The structure of tides in the Western Iberian region
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Abstract

A s-coordinate three-dimensional model, regional ocean modeling system (ROMS), was implemented in the Western Iberian region ranging from the coast to 11°W aiming high-resolution tidal simulations for an homogeneous ocean. The features for tidal heights and ellipses for the principal constituents, M2, S2, N2, K2, K1, O1, P1 and Q1, were imposed at the boundaries of the model. A tidal analysis for heights and tidal currents was done allowing to calculate two-dimensional distribution of amplitudes and three-dimensional structure of tidal currents. The amplitudes and phases for heights agree with previous results and observations, showing a good precision on the tidal propagation in the interior of the domain. Tidal kinetic energy is dominated by the semi-diurnal components, mainly M2, and increases on the shelf. Over the Lisbon Promontory the diurnal component K1 is however the second more energetic harmonic. Vertical variation of tidal ellipse parameters evidences the different structure of semi-diurnal and diurnal tidal components, as well as differences between the open sea and shelf tidal circulation.
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1. Introduction

The main aim of this work is to study the tides and its associated currents in the shelf/slope of western Iberian Peninsula based on a three-dimensional (3-D) model. In spite of a large number of studies and observational programmes on this region were (and are) devoted to subinertial aspects of the circulation at the shelf/slope, much less studies about the tidal dynamics in this region can be found.

The Western Iberian Peninsula (Fig. 1) extends approximately south–north along the meridian 9°W, between 37°N and 43°N. The shelf width is approximately 40 km unless in the southernmost region, until Lisbon, where it is half of this value. The region is characterised by the presence of several irregularities determinant for the tidal dynamics, namely the Lisbon Promontory (LP) and four main canyons: Setúbal, Nazaré, Aveiro and Porto. The bathymetry profile from cape S. Vicente to Setúbal Canyon is characterised by the lack of a clear shelf break and the depth increases in a near exponential manner.

Previous work has already been done in this region using also a 3-D model (Fanjul et al., 1997) and using bidimensional finite elements models (Sauvaget et al., 2000; Fortunato et al., 2002). Fanjul et al. (1997) performs a very extensive analysis of the tidal propagation for the eastern North Atlantic region. They put a special emphasis
in comparison with observational data (tidal gauges and currentmeters on the French shelf) and achieve a very accurate description in terms of the propagation of the tidal wave. However, their model configuration is not designed to study the details of the adjustment of the tidal wave in the shelf/slope region. Bidimensional modelling study of Sauvaget et al. (2000) is centred mainly on the numerical formulation of the finite elements model and the comparison of amplitudes and phases with tidal gauges registers. Fortunato et al. (2002) also with finite element modelling approach, give emphasis to the generation of barotropic shelf waves arising from diurnal tides at the LP. The main feature of the above-cited works is an accurate comparison of amplitudes and phases of the main tidal constituents with observational data (tidal gauges). The main emphasis of this work will be to carry out a study of some 3-D aspects of the adjustment of the tidal ellipses at the shelf/slope, namely, the horizontal structure (amplitude and polarisation) and the vertical structure in the water column. However, some comparisons of tidal heights and tidal currents are done to assure the model results validation.

For several years, two-dimensional models gave adequate results for predictions of tidal elevations. However, because of much small scale variability of tidal currents, in comparison with elevations, a rigorous study of tidal dynamics on the shelf requires high resolution 3-D numerical model (Prandle, 1997b; Davies et al., 1997). This is a consequence of the higher bottom and internal frictional influence in these regions (Prandle, 1997a). Because diurnal currents are more sensitive to friction than the semi-diurnals currents of the same magnitude (Prandle, 1997b), this may be a justification to the fact that in the above mentioned previous studies, diurnal constituents exhibit larger deviations when compared with available data.

Many results of this work are built upon previous theoretical and observational works on tidal dynamics. A good explanation of the vertical tidal ellipse variation was given by Prandle (1982) for the homogeneous case and some other studies for the stratified ocean also exist (Souza and Simpson, 1996; Simpson, 1997; Xing and Davies, 1997, 1998).

The stratification is not considered in this study, neglecting the internal tide associated with the interaction between steep topography, the stratification and the barotropic tide. Although we do not expect that the influence of internal wave propagation to be so large as in Bay of Biscay (New and da Silva, 2002) or in Malin-Hebrides region (Xing and Davies, 1998), some evidences from internal tide tidal currents can be found in Vitorino et al. (2002), which reports bottom intensification and cross-shore polarisation of currents along the Porto Canyon axis, over the shelf. However, the comparison of tidal ellipses of stations located in the inner shelf reported in this work indicates that the effects of stratification in tidal currents are not important in that region. Also, it is not expected that the amplitude and phase of tidal wave be significantly affected by stratification, similarly to the Xing and Davies (1998) study.

The following section describes the model setup and parameterisation. Section 3 includes the results
and its analysis being divided in analysis of tidal heights, analysis of tidal currents, analysis of the vertical structure of tidal ellipse parameters and analysis of sensitivity of the results to the bottom friction. In Section 4 the results are summarised.

2. Model setup and parameterisation

A 3-D model was used to simulate tidal dynamics in the Western Iberian Peninsula Coast. The model is ROMS (Haidvogel et al., 2000), a free surface, hydrostatic, primitive equations model, with vertical s-coordinates (Song and Haidvogel, 1994).

The grid used covers the longitudes between 8.5°W and 11°W and the latitudes 37°N–43.5°N (Fig. 1), thus 720 km in the south–north direction and 210 km in the west–east direction. Grid resolution is constant with ~0.75 km in the zonal (W–E) direction and ~2 km in the meridional (S–N) direction, consisting in 280 by 360 grid points. Ten vertical s-levels were used, with \( \theta_s = 3 \) and \( \theta_b = 0.4 \), as defined by Song and Haidvogel (1994), indicating that vertical resolution is increased in surface and bottom.

In this study, homogeneous conditions for temperature and salinity, with values \( T = 14^\circ\text{C} \) and \( S = 35\text{psu} \), were used.

Grid topography was taken from General Bathymetric Chart of the Oceans (GEBCO) 1-min global bathymetric grid, with some corrections on the continental shelf.

ROMS was forced at the open boundaries with tidal parameters for elevations (amplitudes and phases) and for current ellipses (semi-major axis, semi-minor axis, inclination and phase). Tidal data was obtained from OSU TOPEX/Poseidon Global Inverse Solution, TPXO (Egbert and Erofeeva, 2002). TPXO is a global model of ocean tides, which best suits the Laplace tidal equation and data from the TOPEX/Poseidon orbit cycles. It uses an inversion scheme (Egbert et al., 1994) developed for assimilating the altimetric data into a global barotropic model. That model provides elevations and tidal currents for the main semi-diurnal and diurnal constituents (M2, S2, N2, K2 and K1, O1, P1, Q1, respectively) with a resolution of 1°/6° for the North Atlantic. As a first approach, barotropic initial conditions were used. The model was ran for 60 days and the output time series of ocean surface heights and ocean currents was analysed, using harmonic least squares fit, to retrieve harmonic parameters of tides. The output time series were separated by 5 grid points, in both S–N and W–E direction, i.e., with a resolution of 10 per 3.75 km, respectively.

The simulation period was smaller than synodic period of some pairs of constituents, following Rayleigh criterion. In the case of S2 and K2, or K1 and P1, the time series length should be at least 182 days. However, using Fourier analysis it was realised that shallow water tidal constituents are not important in the studied region. For this reason, the least-squares fit was done only with the forcing frequencies becoming the Rayleigh criterion unnecessary.

Model setup parameters are shown in Table 1. The vertical mixing scheme is based on the vertical closure turbulent model proposed by Large et al. (1994) (K-profile parameterisation, KPP).

Due to the importance of the bottom friction for the tidal currents on the shelf, four simulations were performed in order to test the sensitivity of the parameterisation of the bottom friction on the tidal dynamics (Table 2). In three simulations, a linear bottom friction condition \( (\tau_b = rv_b, \text{where } v_b \text{ stands for the velocity at the deepest level}) \), with different bottom drag coefficients, \( r \), was used. In one simulation a typical value of \( r = 3 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m s}^{-1} \) was used, and in the other two, half and the double of this value. In the fourth simulation, a quadratic formulation, \( \tau_b = C_d v_b U_b, \text{where } v_b \text{ is an horizontal current component at the deepest level, } U_b \text{ is the horizontal speed at the same level and } C_d = (k/\ln(z_b/z_0))^2, \text{with } k = 0.4 \text{ von Karman's} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Model setup parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( L )</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N )</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( h_{\text{max}} )</td>
<td>5125 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( h_{\text{min}} )</td>
<td>5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \theta_s )</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \theta_b )</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta x )</td>
<td>0.75 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta y )</td>
<td>2 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta t )</td>
<td>60 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta t_r )</td>
<td>3 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v )</td>
<td>15 m²s⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_t )</td>
<td>15 m²s⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \kappa )</td>
<td>5 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m}²\text{s}⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \kappa_t )</td>
<td>5 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m}²\text{s}⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r )</td>
<td>3 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}²\text{s}⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T )</td>
<td>14°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S )</td>
<td>35 psu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
constant, $z_b$ the height of the deepest level and $z_0$ the bottom roughness was used. For $z_0$, a typical value of 0.005 m was used.

### 3. Results

The characteristics of the slope and the latitudinal variations in bathymetry lead to important modifications in the offshore tidal wave, originally moving northwards as a Kelvin wave. Acting as a barrier to the tidal wave propagation, the relatively wide LP (see Fig. 1) is an important topographic feature in the studied region. In this area, different relative amplification of tidal constituents originates an interesting horizontal tidal currents pattern, with currents in opposite directions at points separated by few dozens of kilometres at the shelf, analysed below.

Tides in the Western Iberian Coast are dominated by the semi-diurnal tidal components $M_2$ and $S_2$ (Figs. 2 and 3), which give rise to clear spring-neap cycles modulated by other constituents. In some parts of the shelf like LP, however, diurnal harmonics, especially $K_1$, assume a great importance and modifies significantly the tidal currents pattern.

The results presented hereinafter, namely the tidal heights, tidal currents and vertical structure are the results of the main simulation (Table 2, run II), with linear drag coefficient $r = 3 \times 10^{-4} \text{m s}^{-1}$. At the end of this section, the sensitivity to bottom friction is analysed by comparing the results of the main simulation with the other simulations, with different bottom friction parameterisations (Table 2).

#### 3.1. Tidal heights

Figs. 2 and 3 show cotidal charts for the semi-diurnal and diurnal tidal components. Results are in agreement with Fanjul et al. (1997). Tidal wave propagates from south to north as a Kelvin wave with amplitudes decreasing offshore. Highest tidal amplitudes are found in the north of the region. $M_2$ is the main harmonic with amplitudes around 1 m, followed by $S_2$ with less than half of this value, $N_2$ with 0.25 m and $K_2$ with 0.1 m. Diurnal components show relative small values, around 0.08 m for $K_1$, 0.06 m for $O_1$, 0.02 m for $P_1$ and less than 0.02 m for $Q_1$. Exponential increase of amplitude towards the coast is found in all semi-diurnal charts for the generality of the region, and phase lines are perpendicular to the coast, while diurnal components do not show such behaviour. These components exhibit an amplification over LP and over the Galician shelf.

Table 3 shows a comparison of the simulated amplitudes and phases of tidal heights with analysis of observations done in Tables 3 and 4 of Fanjul et al. (1997), for two locations of the west coast of the Iberian Peninsula: Vigo and Cascais ports. We consider this comparison satisfactory, with amplitude differences of $O(1 \text{ cm})$ and typical phase errors of $3^\circ$ for semidiurnal components and $6^\circ$ for diurnal ones, and provides confidence for the results analysed in this work.

#### 3.2. Tidal currents

Figs. 4 and 5 show the tidal ellipses for the semi-diurnal and diurnal components calculated from the vertically integrated currents. The blue ellipses are counterclockwise and the red ones are clockwise. Pure Kelvin wave dynamics expects current ellipses rotating counterclockwise and aligned parallel to the coast. By these figures we realise that if this happens approximately in the open sea, it is not the case of the shelf region. Bathymetric irregularities have large influence in the adjustment of the velocity field. It is responsible for amplification of tidal currents, inversion of the direction of rotation of the tidal ellipses and its polarisation in certain directions.

The $S$–$N$ orientation of tidal currents changes in presence of the shelf features. In southern region, where slope is smooth this influence is not relevant. On the other hand, because of the steep slope of northern region, semidiurnal components suffer amplification and ellipses become polarised orthogonally to bathymetric lines. This behaviour has been observed in other places, recently by de Mesquita (2003) and Pereira et al. (2002), for
Fig. 2. Amplitudes (m) and Greenwich phases (deg) isolines of the semi-diurnal tidal components: M$_2$, S$_2$, N$_2$ and K$_2$. 
Fig. 3. Amplitudes (m) and Greenwich phases (deg) isolines of the diurnal tidal components: $K_1$, $O_1$, $P_1$, and $Q_1$. 
instance, and it happens in places were the wave front crosses the slope. Associated with the depth increase or decrease, the change of wave speed leads to wave refraction which make the wave front to become oriented parallel with isobaths (Pugh, 1987). This phenomenon is clearer in places with larger slope, that is, between LP and Galicia and is not a feature of diurnal tides.

Of special interest when referring to diurnal tides in the studied area, is the LP. This is the place where larger ellipse amplification of diurnal components occurs, associated with the intensified tidal amplitudes in this region (Fig. 3).

Diurnal currents amplification in the Western Iberian shelf has been studied in terms of topographic waves (Sauvaget et al., 2000). In what concerns tidal currents structure, four regimes are noticeable: open sea/shelf and semi-diurnal/diurnal currents. Shelf tidal circulation completely differs from open sea dynamics for all tidal components; all semi-diurnal current ellipses exhibits similar behaviour with different scales and the same statement is valid for diurnal current ellipses.

To quantify the relative importance of tidal components currents and the differences between open sea and shelf regimes, the kinetic energy density averaged over the tidal period was calculated for each tidal component. This calculus was done as

$$\frac{1}{T_i} \int_0^{T_i} \frac{1}{2} \rho (U_i^2 + V_i^2) dt,$$

where $T_i$ is the period of the tidal component $i$,

$$U_i = U_{0i} \cos \left( \frac{2\pi}{T_i} t + \phi_{ui} \right)$$

and

$$V_i = V_{0i} \cos \left( \frac{2\pi}{T_i} t + \phi_{vi} \right).$$

This integral results in $\rho (U_{0i}^2 + V_{0i}^2)$. Considering the absence of spatial density differences, because we are interested in relative values (rates), the expression used for the kinetic energy density was $U_{0i}^2 + V_{0i}^2$. Notice that the integral is independent of the number of periods used, i.e., the result is the same if we use $nT_i$ instead of $T_i$, for integer $n > 1$.

Table 4 shows these values for the barotropic velocities. The first column represents the rate between energy on shelf/upper slope of each component and energy of whole domain region for that component. Second column: rate between energy on Lisbon Promontory (LP) of each component and energy of whole domain region for that component. Third column: rate between energy on shelf/upper slope of each component and total energy of whole domain. Fourth column: rate between energy on LP of each component and total energy of whole domain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Shelf/region</th>
<th>LP/region</th>
<th>Shelf/total</th>
<th>LP/total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M_{2}</td>
<td>62.02</td>
<td>30.71</td>
<td>62.02</td>
<td>30.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S_{2}</td>
<td>51.92</td>
<td>15.87</td>
<td>40.48</td>
<td>12.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N_{2}</td>
<td>97.79</td>
<td>83.28</td>
<td>21.53</td>
<td>18.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K_{2}</td>
<td>51.78</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>33.41</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K_{1}</td>
<td>51.91</td>
<td>16.92</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N_{2}</td>
<td>54.28</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>15.22</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K_{2}</td>
<td>54.28</td>
<td>17.78</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K_{1}</td>
<td>97.69</td>
<td>82.23</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>12.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O_{1}</td>
<td>97.95</td>
<td>83.84</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_{1}</td>
<td>98.40</td>
<td>89.53</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q_{1}</td>
<td>96.38</td>
<td>84.81</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Simulated and observed amplitudes and phases of tidal heights for Cascais and Vigo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Cascais Amplitude (cm)</th>
<th>Phase (deg)</th>
<th>Vigo Amplitude (cm)</th>
<th>Phase (deg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obs</td>
<td>Sim</td>
<td>Obs</td>
<td>Sim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M_{2}</td>
<td>112.3</td>
<td>113.2</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S_{2}</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N_{2}</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K_{2}</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K_{1}</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O_{1}</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>313.0</td>
<td>317.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_{1}</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q_{1}</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>262.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observed data is taken from Tables 3 and 4 of Fanjul et al. (1997). Empty field is employed where no data is available.
The distribution of energy from each component (columns 1 and 2) shows that between 96 and 98% of the diurnal energy is on the shelf, mainly over LP.
(second column, 82–90%). For the semi-diurnal components these values decrease to about 50% over the shelf and 15–18% over LP. Comparing the energy of each component with the total energy (columns 3 and 4) we see that \( M_2 \) represents 33.41% of the energy distribution and one third of it is

---

**Fig. 5.** Barotropic tidal ellipses of the diurnal tidal components: \( K_1, O_1, P_1 \) and \( Q_1 \). Blue ellipses are counterclockwise, while red ones have clockwise rotation. The radial line inside the ellipses gives the Greenwich phase. Notice that \( K_1 \) ellipse scale is the double or the others.
found over LP (10.14%). In the case of \( K_1 \) this proportion increases to almost one, 15.25% for the shelf and 12.84% for LP, indicating a concentration of diurnal energy on LP. The diurnal components dominate over LP (last column), where \( K_1 \) is the strongest component followed by \( M_2, O_1 \) and \( P_1 \).

Similar analysis has been done for surface and bottom velocities (not shown). For the surface, the shelf energy density shows higher values, mainly for the semi-diurnal components where the rate between the shelf and the full region for each component is now about 67% (it was about 52% in the case of barotropic velocities). Diurnal components remain closer to the barotropic value, about 99%. Over LP (second column), the diurnals have approximately the same value but the semi-diurnals, however, decrease to about one third of the barotropic case. The bottom velocities follow very close (qualitatively and quantitatively) what happens at the surface.

An example of the complex behaviour of the tidal currents is reported in Fig. 6 in which the tidal elevation during 10 days is represented in the upper side of the figure for two stations, located at the positions P1 and P2, of Fig. 7. Both graphics of tidal elevations are almost coincident because both stations are close. However the tidal currents present rather different patterns. Even if the stations are separated by \( \sim 50 \) km in the shelf of LP, the time evolution of the tidal current is almost opposite in intensity and direction, in such a way that during flooding flow tide the currents in the offshore station P1 are in the northward direction and rotating clockwise whereas in the coastal station P2 the flow has southward direction and it turns mainly in the counterclockwise direction, opposing to the surrounding flow. This occurs because at P1 diurnal currents are similar in amplitude to semi-diurnal currents, generating a pattern essentially diurnal, while in location P2, diurnal currents are much smaller than at P1 and the typical semi-diurnal modulation is observed.

The validation of tidal heights is basically based on previous studies for this region as was done in Table 3, indicating a good agreement between observation and modelling. For currents validation there are some available data from currentmeters. Fig. 8 is a comparison between \( M_2 \) ellipses obtained through analysis of data collected during the Survival cruise, described in Santos et al. (2004), during 2 weeks of February 2000. The harmonic analysis of these time series was done with the T_TIDE package (Pawlowicz et al., 2002). The currentmeters location is shown in Fig. 7 as C1 and C2. C1 was placed at 10 m depth, being the total depth 30 m. At C2 there were two currentmeters at depths 20 and 45 m, being the total depth 80 m. Taking into account the small length of the data series and the current variance, this comparison is considered quite good, giving confidence to the results obtained in this work.

3.3. Vertical structure

The vertical structure of tidal ellipses parameters—semi-major axis, eccentricity, inclination and phase angle—will now be discussed. Three region slices were chosen for this analysis according to its tidal circulation behaviour. In each slice were selected a variable number of sites either on open sea and shelf, where twenty equally spaced in depths harmonic analysis of currents (obtained through interpolation between the s-levels) was performed.

Slices locations are shown in Fig. 7a by I, II and III. Fig. 7b–d shows the grid vertical slices at these locations, together with position of the analysed sites—numbered vertical lines. S-coordinate levels are also shown. This figure is particularly useful to see the topographic differences of the slices. We remark the nonexistence of shelf break in the slice III, corresponding to southern region, in contrast
with the steep slope in the other slices—LP (II) and northern region (I).

In Figs. 9 and 10 are represented the vertical profile of ellipse parameters for $M_2$ and $K_1$, respectively. Numbered (bold) lines correspond to the sites at the shelf and numbers increase in the offshore direction. Open sea sites were not numbered because the lines in these figures are very close, indistinguishable in some cases. Only $M_2$ harmonic, as semi-diurnal, and $K_1$ harmonic, as diurnal, are shown, because other semi-diurnal and diurnal components follow qualitatively the same analyses. Notice that in these figures, the mean value of the ellipse parameters was removed. In the vertical, relative depth is used, being 0 the surface and −1 the bottom.

These figures evidence the distinction between open sea and shelf. Offshore vertical structure of the velocity field is independent of the depth. Indeed, for the offshore stations, vertical variations in ellipses parameters occur usually only near the bottom. On the other hand, in the shelf, the vertical modification of ellipses occurs in the entire water column, also associated with spacial variations from
slice to slice. Differences in the way diurnal and semi-diurnal tidal components change, not only spatially but vertically, are also shown.

Tidal components have larger semi-major axis (Figs. 9 and 10, first column) usually below the surface decreasing with depth. A typical variation of \(O(1)\) cm s\(^{-1}\) in semi-major axis is found in all slices, for both \(M_2\) and \(K_1\), on the shelf except in slice III, located in the southern region, where the slope is very smooth (see Fig. 7). The largest surface to bottom variation occurs for the diurnal harmonic at the slices II, over the LP, where highest tidal current amplification exists. The vertical variation of ellipse amplitude and other parameters generally decrease offshore, until the shelf break, becoming the tidal structure essentially barotropic in the open sea.
Elliptic eccentricity (rate between semi-major and semi-minor axis; if 0 the ellipse is degenerated, a line segment; if 1 the ellipse is a counterclockwise circumference; if \(-1\), the ellipse is a clockwise circumference) behaves in opposite way to semi-major axis. Highest eccentricity is found at the bottom indicating that ellipses become more counterclockwise with depth (positive eccentricity means counterclockwise ellipse rotation). Once again, variation with depth has a minimum below the surface (in the case of semi-major axis it was a maximum). Larger amplitude of vertical variation also increases onshore. \(K_1\) eccentricity at offshore sites seems to be less barotropic than for \(M_2\).

Elliptic inclination (angle between semi-major axis, in the first or second quadrant, and \(u\)-axis) also evidences difference between semi-diurnal and diurnal components. Semi-diurnal ellipses inclination shows smaller difference between open sea and shelf than diurnal ones. Also should be noticed that diurnal inclinations in open sea are more depth dependent than semi-diurnal, increasing in the last third of water depth, near the bottom. If slice III is almost barotropic respecting semi-major axis, it is not in terms of inclination, which shows a variation comparable to the other slices. Inclination vertical profile of diurnal components is opposite to the semi-diurnal one.

Tidal ellipses phase (the angle, relative to Greenwich meridian, the ellipse need for currents reach the maximum in the first or second quadrant) evidences similar behaviour. Semi-diurnal components have bigger vertical variation in the shelf than diurnal components phases. A typical variation of \(O(10)^\circ\) almost linear between bottom and surface is found in the slice I and II for the semi-diurnal component. The variation in the diurnal \(K_1\) component is about two thirds of the semi-diurnal \(M_2\) phase’s vertical variation. In the slice III the phases are almost constant in the first half of the water column (from surface to bottom).

3.4. Sensitivity to bottom friction

The vertical structure of tidal currents, mainly in shelf regions, is sensitive to bottom friction, which should be responsible for many of the features described until here. Fig. 11 shows the vertical variation of the tidal ellipses parameters at the shelf station I.4, shown in Fig. 7a. Each row corresponds to one of the four runs done to test the sensitivity of the model to bottom friction (Table 2). The bold
lines correspond to the semi-diurnal harmonics $M_2$, $S_2$, $N_2$ and $K_2$ (with numbers 1–4), and the thin lines correspond to the diurnal components $K_1$, $O_1$, $P_1$ and $Q_1$ (with numbers 5–8). Like in previous figures, here again the mean value of the parameters was removed. In the rows one to three, the linear bottom friction was used with the drag coefficient increasing twice from run I to run II and from run II to run III (run II used a typical parameterisation and was the one analysed until here). In the last run it was used a quadratic bottom friction parameterisation, as described previously.

We realise that runs I to III are qualitatively very similar, but the variation of the ellipse parameters with depth increases with the bottom drag coefficient. This leads to a higher distinction between the behaviours of the diurnal and semi-diurnal components, mainly in terms of the ellipse inclination and phase angle. The run IV is in general more similar with run two, without quantitatively significative differences. This result was expected since run two and four correspond to typical parameterisations used in ocean modelling, in spite of the first (run II) be linear and the other (run VI) quadratic. One final simulation without bottom friction was also done. As result, the tidal currents become barotropic in the entire region. Also no distinction between semi-diurnal and diurnal vertical variation of parameters was possible.

4. Discussion and conclusions

A description of tidal dynamics of the Western Iberian Peninsula was obtained by means of
numerical modelling, putting emphasis on the study of the vertical structure of tidal ellipses for the homogeneous case. Stratification effects are beyond the scope of this study. It is well known that the stratification has influence on tidal ellipses (Souza and Simpson, 1996, Simpson 1997, Xing and Davies, 1997, 1998). However, in this study it has not been considered to avoid studying the many different situations concerning the stratification along the year for this region. Thus, the obtained results describe the winter situation in which the shelf is nearly homogeneous (Oliveira et al., 2004). As the main results for tidal heights amplitude and phase are similar to the previous literature (Fanjul et al., 1997) and compares well with the observations, no large efforts in validation for these results has been done. However, comparison of tidal ellipses for two points in the inner and middle shelf with currentmeters registers shows a good agreement. The tidal currents in the domain are dominated the semi-diurnal M2 component and are amplified in the shelf. The diurnal components suffer a greater amplification, specially K1 over the Lisbon Promontory. The analysis of vertical parameters of tidal ellipses allows a clear separation between semi-diurnal and diurnal components, and between the almost barotropic open sea circulation and the depth dependent, due to bottom friction, shelf currents.

Acknowledgements

Financial support for this study, a component of the project ProRecruit (POCTI/1999/BSE/36663), was supplied by Fundaçao para a Ciência e Tecnologia (FCT). Martinho Marta Almeida was supported by a FCT PhD grant (SFRH/BD/5439/2001). Financial support was allocated by FCT under the Support Community Framework III, Operational Programme Science, Technology and Innovation. The authors thank to IPIMAR-INIAP for the data used in Fig. 8.

References


