\langle F \rangle}\), \(\langle (u - \bar{u})F \rangle = \langle (v - \bar{v})F \rangle = 0\), which is consistent with the no flux boundary conditions, and the above equations are solvable.

Equation of order \(\varepsilon^2\) is,

\[p_{0r} + (u - \bar{u})p_{1\xi} + (v - \bar{v})p_{1\eta} + w_{b}p_{2z} = \nabla_{h} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} k_{xx}^{\text{tur}} & k_{xy}^{\text{tur}} \\ k_{xy}^{\text{tur}} & k_{yy}^{\text{tur}} \end{pmatrix} \nabla_{h} p_{0} + (k_{v}p_{2z})_{z}\] (A8)

Averaging this equation from \(-h\) to 0 along \(z\) direction, we have

\[\bar{P}_{t} = \nabla \cdot (K_{\text{eff}} \cdot \nabla \bar{P})\] (A9)

where
\[ K_{\text{eff}} = \left( \begin{array}{ccc}
\langle k_{xx}^{\text{tur}} F \rangle - \langle (u - \bar{u}) M \rangle & \langle k_{xy}^{\text{tur}} F \rangle - \langle (u - \bar{u}) N \rangle \\
\langle F \rangle & \langle F \rangle & \langle F \rangle \\
\langle k_{xy}^{\text{tur}} F \rangle - \langle (v - \bar{v}) M \rangle & \langle F \rangle - \langle F \rangle
\end{array} \right) \]  

(A10)

Although \( \langle F \rangle \) can be any positive value, we set \( \langle F \rangle = 1 \) for the ease of presentation. Equation (A10) can then be in the form of equation (7a), i.e.,

\[ K_{\text{eff}} = \left( \begin{array}{ccc}
\langle k_{xx}^{\text{tur}} F \rangle - \langle (u - \bar{u}) M \rangle & \langle k_{xy}^{\text{tur}} F \rangle - \langle (u - \bar{u}) N \rangle \\
\langle k_{xy}^{\text{tur}} F \rangle - \langle (v - \bar{v}) M \rangle & \langle k_{yy}^{\text{tur}} F \rangle - \langle (v - \bar{v}) N \rangle
\end{array} \right) \]  

(A11)

\( F, M, \) and \( N \) are the solutions of (A4) and (A7), and can be written as,

\[
\begin{align*}
F(z) &= C \exp \left( w_b \int_{-h}^{z} \frac{ds}{k_v(s)} \right) \\
M(z) &= F(z) \int_{-h}^{z} \frac{\psi_u(s)}{F(s)k_v(s)} ds \\
N(z) &= F(z) \int_{-h}^{z} \frac{\psi_v(s)}{F(s)k_v(s)} ds
\end{align*}
\]  

(A12)

where \( C \) is a constant chosen to ensure \( \langle F \rangle = 1 \), \( \psi_u(s) = \int_{-h}^{s} (u(s) - \bar{u}) F(s) ds \) with \( \bar{u} = \langle uF \rangle \), and \( \psi_v(s) = \int_{-h}^{s} (v(s) - \bar{v}) F(s) ds \) with \( \bar{v} = \langle vF \rangle \). Using the fact that \( \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} = \bar{v} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \bar{v} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \), \( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \xi} \) and \( \frac{\partial}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \), the effective equation (A9) can be written in the original coordinate system as

\[
\bar{P}_t + \bar{u} \bar{P}_x + \bar{v} \bar{P}_y = \nabla h \cdot (K_{\text{eff}} \cdot \nabla h \bar{P})
\]  

(A13)

which is the governing equation for depth-averaged material concentration advected by current [(\( u \) \( v \))] and dispersed following an effective diffusivity \( K_{\text{eff}} \).

Equation (A11) is consistent with the effective horizontal diffusivity by Esler and Ramli [2017] (equation (3) in this study) when \( w_b = 0 \). With \( w_b = 0 \), equation (A7) becomes
\[
(u - \bar{u})F = (k_v M_z)_z \\
(v - \bar{v})F = (k_v N_z)_z.
\]

According to equation (A4), \(F\) is a constant with \(z\), the solutions of the above equation is,

\[
\begin{cases}
M(z) = F \int_{-h}^{z} \frac{1}{k_v} dz' \int_{-h}^{z'} (u - \bar{u}) dz'' \\
N(z) = F \int_{-h}^{z} \frac{1}{k_v} dz' \int_{-h}^{z'} (v - \bar{v}) dz''
\end{cases}
\]

(A14)

Substituting (A14) into (A11) and changing the order of integration, we recover the solution by Esler and Ramli (2017) (equation (5) of this paper), i.e.,

\[
K_{eff} = \begin{pmatrix}
(k_{Hx} + \frac{F_1^2}{k_v}) & \frac{F_1 F_2}{k_v} \\
\frac{F_1 F_2}{k_v} & (k_{Hy} + \frac{F_2^2}{k_v})
\end{pmatrix}
\]

where \(F_i(z) = \int_{-h}^{z} (u_i - \bar{u}_i) dz'\).
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Table 1. Model configurations for simulations discussed in section 3.2. LMD94 stands for $k_v$ parameterization proposed in Large et al. [1994]; MS2000 stands for $k_v$ proposed in McWilliams and Sullivan [2000]; and MH06 stands for $k_v$ proposed in McWilliams and Huckle [2006].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run #</th>
<th>$U_{10}$ [m/s]</th>
<th>$h_{bl}$ [m]</th>
<th>$u_{st}$</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>$k_v$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84 (= $h_{ek}$)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45ºN</td>
<td>LMD94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30 (&lt; $h_{ek}$)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45ºN</td>
<td>LMD94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84 (= $h_{ek}$)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45ºN</td>
<td>2×LMD94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84 (&lt; $h_{ek}$)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15ºN</td>
<td>LMD94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84 (= $h_{ek}$)</td>
<td>Equilibrium</td>
<td>45ºN</td>
<td>MS2000 ($La_t = 0.3$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84 (= $h_{ek}$)</td>
<td>Equilibrium</td>
<td>45ºN</td>
<td>MS2000 ($La_t = 0.3$) + MH06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Simulated mean horizontal velocity ((a) and (b)), turbulent velocity variances ((c) and (d)), and vertical profiles of material concentration ((e) and (f)) using a large eddy simulation model. Upper panels are for Ekman boundary layer ($U_{10} = 10$ m/s), and lower panels are for Langmuir boundary layer ($U_{10} = 10$ m/s, wind-wave equilibrium).

Figure 2. The horizontal locations of particles in Ekman turbulence three days after release (black: $w_b = 1$ mm/s; red: $w_b = 4$ mm/s; magenta: $w_b = 10$ mm/s; cyan: $w_b = 40$ mm/s). Insets are zoom-ins to better demonstrate the patterns.
Figure 3. The horizontal locations of particles in Langmuir turbulence three days after release (black: $w_b = 1$ mm/s; red: $w_b = 4$ mm/s; magenta: $w_b = 10$ mm/s; cyan: $w_b = 40$ mm/s). Insets are zoom-ins to better demonstrate the patterns.

Figure 4. Horizontal relative dispersion due to total velocity (a), mean horizontal velocity (b) and turbulent fluctuating velocities (c) in Ekman turbulence ($U_{10} = 10$ m/s). Dispersion is rotated to the major and minor axes of dispersion following equations (14a) to (14c). Panels (d) and (e) are the asymptotic diffusivities and the directions of major axis of rotation.

Figure 5. Horizontal relative dispersion due to total velocity (a), mean horizontal velocity (b) and turbulent fluctuating velocities (c) in Langmuir turbulence ($U_{10} = 10$ m/s). Dispersion is rotated to the major and minor axes of dispersion following equations (14a) to (14c). Panels (d) and (e) are the asymptotic diffusivities and the directions of major axis of rotation.

Figure 6. The effective horizontal diffusivity in major and minor axes due to horizontal turbulent fluctuating velocity (a), and the angle between major axis of dispersion and wind (b) in Ekman turbulence. Panels (c) to (d) are the same variables as in (a) to (b) in Langmuir turbulence.

Diffusivity in panel (a) is scaled by the product of friction velocity ($u_*$) and unit length ($L_0$).

Diffusivity in panel (c) is scaled by the product of velocity scale ($(u_*^2 u_{st})^{1/3}$) and unit length ($L_0$) in panel (a).
Figure 7. Solutions from equations (8) to (13) in an unstratified Ekman boundary layer \((U_{10} = 10\ m/s)\) at 45ºN for horizontal velocity (a), normalized concentration (b), effective diffusivity (c), and angle between wind and major axis of dispersion (d).

Figure 8. Same as in Fig. 7 except stable stratification at 30 m.

Figure 9. Same as in Fig. 7 except doubled vertical diffusivity \((k_z)\).

Figure 10. Same as in Fig. 7 except at 15ºN.

Figure 11. Solutions from equations (8) to (12) and equation (14) with \(La_t = 0.3\) and \(G_{brk}(\sigma) = 0\) (without breaking wave effect) in a stratified Langmuir boundary layer \((U_{10} = 10\ m/s)\) at 45ºN for horizontal velocity (a), normalized concentration (b), effective diffusivity (c), and angle between wind and major axis of dispersion (d).

Figure 12. Same as in Fig. 11 except \(G_{brk}(\sigma) \neq 0\) (with breaking wave effect).
Figure 1. Simulated mean horizontal velocity ((a) and (b)), turbulent velocity variances ((c) and (d)), and vertical profiles of material concentration ((e) and (f)) using a large eddy simulation model. Upper panels are for Ekman boundary layer ($U_{10} = 10$ m/s), and lower panels are for Langmuir boundary layer ($U_{10} = 10$ m/s, wind-wave equilibrium).
Figure 2. The horizontal locations of particles in Ekman turbulence three days after release (black: $w_b = 1$ mm/s; red: $w_b = 4$ mm/s; magenta: $w_b = 10$ mm/s; cyan: $w_b = 40$ mm/s). Insets are zoom-ins to better demonstrate the patterns.
Figure 3. The horizontal locations of particles in Langmuir turbulence three days after release (black: $w_b = 1$ mm/s; red: $w_b = 4$ mm/s; magenta: $w_b = 10$ mm/s; cyan: $w_b = 40$ mm/s). Insets are zoom-ins to better demonstrate the patterns.
Figure 4. Horizontal relative dispersion due to total velocity (a), mean horizontal velocity (b) and turbulent fluctuating velocities (c) in Ekman turbulence \((U_{10} = 10 \text{ m/s})\). Dispersion is rotated to the major and minor axes of dispersion following equations (14a) to (14c). Panels (d) and (e) are the asymptotic diffusivities and the directions of major axis of rotation.
Figure 5. Horizontal relative dispersion due to total velocity (a), mean horizontal velocity (b) and turbulent fluctuating velocities (c) in Langmuir turbulence ($U_{10} = 10$ m/s). Dispersion is rotated to the major and minor axes of dispersion following equations (14a) to (14c). Panels (d) and (e) are the asymptotic diffusivities and the directions of major axis of rotation.
Figure 6. The effective horizontal diffusivity in major and minor axes due to horizontal turbulent fluctuating velocity (a), and the angle between major axis of dispersion and wind (b) in Ekman turbulence. Panels (c) to (d) are the same variables as in (a) to (b) in Langmuir turbulence. Diffusivity in panel (a) is scaled by the product of friction velocity \( u^* \) and unit length \( L_0 \). Diffusivity in panel (c) is scaled by the product of velocity scale \( (u_{st}^2)\) and unit length \( L_0 \) in panel (a).
Figure 7. Solutions from equations (8) to (13) in an unstratified Ekman boundary layer ($U_{10} = 10$ m/s) at 45ºN for horizontal velocity (a), normalized concentration (b), effective diffusivity (c), and angle between wind and major axis of dispersion (d).
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