

Coastal Engineering Journal
© World Scientific Publishing Company and Japan Society of Civil Engineers

NEW APPROACH TO FLAP-TYPE WAVEMAKER EQUATION WITH WAVE BREAKING LIMIT

NINO KRVAVICA*, IGOR RUŽIĆ and NEVENKA OŽANIĆ
*Faculty of Civil Engineering, University of Rijeka, Radmile Matejcic 3
Rijeka, 51000, Croatia
nino.krvavica@uniri.hr

Received (24 November 2017)

Revised (7 December 2017)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/21664250.2018.1436242>

Abstract.

The limitations of the classical wavemaker theory motivated the development of a new equation that can directly predict both regular and broken waves based on the flap-type wavemaker set-up. This is achieved first by coupling a commonly accepted wave breaking formula with the linear wavemaker equation. Both these equation were then rewritten in terms of the paddle stroke, water depth and frequency instead of the wave number. Additionally, the validity range for each equation was explicitly defined to predict the maximum wave height before breaking. Comparison with both classical wavemaker theory and measurements confirm the reliability and accuracy of the proposed equation.

Keywords: water waves; wavemaker; wave generator; linear wave theory; wave breaking; laboratory experiments

1. Introduction

Studies and tests of water wave interactions with coastal and offshore structures are regularly performed in experimental wave tanks or flumes. Waves are usually generated by an oscillatory motion of a wavemaker. Although many types of wavemakers were developed in the last several decades, the most commonly used are: flap (or hinged), piston and plunger [Dean & Dalrymple, 1991].

The relationship between the motion of the wavemaker and resulting waves may be defined by the linear wavemaker theory [Havelock, 1929; Biesel & Suquet, 1951], which states that the generated wave height H is directly related to the wavemaker stroke S , still water depth d and wave number $k = 2\pi/L$, where L is the wave length. The wave height to paddle stroke ratio for a flap-type wavemaker is given by the following analytical solution [Dean & Dalrymple, 1991]:

$$\frac{H}{S} = \frac{4 \sinh(kd)}{kd} \frac{kd \sinh(kd) - \cosh(kd) + 1}{\sinh(2kd) + 2kd}, \quad (1)$$

where S is defined as the maximum horizontal distance at the still water level that the paddle travels in one direction from its neutral position (see Fig. 3). Equation (1) defines how the wave height to paddle stroke ratio changes for a given depth and wave number.

The first study designed to verify Eq. (1) was performed almost 60 years ago by a group of engineers at the Laboratoire Neyrpic [1952]. The experiments showed that the measured wave heights were consistently 30% below the values predicted by Eq. (1). Ursell *et al.* [1960] re-evaluated this theory using a piston type wavemaker, and, in contrast, found a very close agreement between the experimental and theoretical results for smaller wave steepness and $\sim 10\%$ lower values than predicted for larger wave steepness. This discrepancy was, at the time, attributed to limitations of the linear wave theory and imperfections in the wavemaker motion [Ursell *et al.*, 1960].

To account for finite amplitude effects, Madsen [1970] extended the linear wavemaker theory to a second order accuracy. He used a piston type wavemaker and found a 15% lower wave heights than predicted by the non-linear equation. Therefore, he suggested that these differences should not be attributed to the finite amplitude effects [Madsen, 1970]. The real reason, he argued, was the leakage around the wavemaker paddle. Madsen [1970] additionally supported his claim by an unpublished technical report by Tenney who demonstrated a significant reduction of wave heights when a hole was drilled in the wavemaker paddle. Furthermore, Fenton [1985] emphasized that in second or higher order wavemaker theories, when the wave length is initially unknown, either the wave speed or the mean current of the fluid or the mass flux induced by the waves must be known to accurately obtain the wave length. Otherwise, the extension to a higher order theory is irrational and is likely to result in the same order of error as in the linear theory [Fenton, 1985].

The wavemaker theory was once more thoroughly analysed and verified by Keat-

ing & Webber [1977] using a more sophisticated measuring equipment. They applied a piston-type wavemaker and focused specifically on steeper waves. The results indicated that the wave heights could be predicted by the linear wavemaker equation to within 6% of error if the leakage around the paddle was minimized. They additionally suggested that a flap-type wavemaker is more suitable for deep water waves, which should additionally reduce the discrepancies. Keating & Webber [1977] also discussed the importance of a reliable prediction of waves generated by a wavemaker. Although knowing the relationship between paddle parameters and wave characteristics is not crucial for regular waves (where generated wave characteristics can be measured directly), it is essential to know this relationship when generating irregular waves by an adaptive control of the wavemaker [Keating & Webber, 1977].

In subsequent years the wavemaker theory was extended for waves with surface tension [Hocking & Mahdmina, 1991], for stratified two-layer systems [Mohapatra *et al.*, 2011], and for porous wavemaker paddles [Chwang, 1983; Chakrabarti & Sahoo, 1998]. Recently, acoustic-gravity waves (AGW) have received much attention in regards to early detection of tsunamis [Stiassnie, 2009] or detection of sea-states for wave-power harnessing farms [Tian & Kadri, 2017]. Therefore, conventional wavemaker theories are currently being adapted for compressible fluids to study the laboratory generation of AGW by wavemakers [Stuhlmeier & Stiassnie, 2016; Tian & Kadri, 2017].

Today, the wavemaker theory is not only important in planning and executing laboratory experiments, but also in verifying numerical models. More and more frequently 2D or 3D numerical wave tanks are being developed and applied in studying different wave conditions as an addition or alternative to physical modelling. In the development stage, the numerical wave tanks are being verified by comparing the results to the linear wavemaker theory (*e.g.*, [Huang *et al.*, 1998; Lal & Elangovan, 2008; Oliveira *et al.*, 2012; Finnegan & Goggins, 2012; Anbarsooz *et al.*, 2013; Saincher & Banerjeea, 2015]). However, the conventional wavemaker approach has two major limitations for such purposes.

First, the wavemaker theory is valid only for a certain range of wave steepness H/L . In other words, it does not account for wave breaking. If a wavemaker is set to generate a wave that is too steep, the wave would break right on the paddle and the generated wave height would be significantly lower than predicted. For validation purposes, however, it would be more useful if the wavemaker equation could accurately predict both regular and broken wave heights or at least indicate the maximum wave height that can be generated before wave breaking occurs. Although, broken wave are rarely used in laboratory experiments, sometimes they are included in the validation of numerical models (*e.g.* [Finnegan & Goggins, 2012]). Another possible application of broken waves could be in AGW experiments where much higher frequencies are required in comparison to traditional wave studies (*e.g.* [Stuhlmeier & Stiassnie, 2016; Tian & Kadri, 2017]).

The second difficulty is that Eq. (1) is given as a function of the wave number k ,

whereas the wavemaker is actually controlled by the paddle frequency f (or period $T = 1/f$). These parameters are linked by the implicit wave dispersion relation [Dean & Dalrymple, 1991]:

$$\omega^2 = gk \tanh(kd), \quad (2)$$

where $\omega = 2\pi f$ is the angular frequency and g is acceleration of gravity. Therefore, the generated wave height cannot be directly predicted based on the wavemaker set-up parameters (paddle stroke, water depth and frequency). Instead, either the wave length must be measured or the wave number must be found by iteratively solving Eq. (2) for a given frequency and depth, before the wave height can be computed by Eq. (1). Note that solving Eq. (2) is not a problem today, however, explicit expression should be more practical to use. Gilbert *et al.* [1971] recognized this limitation, and presented curves for both piston- and flap-type wavemaker as a function of the dimensionless wave period $d/(gT^2)$ rather than the relative water depth kd . Unfortunately, the results were presented only graphically, without any explicit equations.

The aim of this paper is twofold and it follows from existing limitations. First, a new wavemaker equation is proposed, which combines both regular and broken waves. This step also includes defining the validity range for each of these equations and the explicit expression for the maximum wave height that can be generated at a given depth. Second, an approximate wavemaker equation is presented in a more practical form - as a function of frequency and depth. In other words, a modified wavemaker equation is derived that answers a theoretical question: what wave height could one expect to be generated when the wavemaker is set to a certain combination of the paddle stroke and frequency at some water depth? More importantly, this study gives an answer to a practical question: what are the maximum wave heights that can be generated before wave breaking occurs? The classical wavemaker theory can only indirectly provide an answer to the first question, and only for a limited range of parameters.

2. Methodology

2.1. *Wavemaker equation for regular and broken waves*

To define the equation that is valid for both regular and broken waves, Eq. (1) should be combined with a corresponding wave breaking equation. A detailed review of wave breaking equations is given by Rattanapitikon & Shibayama [2000] and Robertson *et al.* [2013]. Because of its inherently variable nature, the understanding of wave breaking process is still an on-going area of research, but the accuracy of predicting wave breaking parameters has progressed significantly over recent years [Robertson *et al.*, 2013]. Many authors have developed different empirical relationships based on small- or large-scale laboratory experiments; most of them are given as a ratio of the broken wave height H_b to the depth at which breaking occurs d_b or to the wave

length at the breaking L_b . The resulting equations have many forms and are given either as linear, slope-based, surf similarity parameter, trigonometric, or deep-water wave steepness relationships [Robertson *et al.*, 2013]. Since this study is interested in the wave breaking that occurs at the paddle, the trigonometric wave steepness relationship was chosen as the most relevant.

Based on the Stokes wave theory and the assumption that wave breaking occurs when the particle velocity in the wave crest exceeds the wave celerity, Miche [1944] proposed the following equation:

$$H_b = K_b L_b \tanh(k_b d), \quad (3)$$

where H_b is the broken wave height, L_b is the wave length at breaking, k_b is the wave number for L_b , and K_b is the breaking coefficient. Maximum theoretical wave steepness is defined by $K_b = 0.143$; however, in practical applications a lower value $K_b = 0.12$ is sometimes recommended [Danel, 1952]. Battjes & Janssen [1978] modified Eq. (3) by introducing an additional parameter γ as follows:

$$H_b = K_b L_b \tanh\left(\frac{\gamma}{0.88} k_b d\right), \quad (4)$$

where values $\gamma = 0.8$ and $K_b = 0.14$ were proposed based on the calibration with laboratory experiments [Battjes & Janssen, 1978]. Ostendorf & Madsen [1979] and, recently, Rattanapitikon *et al.* [2003] extended trigonometric wave breaking equations to include bed slope effects. However, both these formulas may also be used for horizontal beds, in which case they reduce back to Eq. (4), with $K_b = 0.14$, $\gamma = 0.704$ and $K_b = 0.14$, $\gamma = 0.8$, respectively.

To combine the wavemaker equation with the wave breaking, Eq. (4) is rewritten in terms of the wave height to paddle stroke ratio as follows:

$$\frac{H_b}{S} = K_b \frac{L}{S} \tanh\left(\frac{\gamma}{0.88} k_b d\right). \quad (5)$$

Furthermore, since paddle stroke depends on depth, it is more appropriate to define the paddle stroke as $S = d \tan \theta$, where θ is the tilting angle of the paddle (see Fig. 3). Equation (5) is further modified as:

$$\frac{H_b}{S} = K_b \frac{2\pi}{\tan \theta} \frac{\tanh(\gamma k_b d / 0.88)}{k_b d}. \quad (6)$$

Regular and broken waves may, therefore, be predicted by finding a minimum of Eqs. (1) and (6) for a given wave number, water depth, and paddle angle:

$$\left(\frac{H}{S}\right)_{gen} = \min \left[\frac{H}{S}, \frac{H_b}{S} \right]. \quad (7)$$

Equation (7) in its dimensionless form (wave height to paddle stroke ratio H/S versus relative depth kd) is illustrated in Fig. 1A for different paddle angles ranging from 5° to 25° , with $\gamma = 0.8$ and $K_B = 0.14$. This figure shows how a single

wavemaker curve (Eq. 1) spreads into a set of wave breaking curves (Eq. 6) as the relative depth increases. Clearly, the wave height to paddle stroke ratio starts to reduce once the maximum wave steepness is reached. As the wave number increases, wave length becomes shorter, and as a result, the wave height continues to reduce.

Considering that the wavemaker is controlled by the frequency, Eq. (7) is also illustrated in Fig. 1B in a dimensional form. This figure shows one example of the predicted wave heights for a range of frequencies and paddle angles at a 1.0 m depth. In this case, once the breaking limit is reached, all individual wave generator curves (Eq. 1) collapse into a single wave breaking curve given by Eq. (4).




Fig. 1. Dimensionless form of a new wavemaker equation (7) for $\theta = 5 - 25^\circ$, with $\gamma = 0.8$ and $K_B = 0.14$, A) H/S versus kd , B) H versus f for 1.0 m depth

2.2. Laboratory experiments

To verify the classical wavemaker equation and the newly proposed equation that accounts for broken waves, a series of experiments were carried out in the Hydraulic Laboratory of the Faculty of Civil Engineering at the University of Rijeka. Periodic waves were generated by a flap-type wavemaker in a 12.5 m long experimental flume, with rectangular cross-section, 31 cm wide and 45 cm deep. The flume consists of a stainless steel support and glass reinforced plastic walls. The flap wavemaker consists of a motor with a frequency converter and a crank mechanism that drives the paddle which is fixed to the bottom (Fig. 2).

The experimental set-up is illustrated in Fig. 3. The waves were dissipated by a permeable beach positioned at the other end of the flume. A beach slope of 1:5 was chosen to maximize the dampening, as suggested by Finnegan & Goggins [2012]. Some reflection still does occur and, therefore, the wave height slightly varies along



Fig. 2. Flap-type wavemaker and the experimental flume in the Hydraulic Laboratory of the Faculty of Civil Engineering at the University of Rijeka

the channel. The resulting reflection coefficient ϵ_r was determined by measurements of wave heights at two locations between the wavemaker and the absorbing beach, as follows [Ursell *et al.*, 1960]:

$$\epsilon_r = \frac{H_r}{H_i} = \frac{H_{max} - H_{min}}{H_{max} + H_{min}} \quad (8)$$

where H_r is the reflected wave height, H_i is the incident wave height, and H_{max} and H_{min} are the respective maximum and minimum values of measured wave heights at the gauges. The first gauge was positioned at a distance of three times the still water depth from the wavemaker, whereas the second gauge was positioned at a distance $\Delta x = 0.4$ m (for $f < 1.0$ Hz) and $\Delta x = 0.15$ m (for $f \geq 1.0$ Hz) from the first gauge. Keating & Webber [1977] showed that a distance of $3d$ from the wavemaker is the optimum positioning of the measuring device, where the evanescent modes produced by the wavemaker completely decay and only the progressive wave is present. The distance of the second gauge was chosen to always fall somewhere in the recommended range $0.05 < \Delta x/L < 0.45$ [Goda & Suzuki, 1976].

Water level oscillations were measured by capacitive gauges and the corresponding wave heights were computed by a *zero-down* crossing method. For all considered combinations of water depths and paddle angles, the reflected wave height was less than 10% of the incident wave heights.

Four sets of measurements were conducted, which combined two different water depths ($d = 19$ and 29 cm) with two different paddle angles ($\theta = 17.3^\circ$ and 25°). Paddle frequencies varied between 0.4 and 2.0 Hz, and the corresponding wave number was determined from the measured wave period by iteratively solving Eq. (2). Each experiment run for 5 minutes to record at least 100 wave periods of the longest waves ($T = 2.5$ s).




Fig. 3. Scheme of the experimental set-up (not to scale)

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Comparison of measured wave heights with the classical wavemaker equation

The generated waves mainly correspond to intermediate water depth ($\pi/10 \leq kd \leq \pi$), but also several deep water conditions ($kd > \pi$) were tested. Furthermore, a wide range of waves steepness was considered, so that both small steepness ($H/L \leq 0.03$), large steepness ($0.03 < H/L \leq 0.11$), and broken waves ($H/L > 0.11$) were generated. Waves with steepness very close to or over the limit broke right on the paddle; however, they eventually reformed, although the waves profiles were slightly irregular. Keating & Webber [1977] found similar behaviour of broken waves in their experiments.

Measured values were first compared to classical wavemaker equation (1). It seems that in these experiments both small and large steepness wave heights are slightly below the curve predicted by (1), as shown in Fig. 4. However, when the limiting wave steepness is reached, waves break and wave heights decrease as the relative depth increases. Clearly, Eq. (1) is not valid for broken waves. For $\theta = 17.3^\circ$ waves break when $kd > 1.7$ with the maximum H/S ratio equal to 0.81, on the other hand, for $\theta = 25^\circ$ waves break when $kd > 2.0$ with the maximum H/S ratio equal to 0.93. These results show that the point at which the wave generator curve losses its validity depends not only on the relative water depth, but also on the paddle angle. This is expected, however, since kd controls the wave length, whereas both kd and θ control the wave height.

For non-broken waves, the wave height to paddle stroke ratio increases with the relative depth as predicted by the classical wavemaker equation. Slightly lower measured values in comparison to Eq. (1) could be contributed to the leakage around the paddle, as suggested by Madsen [1970]. Leakage is known to cause a loss of wave energy and produce slightly lower wave heights [Keating & Webber, 1977].




Fig. 4. Comparison of measured wave heights with classical equation (1) and new equation (13) for $\beta = 0.81$ and $K_b = 0.14$

3.2. Modification of the wavemaker equation by introducing the energy loss coefficient

To account for the wave height reduction due to leakage, an energy loss coefficient β was introduced, so that Eq. (1) is rewritten as:

$$\frac{H}{S} = \beta \frac{4 \sinh(kd)}{kd} \frac{kd \sinh(kd) - \cosh(kd) + 1}{\sinh(2kd) + 2kd}. \quad (9)$$

A value $\beta = 0.81$ was found by the regression analysis between the measured and computed values for non-broken waves, with coefficient of determination $R^2 = 0.97$ and a root mean square error (RMSE) 3.3 mm. The discussion on quantifying the loss coefficient due to leakage is left for the next section.

Broken waves, on the other hand, agree well with Eq. (6), especially if K_b is calibrated. Again, using regression analysis, a value $K_b = 0.11$ provided the best agreement with the measurements ($R^2 = 0.93$ and RMSE = 4.5 mm). This is lower than $K_b = 0.143$, which is generally used [Miche, 1944]. However, this higher value is based on a maximum theoretical wave steepness limit, which overestimates broken wave heights in practical applications because some of the energy is dissipated in the breaking process. Battjes & Janssen [1978] used $K_b = 0.14$, whereas Danel [1952] proposed that K_b should be lowered to 0.12 when Eq. (4) is applied to horizontal beds. Similarly, Kamphuis [1991] investigated both regular and irregular waves, and found that the broken wave height over a horizontal bed could be better predicted when a lower K_b value was used, he proposed 0.095 for irregular and 0.127 for regular waves.

It is reasonable to conclude that the leakage around the paddle could also be

responsible for lower K_b values in comparison to other studies. Namely, because of the energy loss due to leakage the wavemaker is unable to generate a theoretically steepest wave. In fact, $K_b = 0.14$ multiplied by the energy loss coefficient $\beta = 0.81$ results in $K_b = 0.113$, which is almost identical to the calibrated value found in this study. Furthermore, no significant improvement was found with the parameter γ , therefore the wave breaking equation (6) was also redefined to include the energy loss coefficient as follows:

$$\frac{H_b}{S} = \beta K_b \frac{2\pi}{\tan \theta} \frac{\tanh(kd)}{kd}. \quad (10)$$

The results suggest that, when adequate energy loss and breaking coefficients are included, this new approach predicts generated wave heights with a high degree of accuracy ($R^2 = 0.97$ and $\text{RMSE} = 4.1$ mm), for both regular and broken waves, and over a wider range of wave numbers, water depths and paddle angles (see Fig. 4).

3.3. Conditional wavemaker equation in terms of wave number and water depth

Although the wave height can be obtained by finding a minimum of two equations (as suggested by Eq. 7), it is more convenient to know the relative depth range over which Eq. (9) is valid. This range would be limited by the peak relative depth kd_p which corresponds to the maximum wave height before breaking for a given depth and paddle angle. The kd_p values are defined by points where Eqs. (9) and (10) intersect.

These intersection points are found by computing the root of the following equation:

$$\beta \frac{4 \sinh(kd)}{kd} \frac{kd \sinh(kd) - \cosh(kd) + 1}{\sinh(2kd) + 2kd} = \beta K_b \frac{2\pi}{\tan \theta} \frac{\tanh(kd)}{kd}. \quad (11)$$

Of course, root of Eq. (11) varies with paddle angle θ . Therefore, a set of discrete solutions kd_i that satisfy Eq. (11) were individually computed for different values in the range $\theta_i = 1 - 30^\circ$. Next, a power curve was fitted to a series of points defined by parameters kd_i and $\tan \theta / K_b$, as illustrated in Fig. 5. And finally, the following equation for the peak relative depth was obtained (accurate within 1.3% of error):

$$kd_p(\theta) = 3.43 \left(\frac{\tan \theta}{K_b} \right)^{-0.92} + 0.71. \quad (12)$$

The following conditions can, therefore, be defined based on Eq. (12):

- for $kd < kd_p$ regular waves are generated as predicted by Eq. (9),
- for $kd > kd_p$ broken waves are generated as predicted by Eq. (10),
- for $kd = kd_p$ a maximum wave height before breaking is achieved.




Fig. 5. Curve fitting of discrete solutions for a maximum relative depth kd given by Eq. (11), after which wave breaking occurs

Finally, a conditional wavemaker equation is presented for predicting the wave height to stroke ratio for a given wave number and water depth:

$$\frac{H}{S} = \begin{cases} \beta \frac{4 \sinh(kd)}{kd} \frac{kd \sinh(kd) - \cosh(kd) + 1}{\sinh(2kd) + 2kd} & \text{for } kd < kd_p \\ \beta K_b \frac{2\pi}{\tan \theta} \frac{\tanh(kd)}{kd} & \text{for } kd \geq kd_p \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

where β depends on the amount of leakage around the paddle and K_b is the breaking coefficient. However, Eq. (13) should be valid for any flap-type wavemaker, regardless of what value is chosen (or calibrated) for parameters β and K_b . A comparison between measured wave heights and Eq. (13) for $\beta = 0.81$ and $K_b = 0.14$ is also shown in Figure 4.

3.4. Conditional wavemaker equation in terms of frequency and water depth

Although for each wave number and depth, a corresponding wave frequency may iteratively be found, sometimes it is more convenient to have a wave maker equation defined as a function of water depth and frequency. Using trigonometric hyperbolic functions and curve fitting, the following approximation of Eq. (9) was found (with 3% of error for $kd < \pi$ and 0.6% of error for $kd \geq \pi$):

$$H \approx 2\beta d \tan \theta \left[1 - \frac{1.03 \tanh(0.79 \omega^2 d / g)^{0.97}}{(\omega^2 d / g)^{1.02}} \right]. \quad (14)$$

A comparison between the classical wavemaker equation (9) and the proposed approximate Eq. (14) is illustrated in Fig. 6A.

Wave breaking equation (10) can also be rewritten as a function of the frequency and depth. Since the dispersion equation that defines the relationship between the wave number and wave frequency is implicit, we will base our analysis on its explicit alternative [Guo, 2002]:

$$kd \approx \frac{\omega^2 d}{g} \left[1 - \exp(-(\omega \sqrt{d/g})^{5/2}) \right]^{-2/5}, \quad (15)$$

which approximates Eq. (2) with under 0.75% of error. From Eq. (15) it follows that

$$\tanh(kd) \approx \left[1 - \exp(-(\omega \sqrt{d/g})^{5/2}) \right]^{2/5}, \quad (16)$$

therefore, the wave breaking equation can be rewritten as:

$$H_b \approx \beta K_b \frac{2\pi g}{\omega^2} \left[1 - \exp(-(\omega \sqrt{d/g})^{5/2}) \right]^{4/5}. \quad (17)$$

A comparison between the proposed approximate Eq. (17) and wave breaking equation (10) is illustrated in Fig. 6B. The comparison is presented for paddle angle $\theta = 25^\circ$, but all other angles show almost identical results.




Fig. 6. Comparison of: A) wavemaker Eq. (9) to approximate Eq. (14) and B) wave breaking Eq. (6) to approximate Eq. (17) for $\theta = 25^\circ$

What remains is to find the peak frequency f_p that defines the validity limit for Eq. (14), *i.e.*, defines the maximum wave height before breaking. For each relative depth kd_i that satisfies Eq. (11) a corresponding dimensionless frequency was found, written as follows:

$$\left(\frac{\omega^2 d}{g} \right)_i = kd_i \tanh(kd_i). \quad (18)$$

Next, a power curve was fitted to a series of points defined by parameters $\omega^2 d/g$ and $\tan \theta/K_b$. And, finally, after some algebraic manipulation, the following formula for the peak frequency is obtained (accurate within 2% of error):

$$f_p(d, \theta) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sqrt{\frac{3.77g}{d} \left(\frac{\tan \theta}{K_b} \right)^{-0.83} + \frac{0.37g}{d}}. \quad (19)$$

Fig. 7 shows the curves derived from Eq. (19) for different combinations of coefficients and relative paddle angles $\tan \theta/K_b$, which define the validity of the wavemaker theory and delineate the non-breaking from breaking waves.

The following conditions can now be defined based on Eq. (19):

- for $f < f_p$ regular waves are generated as predicted by Eq. (14),
- for $f > f_p$ broken waves are generated as predicted by Eq. (17),
- for $f = f_p$ a maximum wave height before breaking is achieved.




Fig. 7. Set of curves (Eq. 19) that define the maximum frequency for a given depth after which wave breaking occurs

Finally, a new conditional equation is obtained for directly predicting generated wave heights for a given water depth, paddle angle and frequency.

$$H(f, d, \theta) \approx \begin{cases} 2\beta d \tan \theta \left[1 - \frac{1.03 \tanh(3.16\pi^2 f^2 d/g)^{0.97}}{(4\pi^2 f^2 d/g)^{1.02}} \right] & \text{for } f < f_p \\ \beta K_b \frac{g}{2\pi f^2} \left[1 - \exp(-(2\pi f \sqrt{d/g})^{5/2}) \right]^{4/5} & \text{for } f \geq f_p \end{cases}, \quad (20)$$

The comparison of measured values and Eq. (20) is illustrated in Fig. 8 for each measured depth and paddle angle. Note that the two-step process does not increase

the complexity in obtaining wave heights, since the classical approach also requires that the wave dispersion equation is solved before the wave height to paddle stroke ratio can be obtained.




Fig. 8. Comparison of the measured wave heights and new Eq. (20) with $\beta = 0.81$ and $K_b = 0.14$ for different paddle angles at depth: A) $d = 29$ cm and B) $d = 19$ cm

To summarize, Eq. (7) is a general way of mathematically describing a new approach that combines the classical wavemaker equation with a wave breaking formula to predict both regular and broken waves generated by a flap-type wave-maker. Equation (13) in comparison to Eq. (7) is written as a combined equation with explicitly defined boundaries of validity, which additionally includes the energy loss coefficient β to account for the leakage around the paddle. Equation (20), on the other hand, is an approximation of Eq. (13), which should produce almost the same results. The only difference between these two equations is that the former is explicitly defined and therefore the results can be computed directly for a given water depth, paddle angle and frequency. Equations (7), (13) and (20) are shown side-by-side in Fig. 9 to illustrate their similarities and differences.

4. Effect of the leakage around the paddle

In this study the effects of leakage were accounted for by introducing an energy loss coefficient, which was computed by linear regression between the measured and theoretical values for non-broken waves. However, this reduction in wave heights can be predicted based on waves characteristics and the ratio of the gaps to the flume cross-section. Madsen [1970] proposed the following analytical expression for the wave height reduction which accounts for the leakage under and through the




Fig. 9. Equations (7), (13) and (20) in terms of relative frequency for $\theta = 5 - 25^\circ$

sides of the paddle [Madsen, 1970]:

$$\frac{\Delta H}{H} = - \left[2.22 \frac{\Delta b}{d} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\cosh kd}} \frac{kd}{\sinh kd} + 1.11 \frac{\Delta s}{b} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{1}{\cosh kd}} \right) \right] \sqrt{\frac{gH}{2U^2}} \quad (21)$$

where ΔH is the difference between generated and theoretical wave heights, Δb is the size of the gap between the paddle and flume bottom, Δs is the size of the gap between the flume walls and the paddle, b is the flume cross-section width, and U is the wavemaker velocity averaged over depth. Note that the energy loss coefficient is related to the height reduction as $\beta = 1 - \Delta H/H$.

In the current experiments, the paddle is connected to the flume bottom by a rubber strip to eliminate any leakage under the paddle, however, the gap between a 31 cm wide paddle and flume walls is $\Delta s = 14$ mm (4.5%). For current wavemaker setup, Eq. (21) predicts wave height reductions ranging from 17% to 39% (with a mean value of 25.1 % and standard deviation 5.3 %). This is in a good agreement with an average reduction of 20.7% (standard deviation 8.1%) obtained from comparing measured and theoretical wave heights. A close value was also obtained using linear regression to compare measured and theoretical wave heights, where a constant 19% reduction resulted in the smallest root mean square error (RMSE = 3.3 mm).

A similar difference was found in the Madsen's experiment [1970], where a wave height reduction of 15% was measured for a 3% leakage area. Oliveira *et al.* [2012] found a 8.2 – 8.9% reductions for $\Delta b = 1.2$ cm, $\Delta s = 1.0$ cm and $b = 40$ cm. Keating & Webber [1977] showed that when leakage is minimized, height reduction may become lower than 5%. However, Wu *et al.* [2016] studied generation of solitary waves by a wavemaker and numerically analysed the influence of leakage around

the paddle. They found that the leakage is still apparent even for a very a small gap of just 0.24%. Although Madsen's expression produced reliable prediction of an average wave height reduction in the present study, fully understanding the influence of leakage is, clearly, still an unresolved issue, which requires further experimental and numerical investigation.

5. Conclusion

A combined wavemaker equation for both regular and broken waves was presented in this study. The limitations of the classical wavemaker equation for the prediction of wave heights based on specific paddle angles and frequencies at a certain water depth were demonstrated. The first limitation is that the wavemaker theory is not valid for broken waves. The second, more practical difficulty, is that the wavemaker is sometimes implicit in predicting the wave height based on the experimental set-up (water depth and paddle frequency).

The first problem was solved by combining the linear wavemaker theory with a wave breaking equation, which was expressed as a wave height to paddle stroke ratio. The proposed Eq. (13) indicated a close agreement with small-scale laboratory measurements for both regular and broken waves generated by a flap-type wavemaker. Furthermore, a relative depth limit that defines the maximum wave height before breaking was explicitly defined (Eq. 12). However, waves that break at the paddle are not sufficiently investigated; therefore additional measurements are needed to instil more confidence in the combined equation.

The second difficulty was resolved by deriving an approximate equation (20) for both the wavemaker and wave breaking equation expressed in terms of the water depth, paddle angle and frequency. Comparisons of approximate results against both classical equations and measurements indicated a satisfactory agreement. Furthermore, a frequency limit that denotes the validity range of the wavemaker theory and the maximum wave heights before breaking was also explicitly defined (Eq. 19).

To conclude, the proposed equation should be valid and applicable for any flap-type wavemaker, under the assumption that the energy loss and breaking coefficient are determined by the calibration. Also, it should be straightforward to derive a similar approximation for a piston-type wavemaker by following the methodology presented here.

Acknowledgments

This work has been supported in part by Ministry of Science and Education of the Republic of Croatia under the project Research Infrastructure for Campus-based Laboratories at the University of Rijeka, number RC.2.2.06-0001, which was co-funded from the European Fund for Regional Development (ERDF). The support has also been provided in part by the University of Rijeka under the project Hydrology of Water Resources and Risk Identification from Floods and Mudflows in

Karst Areas (13.05.1.1.03).

References

- Anbarsooz, M., Passandideh-Fard, M. & Moghiman, M. [2013] "Fully nonlinear viscous wave generation in numerical wave tanks", *Ocean. Eng.*, **59**, pp. 73-85.
- Battjes, J.A. & Janssen, J. [1978] "Energy loss and set-up due to breaking of random waves", *Coast. Eng.*, 1978. pp. 569-587.
- Biesel, F., & Suquet, F. [1951] "Laboratory wave generating apparatus", *La Houille Blanche*, Vol. 2, pp. 147-165.
- Chakrabarti, A. & Sahoo, T. [1998] "The effect of surface tension in porous wave maker problems", *J. Aust. Math. Soc. Ser. B.*, **39**, pp. 539-556.
- Chwang, A.T. [1983] "A porous-wavemaker theory", *J. Fluid. Mech.*, **132**, pp. 395-406.
- Danel, P. [1952] "On Limiting Clapotis, Gravity Waves", National Bureau of Standards, Circular, Vol. 521 (US Department of Commerce), pp. 35-45.
- Dean, R. G., & Dalrymple, R. A. [1991] *Water wave mechanics for engineers and scientists (Vol. 2)*, (World scientific publishing Co Inc., Singapore)
- Fenton, J.D. [1985] "A fifth-order Stokes theory for steady waves", *J. Waterw. Port. C. Div.*, **111**(2), pp. 216-234.
- Finnegan, W. & Goggins, J. [2012] "Numerical simulation of linear water waves and wave-structure interaction", *Ocean Eng.*, **43**, pp. 23-31.
- Gilbert, G., Thompson, D. & Brewer, A. [1971] "Design curves for regular and random wave generators", *J. Hydraul. Res.*, **9**(2), pp. 163-196.
- Goda, Y. & Suzuki, Y. [1976] "Estimation of incident and reflected waves in random wave experiments", *Coastal Engineering Proceeding*, **48**(15), pp. 828-845.
- Guo, J. [2002] "Simple and explicit solution of wave dispersion equation", *Coast. Eng.*, **45**(2), pp. 71-74.
- Havelock, T.H. [1929] "Forced Surface Wave on Water", *Philos. Mag.*, **8**(7), pp. 569-576.
- Hocking, L.M. & Mahdmina, D. [1991] "Capillary-gravity waves produced by a wavemaker", *J. Fluid. Mech.*, **224**, pp. 217-226.
- Huang, C.J., Zhang, E.C. & Lee, J.F. [1998] "Numerical simulation of nonlinear viscous wavefields generated by piston-type wavemaker", *J. Eng. Mech.*, **124**(10), pp. 1110-1120.
- Kamphuis, J. W. [1991] "Incipient wave breaking", *Coast. Eng.*, **15**, pp. 185-203.
- Keating, T. & Webber, N. [1977] "The Generation of Periodic Waves in a Laboratory Channel: a Comparison between Theory and Experiment", *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers*, **63**(4), pp. 819-832.
- Lal, A. & Elangovan, M. [2008] "CFD simulation and validation of flap type wave-maker", *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, **4**(1), pp. 76-82.
- Madsen, O.S. [1970] "Waves generated by a piston-type wavemaker", *Coast. Eng.*, 1970, pp. 589-607.
- Miche, A. [1944]. "Mouvements ondulatoires de la mer en profondeur constante ou décroissante", *Annales des Ponts et Chausses*, Vol. 25, pp. 369-406.
- Mohapatra, S.C., Karmakar, D. & Sahoo, T. [2011] "On capillary gravity-wave motion in two-layer fluids", *J. Eng. Math.*, **71**(3), pp. 253-277.
- Neyrpic [1952]. "Laboratory wave generating apparatus. From the user's viewpoint", *La Houille Blanche*, Vol. 6, pp. 779-801.
- Oliveira, T.C.A, Sanchez-Arcilla, A. & Gironella, X. [2012] "Simulation of wave overtopping of maritime structures in a numerical wave flume", *J. App. Math.*, **2012**, pp. 1-19.
- Ostendorf, D. W. & Madsen, O. S. [1979] "An analysis of longshore current and associated sediment transport in the surf zone", Report No. 241, Department of Civil Engineering, MIT, pp. 1165-1178.
- Rattanapitikon, W. & Shibayama, T. [2000] "Verification and modification of breaker height formulas", *Coast. Eng. J.*, **42**(4), pp. 389-406.

- Rattanapitikon, W., Vivattanasirak, T. & Shibayama, T. [2003] “A proposal of new breaker height formula”, *Coast. Eng. J.*, **45**(1), pp. 29-48.
- Robertson, B. and Hall, K. and Zytner, R. & Nistor, I. [2013] “Breaking waves: Review of characteristic relationships”, *Coast. Eng. J.*, **55**(1), pp. 1350002.
- Saincher, S., & Banerjee, J. [2015] “Design of a numerical wave tank and wave flume for low steepness waves in deep and intermediate water”. *Procedia Engineering*, **116**, pp. 221–228.
- Stuhlmeier, R., & Stiassnie, M. [2016] “Adapting Havelock’s wave-maker theorem to acoustic-gravity waves”. *IMA J. App. Math.*, **81**(4), pp. 631–646.
- Stiassnie, M. [2009] “Tsunamis and acoustic-gravity waves from underwater earthquakes”, *J. Eng. Math.*, **67**, pp. 23-32.
- Tian, M., & Kadri, U. [2017] “Wavemaker theories for acousticgravity waves over a finite depth”. *J. Eng. Math.*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10665-017-9902-1>.
- Ursell, F., Dean, R.G. & Yu, Y. [1960] “Forced small-amplitude water waves: a comparison of theory and experiment”, *J. Fluid. Mech.*, **7**(1), pp. 33-52.
- Wu, N.J., Hsiao, S.C., Chen, H.H., & Yang, R.Y. [2016] “The study on solitary waves generated by a piston-type wave maker”, *J. Ocean Eng.*, **117**, pp. 114-129.