




A coupled model for the accumulation of cosmogenic radionuclides during shore platform development

Martin D. Hurst^[co-first author]^[corresponding author]¹, Hironori Matsumoto^{*2}, Jennifer R. Shadrick^{†3}, and Mark E. Dickson^{‡4}

¹ School of Geographical and Earth Sciences, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland, UK. ² Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, US. ³ Earth Science and Engineering, Imperial College London, London, UK. ⁴ School of Environment, University of Auckland, Auckland, NZ.

DOI: [10.21105/joss.03689](https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.03689)

Software

- [Review](#) 
- [Repository](#) 
- [Archive](#) 

Editor: [Pending Editor](#) 

Submitted: 03 September 2021¹⁴

Published: 03 September 2021¹⁵

License

Authors of papers retain copyright and release the work under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License ([CC BY 4.0](#)).

Summary

Rock coasts evolve relatively slowly and oftentimes episodically, and because they are erosive in nature there is little evidence of their former state. These two factors compound to make it difficult to constrain the nature of processes that dictate their evolution, and associated rates of change across appropriately long timescales (centuries to millennia). Measuring how rapidly rock coasts have evolved in the past is important to understand how they will react to future environmental change. Recent developments in numerical modelling of rock coast weathering and erosion processes have shed new light on the fundamental controls on rock coast evolution at these timescales. In parallel, measurement of the concentration of rare cosmogenic radionuclides (CRNs) that accumulate in rocks at the coast is providing a new empirical basis for understanding the development of rock coasts over similarly long timescales. The accumulation of CRNs occurs most rapidly when rocks are near to the Earth surface, and thus the rates and processes by which rocks are unveiled at the coast is a first order control on the amount of CRNs that will be found in rock samples at the coast. Thus, numerical models that account for the morphological development of the shore platform coupled with modelled CRN production are vital if measured CRN concentrations are to reveal the style and pace of rock coast morphodynamics. Towards achieving this end, a coupled model of rock coast morphodynamics and CRN accumulation is presented here.

Statement of need

Rock coasts make up a substantial proportion of the global coastline. Rock decay and wave-driven erosion combine to drive the landward retreat of bedrock, typically resulting in cliffed coasts fronted by shore platforms ([Kennedy et al., 2014](#)). The products of erosion (regolith/debris/beach material) are gradually destroyed or removed in this erosion-limited environment. Rates of erosion by cliff retreat and shore platform lowering are typically considered to be slow. A recent compilation of global cliff retreat rates identified that rates vary from a few mm yr⁻¹ to 10s cm yr⁻¹, with the substrate lithology exerting a dominant control on retreat rates ([Prémaillon et al., 2018](#)). Shore platform erosion rates are typically on the order of mm yr⁻¹ ([Cullen & Bourke, 2018](#); [Stephenson et al., 2012](#); [Swirad et al., 2019](#)). Measurement of cliff retreat and shore platform erosion at rock coasts is temporally limited

*co-first author

†co-first author

‡co-first author

38 to at most a few decades. Therefore, reconstruction of the long-term (centennial-millennial)
39 development, prior to observational records has until recently, been inferential at best, based
40 on conceptual understanding of processes extrapolated using exploratory numerical models
41 (Ashton et al., 2011; Matsumoto et al., 2016; Trenhaile, 2000).

42 Rocks exposed at the Earth surface harbour an archive of cosmogenic radionuclides (CRNs)
43 that reflect how long they have been uncovered or how rapidly they were unveiled to the
44 surface (Dickin, 1995; Gosse & Phillips, 2001). The constant bombardment of the Earth by
45 cosmic radiation causes nuclear reactions that produce CRNs when high energy cosmic ray
46 particles collide with matter down to a few metres below the Earth surface. Measurement
47 of CRN concentrations in bedrock and sediment samples are routinely used in the field of
48 Geosciences to constrain the age of bedrock outcrops or sedimentary deposits, or to estimate
49 rates of erosion at a local or catchment scale (e.g. Granger et al., 2013). Thus, concentrations
50 of CRNs in shore platforms reflects the style and rate of morphological development of the
51 coast (Hurst et al., 2017; Regard et al., 2012).

52 Several recent studies have measured CRN concentrations in rock samples collected from
53 shore platforms in order to estimate long-term rates of cliff retreat or to demonstrate the
54 antiquity of shore platforms at the coast (Choi et al., 2012; Hurst et al., 2016; Raimbault
55 et al., 2018; Regard et al., 2012; Rogers et al., 2012; Swirad et al., 2020). However, the
56 distribution of CRN concentrations across shore platforms is dependent on the pace and style
57 of morphological changes, and thus we require morphodynamic models that represent the
58 myriad of processes influencing shore platform development coupled to predictions of CRN
59 concentration distributions (Hurst et al., 2017). These previous efforts had represented the
60 morphological development of rock coasts in a highly simplistic way, assuming the shoreward
61 translation of a constant shore platform geometry, with the elevation of the cliff-platform
62 junction tracking changes in mean relative sea level. However, there is little basis for this
63 notion of equilibrium in rock coast development (Dickson et al., 2013). Numerical models
64 of shore platform development suggests that shore platforms tend to widen through time
65 [Trenhaile (2000); Matsumoto2016a], with cliff retreat rates declining through time as wave
66 energy is dissipated across the widening shore platform. The exception is when relative sea
67 level rise results continues to facilitate wave energy reaching landward parts of the shore
68 platform, such that cliff retreat continues in some way proportional to the rate relative sea
69 level rise (Ashton et al., 2011), and an equilibrium condition can emerge.

70 Morphodynamic models of rock coast development can exhibit a range of behaviours de-
71 pending on intrinsic and extrinsic conditions including tidal range, relative sea level change,
72 lithological properties and wave energy delivery (Matsumoto et al., 2016, 2018; Trenhaile,
73 2014). However, it is not well known how these behaviours impact upon the expected distri-
74 bution of CRNs stored in the coastal bedrock. Trenhaile suggested that “while [CRN] has the
75 potential to revolutionize our understanding of the evolution of rock coasts, the accuracy of
76 the results is dependent on the validity of the conceptual and mathematical model assump-
77 tions that have to be made” (2018, p. 80). He goes on to highlight several key research
78 challenges relating to processes that are poorly represented in morphodynamic models (such
79 as weathering processes), or absent entirely (such as abrasion, block detachment/quarrying
80 and biological processes). This highlights a critical circular problem, that CRNs can reveal
81 rates of rock coast development but requires a model of rock coast evolution that faithfully
82 represents the dominant processes driving change, while measurements of CRNs has been
83 suggested could improve our process understanding. Nevertheless, in order to progress ef-
84 forts to quantify long-term rock coast development, a coupled modelling framework for the
85 morphodynamic development of rock coasts and accumulation of cosmogenic radionuclides is
86 required.

87 RPM-CRN

88 This paper contributes a coupled model combining rock coast and shore platform development
89 ([Matsumoto et al., 2016](#)) and CRN production at rock coasts ([Hurst et al., 2017](#)) in order
90 to provide a framework for interpreting the history of coastal evolution from measured CRN
91 concentrations. RPM-CRN is being used to interpret the topography and CRN concentrations
92 at various rock coast settings globally through multi-objective optimisation to these field data
93 ([Shadrick et al., 2021](#)).

94 Acknowledgements

95 This modelling effort has benefitted from discussions with Michael A. Ellis, Wayne J Stephen-
96 son and Larissa A Naylor. We acknowledge financial support from the Marine Alliance for
97 Science and Technology Scotland (MASTS).

98 References

- 99 Ashton, A. D., Walkden, M. J. A., & Dickson, M. E. (2011). Equilibrium responses of
100 cliffed coasts to changes in the rate of sea level rise. *Marine Geology*, 284(1-4), 217–229.
101 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.margeo.2011.01.007>
- 102 Choi, K. H., Seong, Y. B., Jung, P. M., & Lee, S. Y. (2012). Using Cosmogenic ¹⁰Be Dating
103 to Unravel the Antiquity of a Rocky Shore Platform on the West Coast of Korea. *Journal of*
104 *Coastal Research*, 282(3), 641–657. [https://doi.org/10.2112/JCOASTRES-D-11-00087.](https://doi.org/10.2112/JCOASTRES-D-11-00087.1)
105 1
- 106 Cullen, N. D., & Bourke, M. C. (2018). Clast abrasion of a rock shore platform on the Atlantic
107 coast of Ireland. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*. [https://doi.org/10.1002/esp.](https://doi.org/10.1002/esp.4421)
108 4421
- 109 Dickin, A. P. (1995). *Cosmogenic nuclides* (pp. 360–396). Cambridge University Press.
110 ISBN: 0521431514
- 111 Dickson, M. E., Ogawa, H., Kench, P. S., & Hutchinson, A. (2013). Sea-cliff retreat and shore
112 platform widening: Steady-state equilibrium? *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*,
113 38(9), 1046–1048. <https://doi.org/10.1002/esp.3422>
- 114 Gosse, J. C., & Phillips, F. M. (2001). Terrestrial in situ cosmogenic nuclides: Theory and
115 application. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 20(14), 1475–1560. [https://doi.org/10.1016/](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-3791(00)00171-2)
116 [S0277-3791\(00\)00171-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-3791(00)00171-2)
- 117 Granger, D. E., Lifton, N. A., & Willenbring, J. K. (2013). A cosmic trip: 25 years of
118 cosmogenic nuclides in geology. *Bulletin of the Geological Society of America*, 125(9-10),
119 1379–1402. <https://doi.org/10.1130/B30774.1>
- 120 Hurst, M. D., Rood, D. H., & Ellis, M. A. (2017). Controls on the distribution of cosmogenic
121 ¹⁰Be across shore platforms. *Earth Surface Dynamics*, 5, 67–84. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-5-67-2017)
122 [5194/esurf-5-67-2017](https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-5-67-2017)
- 123 Hurst, M. D., Rood, D. H., Ellis, M. A., Anderson, R. S., & Dornbusch, U. (2016). Recent
124 acceleration in coastal cliff retreat rates on the south coast of Great Britain. *Proceedings*
125 *of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113, 13336–13341. [https://doi.org/10.1073/PNAS.](https://doi.org/10.1073/PNAS.1613044113)
126 [1613044113](https://doi.org/10.1073/PNAS.1613044113)

- 127 Kennedy, D. M., Stephenson, W. J., & Naylor, L. a. (2014). Chapter 1 Introduction to
128 the rock coasts of the world. *Geological Society, London, Memoirs*, 40(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1144/M40.1>
129
- 130 Kennedy, D. M., Stephenson, W. J., & Naylor, L. a. (2014). Chapter 1 Introduction to
131 the rock coasts of the world. *Geological Society, London, Memoirs*, 40(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1144/M40.1>
132
- 133 Matsumoto, H., Dickson, M. E., & Kench, P. S. (2016). An exploratory numerical model of
134 rocky shore profile evolution. *Geomorphology*, 268, 98–109. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2016.05.017)
135 [geomorph.2016.05.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2016.05.017)
- 136 Matsumoto, H., Dickson, M. E., & Kench, P. S. (2018). Modelling the relative dominance of
137 wave erosion and weathering processes in shore platform development in micro- to mega-
138 tidal settings. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/esp.4422>
- 139 Prémaillon, M., Regard, V., Dewez, T. J. B., & Auda, Y. (2018). GlobR2C2 (Global Recession
140 Rates of Coastal Cliffs): a global relational database to investigate coastal rocky cliff
141 erosion rate variations. *Earth Surface Dynamics*, 2, 651–668.
- 142 Raimbault, C., Duperret, A., Regard, V., Molliex, S., Wyns, R., Authemayou, C., & Le, B.
143 (2018). Quaternary geomorphological evolution of a granitic shore platform constrained
144 by in situ 10 Be concentrations , Penmarc ' h , SW Brittany , France. *Marine Geology*,
145 395(November 2016), 33–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.margeo.2017.09.011>
- 146 Regard, V., Dewez, T., Bourl??s, D. L., Anderson, R. S., Duperret, A., Costa, S., Leanni, L.,
147 Lasseur, E., Pedroja, K., & Maillet, G. M. (2012). Late Holocene seacliff retreat recorded
148 by 10Be profiles across a coastal platform: Theory and example from the English Channel.
149 *Quaternary Geochronology*, 11, 87–97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quageo.2012.02.027>
- 150 Rogers, H. E., Swanson, T. W., & Stone, J. O. (2012). Long-term shoreline retreat rates on
151 Whidbey Island, Washington, USA. *Quaternary Research (United States)*, 78(2), 315–322.
152 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yqres.2012.06.001>
- 153 Shadrick, J. R., Hurst, M. D., Piggott, M. D., Hebditch, B. G., Seal, A. J., Wilcken, K.
154 M., & Rood, D. H. (2021). Multi-objective optimisation of a rock coast evolution model
155 with cosmogenic ¹⁰be analysis for the quantification of long-term cliff retreat rates. *Earth*
156 *Surface Dynamics Discussions*, 2021, 1–42. <https://doi.org/10.5194/esurf-2021-44>
- 157 Stephenson, W. J., Kirk, R. M., Kennedy, D. M., Finlayson, B. L., & Chen, Z. (2012). Long
158 term shore platform surface lowering rates: Revisiting Gill and Lang after 32 years. *Marine*
159 *Geology*, 299-302, 90–95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.margeo.2012.01.005>
- 160 Swirad, Z. M., Rosser, N. J., & Brain, M. J. (2019). Identifying mechanisms of shore platform
161 erosion using Structure-from-Motion (SfM) photogrammetry. *Earth Surface Processes and*
162 *Landforms*.
- 163 Swirad, Z. M., Rosser, N. J., Brain, M. J., Rood, D. H., Hurst, M. D., Wilcken, K. M., &
164 Barlow, J. (2020). Cosmogenic exposure dating reveals limited long-term variability in
165 erosion of a rocky coastline. *Nature Communications*, 11(1), 3804. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-17611-9)
166 [1038/s41467-020-17611-9](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-17611-9)
- 167 Trenhaile, A. S. (2000). Modeling the development of wave-cut shore platforms. *Marine*
168 *Geology*, 166(1-4), 163–178. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-3227\(00\)00013-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0025-3227(00)00013-X)
- 169 Trenhaile, A. S. (2014). Climate change and its impact on rock coasts. *Geological Society,*
170 *London, Memoirs*, 40(1), 7–17. <https://doi.org/10.1144/M40.2>
- 171 Trenhaile, A. S. (2018). Shore platform erosion and evolution : Implications for cosmogenic
172 nuclide analysis. *Marine Geology*, 403(March), 80–92. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.margeo.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.margeo.2018.05.005)
173 [2018.05.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.margeo.2018.05.005)