

A consistent phase-averaged model of the interactions between surface gravity waves and currents

Jacques Vanneste¹ and William R. Young²

¹School of Mathematics and Maxwell Institute for Mathematical Sciences, University of Edinburgh, EH9 3FD, UK

²Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California at San Diego, La Jolla CA 92093-0213, USA

(Received xx; revised xx; accepted xx)

We formulate a model of the two-way interactions between surface gravity waves and ocean currents. The model couples the transport of wave action in the four-dimensional (horizontal) position–wavevector phase space with the Craik–Leibovich system for the currents. Coupling is via the Doppler shift in the dispersion relation governing action transport, and wave pseudomomentum in the Craik–Leibovich system. The velocity in the Doppler shift is a vertical integral of the Lagrangian mean velocity of the currents, with a weight that is consistent with the vertical structure of the pseudomomentum. This consistency ensures conservation of momentum and energy in the coupled wave–current system.

The conservation properties of the wave–current model stem from an underlying variational structure. We derive this structure from that of the rotating Euler equations for an incompressible fluid with free surface by introducing a Lagrangian wave–mean decomposition, making simplifying approximations, and Whitham averaging.

We apply the wave–current model to the problem of generation of inertial oscillations by surface waves originally considered by Hasselmann.

Key words: ocean, surface waves, wave–mean-flow interaction, variational principles

1. Introduction

Two-way interactions between ocean currents and high-frequency surface gravity waves dominate sea-surface dynamics. The slow, phase-averaged evolution of the wave field can be modelled with the wave-action transport equation, (2.1) below. The action transport equation captures the effect of currents on waves, namely advection and refraction, through a Doppler-shift term in the dispersion relation. On the other hand, the effect of waves on currents via the Stokes–Coriolis force (Hasselmann 1970; Huang 1979) and the vortex force is modelled by the Craik–Leibovich equation (Craik & Leibovich 1976; Leibovich 1980) and its extensions (Ardhuin *et al.* 2008; McWilliams *et al.* 2004; McWilliams 2022). Both forces depend on wave action through the Stokes velocity \mathbf{u}^s . Doppler-shift and wave-averaged forces are the non-dissipative wave–mean-flow interactions by which energy and momentum are exchanged between waves and currents.

Although this exchange can proceed in both directions, a popular simplification considers the wave field for prescribed currents. This simplification underpins recent the

work on the action transport equation (Villas Bôas *et al.* 2020; Villas Bôas & Young 2020; Wang *et al.* 2023, 2025) and the vast literature based on ray tracing (e.g. Gallet & Young 2014). Likewise many studies solve the Craik–Leibovich equation (2.8) with prescribed Stokes velocity $\mathbf{u}^s(z)$ (e.g. Skyllingstad & Denbo 1995; McWilliams *et al.* 1997; Seshasayanan & Gallet 2019; Wagner *et al.* 2021, 2023). Prescription of either waves or currents severs the wave–mean-flow interaction problem into non-communicating halves.

Coupled models have emerged in the last decade. Driven by the demands of operational oceanography, established wave models based on the action transport equation are paired with ocean circulation models (e.g. Breivik *et al.* 2015; Clementi *et al.* 2017; Couvelard *et al.* 2020; Sun *et al.* 2023; Porcile *et al.* 2024). This a posteriori coupling does not treat the wave action and Craik–Leibovich equations in a consistent manner. As a result, the conservation laws of energy and momentum are damaged.

Here we formulate a consistent model describing the joint evolution of waves and currents (§2). Main elements of this framework are familiar: currents enter the action transport equation via the Doppler shift $\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{U}$ in the dispersion relation. But it is not obvious how the Doppler velocity \mathbf{U} relates to the current in the Craik–Leibovich system. We show that taking \mathbf{U} to be a suitable (wavenumber-dependent) weighted vertical average of the Lagrangian mean velocity \mathbf{u}^L leads to a coupled model conserving energy and momentum (§3).

The coupled model is consistent and enjoys conservation properties because of an underlying variational formulation. We obtain this formulation from a variational form of the rotating Euler equation with free surface by making a series of approximations: wave–mean decomposition, linear-wave ansatz and Whitham averaging (§4). This applies to surface gravity waves the approach pioneered by Dewar (1970) and Bretherton (1971) for hydromagnetic and acoustic waves, and developed by Grimshaw (1984), Gjaja & Holm (1996) and Salmon (2016) for internal waves (see also Xie & Vanneste 2015; Pizzo & Salmon 2021; Salmon 2020; Holm *et al.* 2023).

The exact conservation of energy and momentum in the absence of forcing and dissipation for the coupled model of §2 is key to understanding wave–current interactions. Without a conserved energy it is impossible to decide on the ‘best’ definition of mean kinetic energy, whether the Lagrangian mean kinetic energy $\frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}^L|^2$ or its Eulerian counterpart $\frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}^E|^2$, neither of which are conserved according to the Craik–Leibovich equation alone. Without a consistently coupled wave action equation, the non-conservative terms in the energy equation of the currents can always be attributed to energy exchanges with the waves. The consistent wave–current model in §2 answers questions that are inherently ambiguous when examined with either prescribed Stokes velocity in the Craik–Leibovich equation or prescribed currents in the action equation. For example, with a complete understanding of energy conservation, we shown in §3 and §5 that the conserved energy involves the Lagrangian kinetic energy $|\mathbf{u}^L|^2/2$ rather than its Eulerian counterpart $|\mathbf{u}^E|^2/2$.

As a simple application, we revisit the generation of inertial oscillations by surface waves considered by Hasselmann (1970) (§5). We replace Hasselmann’s prescribed Stokes velocity \mathbf{u}^s by a prescribed forcing of the action transport equation. Prescribed forcing of the action represents the effect of wind more directly than prescription of \mathbf{u}^s in the Craik–Leibovich equation. The current dynamics obtained with the wave–current model is identical to that of Hasselmann but the energetics of the process is now clear: the energy of the inertial oscillations is not drawn from the wave energy but instead requires additional wind work.

2. A consistent wave–current model

The coupled model summarised in this section – referred to as ‘consistent wave–current model’, CWCM for short – follows from application of Hamilton’s principle to an approximate Lagrangian, given in (4.23). The derivation of this approximate Lagrangian, starting from the exact Lagrangian for rotating incompressible flow in (4.2), is technically demanding. Instead it is economical to first present the CWCM, then verify its conservation laws (§3).

The phase-averaged wave field is characterized by the wave action density $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k})$. Our notation is that $\mathbf{k} = (k, l) = (k_1, k_2)$ and $\mathbf{x} = (x, y) = (x_1, x_2)$ are horizontal vectors; unless emphasis is required we do not indicate dependence of various fields on time t . We indicate functions of the phase space variables (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}) using calligraphics, e.g. the action density $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k})$ and also $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k})$ and $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k})$ below. We make exceptions for fields traditionally denoted by Greek letters, e.g. the absolute and intrinsic frequencies $\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k})$ and $\sigma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k})$ below. The action density $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k})$ is the phase-space energy density divided by intrinsic frequency $\sigma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k})$ and, in our convention, divided by the constant fluid density ρ .

The evolution of the phase-averaged wave field is determined by the action balance equation:

$$\partial_t \mathcal{N} + \nabla_{\mathbf{k}} \Omega \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{N} - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \Omega \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{k}} \mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}^\circ \quad (2.1)$$

(e.g. Holthuijsen 2010; Janssen 2004; Komen *et al.* 1996). \mathcal{N}° on the right of (2.1) denotes sources and sinks of wave action and nonlinear interactions between waves. The wave frequency in (2.1) is

$$\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}) = \sigma + \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathcal{U}, \quad (2.2)$$

where

$$\sigma(\mathbf{x}, \kappa) = \sqrt{g\kappa \tanh(\kappa d(\mathbf{x}))}, \quad \text{with } \kappa = |\mathbf{k}| = \sqrt{k^2 + l^2}, \quad (2.3)$$

is the intrinsic frequency in water with depth $d(\mathbf{x})$. In (2.2) the Doppler shift $\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathcal{U}$ is based on the ‘Doppler velocity’

$$\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{x}, \kappa) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{-d(\mathbf{x})}^0 \mathbf{u}^\perp(\mathbf{x}, z) Q(\mathbf{x}, z, \kappa) dz, \quad (2.4)$$

where $\mathbf{u}^\perp(\mathbf{x}, z)$ is the three-dimensional Lagrangian mean velocity and

$$Q(\mathbf{x}, z, \kappa) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{2\kappa \cosh(2\kappa(z + d(\mathbf{x})))}{\sinh(2\kappa d(\mathbf{x}))} \quad (2.5)$$

is such that

$$\int_{-d(\mathbf{x})}^0 Q(\mathbf{x}, z, \kappa) dz = 1. \quad (2.6)$$

Because \mathbf{k} is a horizontal vector, the vertical component of \mathcal{U} plays no role in (2.1)–(2.2) nor in the sequel.

The dispersion relation (2.2) with (2.4)–(2.5) was obtained by Kirby & Chen (1989) as an approximation to the dispersion relation of finite-depth waves propagating in a vertically sheared current. In deep water,

$$Q(\mathbf{x}, z, \kappa) = 2\kappa e^{2\kappa z}, \quad (2.7)$$

as originally obtained by Stewart & Joy (1974). The dispersion relation with (2.4) and (2.5) is used by Arduin *et al.* (2008) in their extension of the Craik–Leibovich system.

In all these earlier instances, the Doppler velocity involves the Eulerian mean velocity \mathbf{u}^E instead of the Lagrangian mean velocity \mathbf{u}^L in (2.4).

The evolution of the Lagrangian mean current $\mathbf{u}^L(\mathbf{x}, z) = (u^L, v^L, w^L)$ is determined by the Craik–Leibovich system

$$\partial_t(\mathbf{u}^L - \mathbf{p}) + (\mathbf{f} + \nabla \times (\mathbf{u}^L - \mathbf{p})) \times \mathbf{u}^L + \nabla \pi = \mathbf{u}^\circ, \quad (2.8)$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^L = 0, \quad (2.9)$$

where $\nabla = (\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}, \partial_z)$ is the three-dimensional spatial gradient. In (2.8) \mathbf{f} is a constant vector; we do not make the traditional approximation. Coupling between the action conservation (2.1) and the Lagrangian mean velocity $\mathbf{u}^L(\mathbf{x}, z)$ is via the pseudomomentum

$$\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}, z) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \iint Q(\mathbf{x}, z, \kappa) \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}) \mathbf{k} \, d\mathbf{k}. \quad (2.10)$$

The pseudomomentum $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}, z)$ is a horizontal vector. Integrating (2.10) over z and using (2.6) produces the important identity

$$\int_{-d(\mathbf{x})}^0 \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}, z) \, dz = \iint \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}) \mathbf{k} \, d\mathbf{k}. \quad (2.11)$$

The Craik–Leibovich system is completed with the $z = 0$ rigid-lid boundary condition on the Lagrangian mean vertical velocity

$$w^L(x, y, 0, t) = 0, \quad (2.12)$$

and the no-normal-flow bottom boundary condition

$$w^L + \mathbf{u}^L \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} d = 0 \quad \text{at } z = -d(\mathbf{x}). \quad (2.13)$$

The rigid-lid boundary condition ensures that (2.8) and (2.9) does not have wave solutions, i.e. waves are filtered from the wave-averaged equations.

The system in (2.1) through (2.13) is the dynamical core of the CWCM. Additional processes, such as forcing, dissipation and wave–wave interactions, can be added by specification of the right hand sides, \mathcal{N}° and \mathbf{u}° , of (2.1) and (2.8). The model combines the dynamics of the action in the four-dimensional (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}) phase space with Craik–Leibovich dynamics in the three-dimensional (\mathbf{x}, z) physical space. The two components of the model interact via the pseudomomentum $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}, z)$ and the horizontal Doppler velocity $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{x}, \kappa)$, both of which involve the weight function $Q(\mathbf{x}, z, \kappa)$. This is illustrated in figure 1.

The CWCM uses the Lagrangian mean velocity \mathbf{u}^L and the pseudomomentum \mathbf{p} ; the Stokes velocity \mathbf{u}^S and the Eulerian mean velocity \mathbf{u}^E do not appear. For approximately irrotational waves, as assumed in the derivation in §4, $\mathbf{u}^S \approx \mathbf{p}$. Thus one can compare the CWCM with other formulations of the mean momentum equation that employ \mathbf{u}^S and $\mathbf{u}^E = \mathbf{u}^L - \mathbf{u}^S \approx \mathbf{u}^L - \mathbf{p}$ as main variables (e.g. Craik & Leibovich 1976; McWilliams *et al.* 2004; Suzuki & Fox-Kemper 2016).

An unfamiliar feature of the CWCM is that the Lagrangian mean \mathbf{u}^L , depth-weighted in (2.4) with the kernel $Q(\mathbf{x}, z, \kappa)$, is the Doppler velocity $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k})$ in the dispersion relation (2.2). Because \mathcal{U} depends on the wavenumber \mathbf{k} the group velocity is

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}) = \nabla_{\mathbf{k}} \Omega = \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}) \mathbf{k} + \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}), \quad (2.14)$$

where

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\kappa} \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial \kappa} + \frac{\mathbf{k}}{\kappa} \cdot \frac{\partial \mathcal{U}}{\partial \kappa}. \quad (2.15)$$




Figure 1: Schematic of the CWCM: the dynamical variables are the action density $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k})$ and the current Lagrangian mean velocity $\mathbf{u}^L(\mathbf{x}, z)$. They are coupled through the pseudomomentum $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}, z)$ and the weighted horizontal velocity $\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}, \kappa)$ that appears in the surface wave dispersion relation.

Banihashemi, Kirby & Dong (2017) and Banihashemi & Kirby (2019) have drawn attention to κ -dependence of the current in the wave action conservation and the peculiar term involving $\partial \mathbf{U} / \partial \kappa$ in \mathcal{G} .

For reference we record alternative equivalent forms of the Craik–Leibovich equation (2.8). Andrews & McIntyre (1978) and Leibovich (1980) favour the form that emerges directly from the application of Hamilton’s principle in §4,

$$(\partial_t + u_j^L \partial_j)(u_i^L - \mathbf{p}_i) + u_{j,i}^L (u_j^L - \mathbf{p}_j) + (\mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{u}^L)_i + \hat{\pi}_{,i} = u_i^\circ. \quad (2.16)$$

In (2.16) italic indices i and j run from 1 to 3,

$$\hat{\pi} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \pi + \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{u}^L - |\mathbf{u}^L|^2, \quad (2.17)$$

and the subscript commas indicate spatial (\mathbf{x} and z) derivatives. Another equivalent form is

$$\partial_t u_i^L - \partial_t \mathbf{p}_i - \mathbf{p}_j u_{j,i}^L + (u_i^L u_j^L - \mathbf{p}_i u_j^L)_{,j} + (\mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{u}^L)_i + \tilde{\pi}_{,i} = u_i^\circ, \quad (2.18)$$

where

$$\tilde{\pi} = \pi + \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{u}^L - \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}^L|^2. \quad (2.19)$$

The form in (2.18) is useful in the discussion of momentum conservation in §3.2. Suzuki & Fox-Kemper (2016) present five alternative versions of the Craik–Leibovich equation with \mathbf{u}^E or \mathbf{u}^L as the primary velocity. All versions follow from (2.8), (2.16) or (2.18) on using $\mathbf{u}^L - \mathbf{p} = \mathbf{u}^E$ and $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{u}^S$.

3. Conservation laws

The CWCM in §2 conserves action, mass, energy, momentum, circulation and potential vorticity. According to (2.1), the action density $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k})$ is transported by the non-

divergent phase-space velocity ($\nabla_{\mathbf{k}} \Omega, -\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \Omega$). Integrals of the form

$$\iint F(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k})) \, d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{k} \quad (3.1)$$

are therefore conserved for any function $F(\cdot)$ when $\mathcal{N}^\circ = 0$. We verify the other conservation laws directly from (2.1) through (2.13).

3.1. Mass conservation

The Lagrangian average used in the formulation above, with a non-divergent \mathbf{u}^\perp in (2.9), is not the GLM Lagrangian average of Andrews & McIntyre (1978): in GLM \mathbf{u}^\perp has non-zero divergence (McIntyre 1988; Arduin *et al.* 2008). Instead we use the glm average of Soward & Roberts (2010) which has a non-divergent Lagrangian mean velocity (Vanneste & Young 2022).

(Mass is conserved by GLM: with non-zero $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^\perp$ there is a Lagrangian density variable – denoted $\tilde{\rho}$ in Andrews & McIntyre (1978) – ensuring mass conservation. Our decision to use glm, with exact $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}^\perp = 0$, avoids the additional ρ -variable.)

3.2. Momentum conservation

Forming $\iint (2.1) \mathbf{k} \, d\mathbf{k}$ we have

$$\partial_t \iint \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}) k_\alpha \, d\mathbf{k} + \partial_\beta \iint \mathcal{C}_\beta k_\alpha \mathcal{N} \, d\mathbf{k} + \iint \Omega_{,\alpha} \mathcal{N} \, d\mathbf{k} = \iint k_\alpha \mathcal{N}^\circ \, d\mathbf{k}. \quad (3.2)$$

In (3.2) the Greek indices α and β run from 1 to 2 and following a comma indicate \mathbf{x} -derivatives. The group velocity, \mathcal{C}_β above, is defined in (2.14). Using (2.11) to transform the first term in (3.2), and expanding $\Omega_{,\alpha}$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \int \mathbf{p}_\alpha \, dz + \int \mathbf{p}_\beta u_{\beta,\alpha}^\perp \, dz + \partial_\beta \iint \mathcal{C}_\beta k_\alpha \mathcal{N} \, d\mathbf{k} \\ + \iint \frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial d} \mathcal{N} \, d\mathbf{k} \, d_{,\alpha} = \iint k_\alpha \mathcal{N}^\circ \, d\mathbf{k}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Above and hereafter we lighten notation by suppressing the limits $-d(\mathbf{x})$ and 0 on vertical integrals.

The term involving $\partial \Omega / \partial d$ on the second line of (3.3) arises because the \mathbf{x} -dependence of $\sigma(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k})$ and $Q(\mathbf{x}, z, \kappa)$ is only through the depth $d(\mathbf{x})$. In appendix A we show that this term can be expanded as

$$\iint \frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial d} \mathcal{N} \, d\mathbf{k} \, d_{,\alpha} = \iint \left(\frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial d} + \mathbf{k} \cdot \int \frac{\partial Q}{\partial d} (\mathbf{u}^\perp(\mathbf{x}, z) - \mathbf{u}^\perp(\mathbf{x}, -d)) \, dz \right) \mathcal{N} \, d\mathbf{k} \, d_{,\alpha}. \quad (3.4)$$

In the shallow-water limit, with \mathbf{u}^\perp independent of z , only $\partial \sigma / \partial d$ remains within the integral on the right.

Turning to the Craik–Leibovich equation, the vertical integral of the horizontal components of (2.18) is

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \int u_\alpha^\perp \, dz - \partial_t \int \mathbf{p}_\alpha \, dz - \int \mathbf{p}_\beta u_{\beta,\alpha}^\perp \, dz + \partial_\beta \int u_\alpha^\perp u_\beta^\perp - \mathbf{p}_\alpha u_\beta^\perp \, dz \\ + \left(\int \mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{u}^\perp \, dz \right)_\alpha + \partial_\alpha \int \tilde{\pi} \, dz - [\tilde{\pi}]_{-d} \, d_{,\alpha} = \int u_\alpha^\circ \, dz, \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

where $[\cdot]_{-d}$ denotes evaluation at $z = -d$, e.g. $[\tilde{\pi}]_{-d} = \tilde{\pi}(\mathbf{x}, -d(\mathbf{x}))$. Terms stemming from the commutation of ∂_β with the vertical integral vanish on using the boundary

conditions (2.12) and (2.13). The sole remaining boundary contribution is the topographic form stress $[\tilde{\pi}]_{-d} d_{,\alpha}$ in (3.5).

Adding (3.3) and (3.5) cancels the terms

$$\partial_t \int \mathbf{p}_\alpha dz + \int \mathbf{p}_\beta u_{\beta,\alpha}^L dz, \quad (3.6)$$

leaving

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_t \int u_\alpha^L dz + \partial_\beta \left(\int u_\alpha^L u_\beta^L - \mathbf{p}_\alpha u_\beta^L dz + \iint k_\alpha \mathcal{C}_\beta \mathcal{N} d\mathbf{k} \right) + \left(\int \mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{u}^L dz \right)_\alpha \\ & + \partial_\alpha \int \tilde{\pi} dz + \left(\iint \frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial d} \mathcal{N} d\mathbf{k} - [\tilde{\pi}]_{-d} \right) d_{,\alpha} = \int u_\alpha^\circ dz + \iint k_\alpha \mathcal{N}^\circ d\mathbf{k}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

The result

$$\int \mathbf{p}_\alpha u_\beta^L dz = \iint k_\alpha \mathcal{U}_\beta \mathcal{N} d\mathbf{k}, \quad (3.8)$$

deduced from the definition of \mathbf{U} in (2.4) and the definition of \mathbf{p} in (2.10), produces a further partial cancellation in (3.7):

$$\iint k_\alpha \mathcal{C}_\beta \mathcal{N} d\mathbf{k} - \int \mathbf{p}_\alpha u_\beta^L dz = \iint \mathcal{G} k_\alpha k_\beta \mathcal{N} d\mathbf{k}, \quad (3.9)$$

where $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k})$ is defined in (2.15). Thus (3.7) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_t \int u_\alpha^L dz + \partial_\beta \left(\int u_\alpha^L u_\beta^L dz + \iint \mathcal{G} k_\alpha k_\beta \mathcal{N} d\mathbf{k} \right) + \left(\int \mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{u}^L dz \right)_\alpha \\ & + \partial_\alpha \int \tilde{\pi} dz + \left(\iint \frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial d} \mathcal{N} d\mathbf{k} - [\tilde{\pi}]_{-d} \right) d_{,\alpha} = \int u_\alpha^\circ dz + \iint k_\alpha \mathcal{N}^\circ d\mathbf{k}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

This is momentum conservation in the absence of the Coriolis term, depth variation $d_{,\alpha}$, and of forcing and dissipation on the right-hand side.

Although the pseudomomentum \mathbf{p} appears throughout the manipulations above, remarkable cancellations ensure that \mathbf{p} does not feature in the final form (3.10). This is a manifestation of McIntyre's (1981) 'wave momentum myth': the momentum density, namely

$$\int \mathbf{u}^L dz, \quad (3.11)$$

contains only the Lagrangian mean velocity and the direct effect of the waves in (3.10) is flux of momentum via the radiation stress tensor

$$\iint \mathcal{G} k_\alpha k_\beta \mathcal{N} d\mathbf{k}, \quad (3.12)$$

where $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k})$ is defined in (2.15). As noted by Dewar (1970), however, an alternative viewpoint regards

$$\int \mathbf{u}^L - \mathbf{p} dz \quad (3.13)$$

as the Lagrangian mean momentum, $\int \mathbf{p} dz$ as the wave momentum and their sum (3.11) as the total momentum. This viewpoint is consistent with a geometric interpretation of the Lagrangian mean momentum (Gilbert & Vanneste 2018, 2025).

In this section, for simplicity, we have focused on the depth-integrated momentum. By forming $\iint (2.1) Q \mathbf{k} d\mathbf{k}$ and combining with the Craik–Leibovich equation (2.18), it is possible to derive an equation for the total momentum \mathbf{u}^L at each z . This equation

reduces to (3.10) when integrated with respect to z . It provides an alternative to (2.18) in which wave forcing appears through radiation stresses with vertical as well as horizontal components.

3.3. Energy conservation

Following Bretherton & Garrett (1968), we expect that the wave-energy density is

$$\mathcal{E}_w(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}) = \sigma(\mathbf{x}, \kappa) \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}), \quad (3.14)$$

where $\sigma(\mathbf{x}, \kappa)$ is the intrinsic frequency in (2.3). We also expect that the total energy density,

$$E(\mathbf{x}) = \int \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}^\perp|^2 dz + \iint \mathcal{E}_w(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}) d\mathbf{k}, \quad (3.15)$$

satisfies a physical space conservation law

$$\partial_t E + \nabla_x \cdot \mathbf{J} = E^\circ. \quad (3.16)$$

The horizontal vector $\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x})$ above is the energy flux.

To determine \mathbf{J} and E° in (3.16), start with the depth integral of $\mathbf{u}^\perp \cdot$ (2.8) and use the vertical boundary conditions (2.12) and (2.13) to find

$$\partial_t \int \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}^\perp|^2 dz + \nabla_x \cdot \int \mathbf{u}^\perp \pi dz = \int \mathbf{u}^\perp \cdot \mathbf{p}_t dz + \int \mathbf{u}^\perp \cdot \mathbf{u}^\circ dz. \quad (3.17)$$

Equation (3.17) is the energy equation for the currents.

Turning to the wave energy in (3.14), $\iint (\mathbf{2.1}) \Omega d\mathbf{k}$ produces

$$\partial_t \iint \mathcal{E}_w d\mathbf{k} + \iint (\mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{k}) \mathcal{N}_t d\mathbf{k} + \nabla_x \cdot \iint \mathcal{C} \Omega \mathcal{N} d\mathbf{k} = \iint \Omega \mathcal{N}^\circ d\mathbf{k}, \quad (3.18)$$

where \mathcal{C} is the group velocity in (2.14). The key identity

$$\iint (\mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{k}) \mathcal{N}_t d\mathbf{k} = \int \mathbf{u}^\perp \cdot \iint Q \mathbf{k} \mathcal{N}_t d\mathbf{k} dz = \int \mathbf{u}^\perp \cdot \mathbf{p}_t dz \quad (3.19)$$

puts (3.18) in the form

$$\partial_t \iint \mathcal{E}_w d\mathbf{k} + \int \mathbf{u}^\perp \cdot \mathbf{p}_t dz + \nabla_x \cdot \iint \mathcal{C} \Omega \mathcal{N} d\mathbf{k} = \iint \Omega \mathcal{N}^\circ d\mathbf{k}. \quad (3.20)$$

Summing (3.17) and (3.20) eliminates the energy-exchange term

$$\int \mathbf{u}^\perp \cdot \mathbf{p}_t dz \quad (3.21)$$

and produces energy conservation in (3.16) with

$$\mathbf{J} = \int \mathbf{u}^\perp \pi dz + \iint \mathcal{C} \Omega \mathcal{N} d\mathbf{k}, \quad (3.22)$$

and

$$E^\circ = \iint \Omega \mathcal{N}^\circ d\mathbf{k} + \int \mathbf{u}^\perp \cdot \mathbf{u}^\circ dz. \quad (3.23)$$

The right of (3.20),

$$\iint \Omega \mathcal{N}^\circ d\mathbf{k} = \iint \sigma \mathcal{N}^\circ d\mathbf{k} + \iint \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{U} \mathcal{N}^\circ d\mathbf{k}, \quad (3.24)$$

involves a non-obvious contribution of the Doppler shift to E° . We return to this in §5.

Using the dispersion relation (2.2), the final term in (3.22) can be split into physically distinct contributions

$$\iint \mathcal{C} \Omega \mathcal{N} \, d\mathbf{k} = \iint \mathcal{C} \mathcal{E}_w \, d\mathbf{k} + \iint \mathcal{G} \mathbf{k} \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{u} \mathcal{N} \, d\mathbf{k} + \iint \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{k} \mathcal{N} \, d\mathbf{k}. \quad (3.25)$$

The first term on the right of (3.25) is group-velocity transport of the wave energy \mathcal{E}_w . The second term is the wave radiation stress (3.12) acting on \mathbf{u} . The third term is the momentum flux associated with \mathbf{u} acting on the wave pseudomomentum.

The mean kinetic energy in the conserved energy (3.15) is the Lagrangian kinetic energy $\frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}^L|^2$ rather than the Eulerian kinetic energy $\frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}^E|^2$. For the CWCM, this is natural: \mathbf{u}^L is the primary dynamical variable and \mathbf{u}^E does not appear explicitly. Moreover, the form of the conserved energy is linked to the variational formulation of the CWCM in §4 via Noether's theorem.

Wagner *et al.* (2021) and Czeschel & Eden (2023) contrast the simplicity of the Lagrangian kinetic energy budget for the (uncoupled) Craik–Leibovich system with the complexity of the Eulerian kinetic energy budget. The CWCM explains this simplicity by the privileged role of the Lagrangian kinetic energy as one of the two terms in the conserved total energy (3.15). In §5 we return to the primacy of $\frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}^L|^2$ over $\frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}^E|^2$ in a discussion of wave-forced inertial oscillations. In this basic example the CWCM is forced by prescribing \mathcal{N}° in the action transport equation (2.1) and all terms in the energy balance can be calculated explicitly.

3.4. Circulation and potential vorticity

Material conservation of circulation and potential vorticity is a property of the Craik–Leibovich equation (2.8), i.e. these laws are independent of the wave action equation (2.1). We state the results and defer to Andrews & McIntyre (1978) or Holm (1996) for proof.

Introduce the ‘absolute Lagrangian mean momentum’

$$\mathbf{v}^a = \mathbf{h} + \mathbf{u}^L - \mathbf{p}, \quad (3.26)$$

where

$$\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}_3) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{x}_3 \quad (3.27)$$

with $\mathbf{x}_3 = (\mathbf{x}, z)$. A key property of \mathbf{h} is that $\nabla \times \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{f}$. The corresponding absolute vorticity is

$$\zeta^a = \nabla \times \mathbf{v}^a = \mathbf{f} + \nabla \times (\mathbf{u}^L - \mathbf{p}). \quad (3.28)$$

Then conservation of circulation is

$$\frac{d}{dt} \oint_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbf{v}^a \cdot d\mathbf{l} = 0, \quad (3.29)$$

where \mathcal{C} is a material circuit and we assume $\mathbf{u}^\circ = 0$.

As noted by Andrews & McIntyre (1978), for $\mathbf{f} = 0$, conservation of circulation implies that $\nabla \times (\mathbf{u}^L - \mathbf{p}) = 0$ for all times if this holds initially. In this irrotational flow regime, \mathbf{u}^L is diagnosed from \mathbf{p} as $\mathbf{u}^L = \mathbf{p} - \nabla \phi$ for a potential ϕ that is uniquely determined by the Poisson equation $\nabla^2 \phi = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{p}$ and the boundary conditions satisfied by \mathbf{u}^L . The CWCM thus reduces to the action equation (2.1), with $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{x}, \kappa)$ related linearly to $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k})$ via solution of the Poisson equation.

For potential vorticity, suppose that we have a passive scalar $b(\mathbf{x}, z, t)$ satisfying wave-averaged material conservation,

$$b_t + \mathbf{u}^L \cdot \nabla b = b^\circ. \quad (3.30)$$

Potential vorticity is

$$\Pi = \boldsymbol{\zeta}^a \cdot \nabla b, \quad (3.31)$$

and satisfies

$$\partial_t \Pi + \mathbf{u}^\perp \cdot \nabla \Pi = \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{u}^\circ \times \nabla b + \boldsymbol{\zeta}^a b^\circ). \quad (3.32)$$

4. Variational derivation

The conservation properties of the CWCM can be traced to its variational formulation. We obtain this variational formulation from that of the rotating incompressible Euler equations.

4.1. Rotating Euler equations

Variational formulations of fluid models typically involve the flow map, $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$, which sends labels \mathbf{a} identifying fluid particles to the time- t positions of the particles, $\mathbf{x} = \boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t)$ (e.g. Salmon 1988). Incompressibility implies that the flow map preserves volume, that is, $|\partial \boldsymbol{\varphi} / \partial \mathbf{a}| = \text{const.}$ We can take the constant to be 1 without loss of generality. Flow map and velocity field are related via

$$\partial_t \boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t) = \mathbf{u}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t), t). \quad (4.1)$$

Following Dewar (1970), Bretherton (1971) and Gjaja & Holm (1996) (see also Holm *et al.* 2023), we make minimal use of labels and flow map by adopting an Eulerian variational formulation. In this formulation – an instance of the Euler–Poincaré framework (Holm *et al.* 1998) – the flow map only appears implicitly through a constrained form of the variations of \mathbf{u} first obtained by Newcomb (1962) and Bretherton (1970).

In Appendix B, we show that the rotating, incompressible Euler equations, with a free surface at $z = s(\mathbf{x}, t)$, follow from Hamilton’s principle $\delta \int \mathcal{L} dt = 0$ applied to the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}[\mathbf{u}, s] = \iint d\mathbf{x} \left(\int_{-d}^s (\tfrac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 + \mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{u}) dz - \tfrac{1}{2} g s^2 \right). \quad (4.2)$$

The Eulerian variations $\delta \mathbf{u}$ and δs are induced by variations $\delta \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ of the flow map. Introducing an Eulerian vector field $\mathbf{q}(\mathbf{x}, t) = (q_1, q_2, q_3)$ by

$$\delta \boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t) = \mathbf{q}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t), t), \quad (4.3)$$

leads to

$$\delta \mathbf{u} = \partial_t \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}, \quad (4.4a)$$

$$\delta s = q_3 - q_1 s_x - q_2 s_y, \quad (4.4b)$$

where \mathbf{q} satisfies $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{q} = 0$ and is otherwise arbitrary (see appendix B). Incompressibility is enforced by considering only volume preserving flow maps and hence divergence-free \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{q} . No explicit constraint enforcing $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0$ is therefore required in (4.2).

4.2. Lagrangian mean framework

Following the GLM framework, we introduce a wave–mean flow decomposition at the level of the flow map by writing

$$\boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t) = \bar{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}(\mathbf{a}, t) + \boldsymbol{\xi}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}(\mathbf{a}, t), t), \quad (4.5)$$

where $\bar{\varphi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ denote the mean flow and perturbation maps. Below we introduce a linear-wave ansatz for $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ that captures the wavy displacements resulting from surface gravity waves; $\bar{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t)$ captures the mean currents.

Differentiating (4.5) with respect to t and using the mean position $\mathbf{x}_3 = (\mathbf{x}, z) = \bar{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t)$ as independent variable gives

$$\mathbf{u}^\xi = \mathbf{u}^\perp + D_t \boldsymbol{\xi}. \quad (4.6)$$

Here, $\mathbf{u}^\perp(\mathbf{x}, t)$ defined by

$$\mathbf{u}^\perp(\bar{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}), t) = \partial_t \bar{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t) \quad (4.7)$$

is the Lagrangian mean velocity,

$$D_t = \partial_t + \mathbf{u}^\perp \cdot \nabla, \quad (4.8)$$

and

$$\mathbf{u}^\xi(\mathbf{x}_3, t) = \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}_3 + \boldsymbol{\xi}(\mathbf{x}_3, t), t). \quad (4.9)$$

The decomposition (4.5) involves a degree of arbitrariness. We take advantage of this to impose that the mean flow map preserves volume and leaves the free surface flat, that is,

$$|\partial \bar{\varphi} / \partial \mathbf{a}| = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\varphi}_3(a, b, c = 0) = 0. \quad (4.10)$$

In contrast with standard GLM, the assumptions in (4.10) imply a non-zero average for the perturbation map, $\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \neq 0$ (see Vanneste & Young 2022). Below in (4.12), however, we use a linear approximation for $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ so that $\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$ vanishes up to neglected terms.

Volume preservation implies that \mathbf{u}^\perp is divergence free, i.e. (2.9). With this, we can rewrite the Lagrangian (4.2) using the mean position $(\mathbf{x}, z) = \bar{\varphi}(\mathbf{a})$ as an independent variable. This results in

$$\mathcal{L}[\mathbf{u}^\perp, \boldsymbol{\xi}] = \iint d\mathbf{x} \left(\int_{-d}^0 \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}^\perp + D_t \boldsymbol{\xi}|^2 + \mathbf{h}^\xi \cdot (\mathbf{u}^\perp + D_t \boldsymbol{\xi}) dz - \frac{1}{2} g \zeta^2 \right), \quad (4.11)$$

where $\zeta = \xi_3(\mathbf{x}, z = 0)$ and $\mathbf{h}^\xi(\mathbf{x}_3) = \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}_3 + \boldsymbol{\xi}(\mathbf{x}_3)) = \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}_3) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{f} \times \boldsymbol{\xi}(\mathbf{x}_3)$. (Without the assumption of volume preservation (4.10), (4.11) would contain a Jacobian factor $\bar{\rho}$, as in the GLM formulation of Andrews & McIntyre (1978).)

4.3. Averaged Lagrangian

Up to (4.11) no approximations have been made. We now make a WKB ansatz for $\boldsymbol{\xi}$, assuming a scale separation between rapid phase variations and slow envelope modulations, and Whitham average. Following the prescription of Whitham (1965, 1974), the displacement field $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is approximated by that of a linear wavetrain,

$$\boldsymbol{\xi} \approx \text{Re } a(\mathbf{x}, t) \hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\mathbf{x}, z, \mathbf{k}) e^{i\theta(\mathbf{x}, t)}, \quad (4.12)$$

where $a(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is a slowly varying amplitude, $\theta(\mathbf{x}, t)$ the phase, and $\mathbf{k} = (k, l) = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \theta$. The vertical structure is dictated by

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\mathbf{x}, z, \mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{\kappa \sinh(\kappa d)} \begin{pmatrix} ik \cosh(\kappa(z+d)) \\ il \cosh(\kappa(z+d)) \\ \kappa \sinh(\kappa(z+d)) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.13)$$

This structure is that obtained for surface waves propagating in a uniform current, with uniform depth and neglecting background rotation. The dependence of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\mathbf{x}, z, \mathbf{k})$ on \mathbf{x} stems from that of $d(\mathbf{x})$.

With $\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$ in (4.13), the displacement $\boldsymbol{\xi}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ in (4.12) is approximately incompressible

and irrotational:

$$\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi} \approx 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla \times \boldsymbol{\xi} \approx 0. \quad (4.14)$$

This approximation is associated with Whitham's variational derivation of the WKB approximation: applying $\nabla = (\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}, \partial_z)$ to (4.12) the derivatives act only on the phase $\theta(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and on the z -dependence of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$. For instance,

$$D_t \boldsymbol{\xi} \approx \text{Re } a(\mathbf{x}, t) \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\mathbf{x}, z, \mathbf{k})(-i\omega + i\mathbf{u}^L \cdot \mathbf{k}) + w^L(\mathbf{x}, z) \hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_z(\mathbf{x}, z, \mathbf{k}) \right) e^{i\theta(\mathbf{x}, t)}. \quad (4.15)$$

We further neglect the term involving $w^L \hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_z$ in (4.15) on the grounds that $w^L \ll u^L, v^L$.

Introducing (4.12) into the Lagrangian (4.11) and averaging over the phase θ leads to the averaged Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\mathcal{L}}[\mathbf{u}^L, \theta, a] = & \iint d\mathbf{x} \left(\int_{-d}^0 \left(\frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}^L|^2 + \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{u}^L \right) dz \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{4} \left(\int_{-d}^0 \frac{\cosh(2\kappa(z+d)) (\omega - \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{u}^L)^2}{\sinh^2(\kappa d)} dz - g \right) |a|^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

where $\omega = -\partial_t \theta$ and we neglect the wave contributions to the Coriolis term.

Using the definition of $Q(\mathbf{x}, z, \kappa)$ in (2.5), we rewrite the second z -integral in (4.16) as

$$\int_{-d}^0 \frac{\cosh(2\kappa(z+d)) (\omega - \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{u}^L)^2}{\sinh^2(\kappa d)} dz = \frac{1}{\kappa \tanh(\kappa d)} \int_{-d}^0 (\omega - \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{u}^L)^2 Q(\mathbf{x}, z, \kappa) dz. \quad (4.17)$$

Justified by the smallness of the Doppler shift against the wave frequency, we make the approximation

$$\int_{-d}^0 (\omega - \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{u}^L)^2 Q dz = \omega^2 - 2\omega \mathbf{k} \cdot \int_{-d}^0 \mathbf{u}^L Q dz + \int_{-d}^0 (\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{u}^L)^2 Q dz, \quad (4.18a)$$

$$\approx (\omega - \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{U})^2, \quad (4.18b)$$

where the Doppler velocity is

$$\mathbf{U} = \int_{-d}^0 \mathbf{u}^L Q dz, \quad (4.19)$$

as in (2.4). This maneuver simplifies (4.16) to

$$\overline{\mathcal{L}}[\mathbf{u}^L, \theta, a] = \iint d\mathbf{x} \left(\int_{-d}^0 \left(\frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}^L|^2 + \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{u}^L \right) dz + \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{(\omega - \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{U})^2}{\kappa \tanh(\kappa d)} - g \right) |a|^2 \right). \quad (4.20)$$

The approximation in (4.18) is not necessary: one can proceed from the Lagrangian in (4.16). The resulting model has a more complicated dispersion relation than (2.2), and a more complicated expression for the pseudomomentum than (2.10). Alternatively, one obtains a superficially simpler model by boldly dropping the final term in (4.18a). But this is one step too many: we prefer the dispersion relation (2.2) with a physically intuitive Doppler shift that preserves Galilean invariance.

The Lagrangian (4.20) is the surface-wave analogue of the Lagrangian obtained by Bretherton (1971), Gjaja & Holm (1996) and Salmon (2016) for acoustic and gravity waves. Hamilton's principle can be applied using variations $\delta \mathbf{u}^L$ similar to (4.4a), δa and $\delta \theta$. This leads to the Craik–Leibovich system and to equations governing the phase $\theta(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and amplitude $a(\mathbf{x}, t)$ of a single wavetrain. We do not detail these equations

here. Instead, we follow Dewar (1970) to relax the assumption of a single wavetrain and consider a spectrum of linear waves.

4.4. Variational form of the CWCM

A spectrum of waves can be regarded as a superposition of independent wavetrains indexed by a two-dimensional (continuous) variable, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ say (see Dewar's (1970) discussion of the 'weak turbulence' assumption). Phase $\theta(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, t)$ and amplitude $a(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, t)$ then depend on $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, and the Lagrangian (4.20) acquires an additional integration over $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ to become

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\mathcal{L}}[\mathbf{u}^L, \theta, a] = & \iint d\mathbf{x} \left(\int_{-d}^0 \left(\frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}^L|^2 + \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{u}^L \right) dz \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{4} \iint \left(\frac{(\omega - \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{U})^2}{\kappa \tanh(\kappa d)} - g \right) |a|^2 d\boldsymbol{\alpha} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.21)$$

The representation using $(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ as independent variables and (θ, a) as dependent variables is inconvenient. It is preferable to use instead (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}) as independent variables and (ω, \mathcal{N}) as dependent variables, where

$$\mathcal{N} = \frac{\sigma |a|^2}{2\kappa \tanh(\kappa d)} \left| \frac{\partial \mathbf{k}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\alpha}} \right|^{-1} \quad (4.22)$$

is the wave action density in (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}) -space. Making this change of variables in (4.20) puts the averaged Lagrangian in its final form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{CWC}}[\mathbf{u}^L, \mathcal{N}, \omega] = & \iint d\mathbf{x} \left(\int_{-d}^0 \left(\frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}^L|^2 + \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{u}^L \right) dz \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{2} \iint \left(\sigma^{-1} (\omega - \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{U})^2 - \sigma \right) \mathcal{N} d\mathbf{k} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

The Lagrangian \mathcal{L}_{CWC} is the Lagrangian of the CWCM. The term on the second line is a standard Whitham-averaged Lagrangian governing wave dynamics. Because of its dependence on the current variable \mathbf{u}^L via \mathbf{U} , this term contributes to the dynamics of both waves and currents. This is key to consistency of the CWCM.

Hamilton's principle can now be applied to (4.23). The variations are

$$\delta \mathbf{u}^L = \partial_t \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{u}^L \cdot \nabla \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}^L, \quad (4.24)$$

with \mathbf{q} satisfying $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{q} = 0$ but otherwise arbitrary (in analogy with (4.4a)), $\delta \mathcal{N}$, and

$$\delta \omega = \partial_t r + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} r \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{k}} \omega - \nabla_{\mathbf{k}} r \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \omega \quad (4.25)$$

with r arbitrary. This leads to the Craik–Leibovich equation in the form (2.16), dispersion relation (2.2) and action transport equation (2.1). Details are given in Appendix C. The form (4.25) of the variation of ω , reminiscent of (4.24), emerges when changing variables from the mixed Eulerian-Lagrangian $\theta(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ to the Eulerian $\omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k})$ (see Dewar (1970) and Appendix D).

5. Hasselmann's problem

Hasselmann (1970) showed that the rectified effect of surface waves is to drive inertial oscillations through 'a vertical shear stress induced by the rotation of the earth'; see also Ursell & Deacon (1950). To exhibit this nonlinear interaction between surface waves and

inertial oscillations, we consider a flat-bottom ($\nabla_{\mathbf{x}}d = 0$), initially motionless ocean with no waves and no currents:

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}) = \mathbf{u}^{\text{L}}(\mathbf{x}, z) = 0 \quad \text{at } t = 0. \quad (5.1)$$

Currents and waves are jointly forced by suddenly switching on horizontally uniform wind forcing. This $t > 0$ forcing is modelled with

$$\mathcal{N}^{\circ} = \alpha(\mathcal{N}_{\star}(\mathbf{k}) - \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k})) \quad (5.2)$$

on the right-hand side of the action transport equation (2.1). In (5.2) $\mathcal{N}_{\star}(\mathbf{k})$ is an equilibrium wave spectrum with pseudomomentum

$$\mathbf{p}_{\star}(z) = \iint Q(z, \kappa) \mathcal{N}_{\star}(\mathbf{k}) \mathbf{k} \, d\mathbf{k} \quad (5.3a)$$

$$= \mathbf{p}_{\star}(z) \hat{\mathbf{x}}. \quad (5.3b)$$

The parameter α in (5.2) controls the rate at which the action spectrum adjusts to the equilibrium spectrum \mathcal{N}_{\star} . In Hasselmann's idealization, $\mathcal{N}_{\star}(\mathbf{k})$ and $\Omega = \sigma(\mathbf{k}) + \mathbf{U}(\kappa) \cdot \mathbf{k}$ do not depend on the horizontal coordinates $\mathbf{x} = (x, y)$. Thus there is a horizontally uniform solution of the action equation (2.1):

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{k}, t) = (1 - e^{-\alpha t}) \mathcal{N}_{\star}(\mathbf{k}). \quad (5.4)$$

The time-varying pseudomomentum is

$$\mathbf{p}(z, t) = (1 - e^{-\alpha t}) \mathbf{p}_{\star}(z) \hat{\mathbf{x}}. \quad (5.5)$$

Making the traditional approximation that $\mathbf{f} = f \hat{\mathbf{z}}$ and assuming a solution with the form $\mathbf{u}^{\text{L}} = (u^{\text{L}}(z), v^{\text{L}}(z), 0)$, we have

$$\nabla \times (\mathbf{u}^{\text{L}} - \mathbf{p}) \times \mathbf{u}^{\text{L}} = -\mathbf{u}^{\text{L}} \cdot (\mathbf{u}^{\text{L}} - \mathbf{p})_{,z} \hat{\mathbf{z}}. \quad (5.6)$$

This vertical force is balanced by the vertical pressure gradient.

With $\mathbf{u}^{\circ} = 0$, the horizontal components of \mathbf{u}^{L} evolve according to

$$\mathbf{u}_t^{\text{L}} + f \hat{\mathbf{z}} \times \mathbf{u}^{\text{L}} = \mathbf{p}_t \quad (5.7a)$$

$$= \alpha e^{-\alpha t} \mathbf{p}_{\star} \hat{\mathbf{x}}. \quad (5.7b)$$

The right hand side of (5.7a) is the inviscid forcing of currents resulting from the ‘growth of swell’ (Wagner *et al.* 2021).

The solution of (5.7b), shown in the upper panel of figure 2 with $\alpha/f = 1$, is

$$u^{\text{L}} + iv^{\text{L}} = \frac{\alpha \mathbf{p}_{\star}}{\alpha - if} (e^{-ift} - e^{-\alpha t}) \quad (5.8a)$$

$$\sim \frac{\alpha \mathbf{p}_{\star} e^{-ift}}{\alpha - if} \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (5.8b)$$

The long-time Lagrangian kinetic energy of the residual inertial oscillation is therefore

$$\frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}^{\text{L}}|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\alpha^2 \mathbf{p}_{\star}^2}{\alpha^2 + f^2}. \quad (5.9)$$

The total work done by the wind in establishing the long-time solution is the sum of the wave energy and the energy in the residual inertial oscillation (5.9):

$$E_{\text{w}} + E_{\text{io}} = \iint \sigma(\kappa) \mathcal{N}_{\star}(\mathbf{k}) \, d\mathbf{k} + \frac{1}{2} \int_{-d}^0 \frac{\alpha^2 \mathbf{p}_{\star}^2(z)}{\alpha^2 + f^2} \, dz. \quad (5.10)$$




Figure 2: Solution of the Hasselmann problem with $\alpha = f$. Upper panel: the dashed sinusoids uL and vL are the scaled Lagrangian velocities $u^L(z, t)/\mathbf{p}_*(z)$ and $v^L(z, t)/\mathbf{p}_*(z)$ and $LKE = |\mathbf{u}^L|^2/2\mathbf{p}_*^2$, is the corresponding scaled Lagrangian kinetic energy. Lower panel: the four kinetic energy densities defined in (5.12), all scaled with $\mathbf{p}_*(z)^2$.

In terms of wave steepness ϵ , E_w is order ϵ^2 while E_{io} of order ϵ^4 .

Equation (5.10) shows that in Hasselmann's scenario the excitation of inertial waves does not deplete wave energy but is instead achieved through an increase of the wind work. The energy balance (3.16) is consistent with this conclusion: combining the expression for energy production in (3.23) with $\Omega = \sigma + \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{U}$, (3.16) reduces to

$$\partial_t E = \underbrace{\iint \sigma \mathcal{N}^\circ d\mathbf{k}}_{\partial_t E_w} + \underbrace{\iint \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{U} \mathcal{N}^\circ d\mathbf{k}}_{\partial_t E_{io}}. \quad (5.11)$$

The final term in (5.11) is the production by wind of near-inertial energy, E_{io} in (5.10).

The assumption of horizontal uniformity ensures that $\nabla_{\mathbf{k}} \Omega \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{N} - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \Omega \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{k}} \mathcal{N} = 0$ in (2.1), i.e. the inertial current in (5.9) has no effect on $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}, t)$. It is possible, however, that the inertial oscillation is linearly unstable, and saturation of this instability might lead to turbulent currents and modification of \mathcal{N} by currents. This possibility is strongly indicated by the numerical solutions of Wagner *et al.* (2021) in which the pseudomomentum $\mathbf{p}(z, t)$ is prescribed. In fact prescription of $\mathbf{p}(z, t)$ is recovered as the special case $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ of the relaxation-to- \mathcal{N}_* model in (5.2).

The ‘Lagrangian kinetic energy density’ is partitioned by the decomposition $\mathbf{u}^L = \mathbf{u}^E + \mathbf{u}^S$ (with $\mathbf{u}^S \approx \mathbf{p}$) into

$$\underbrace{\frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}^L|^2}_{LKE} = \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}^E|^2}_{EKE} + \underbrace{\mathbf{u}^S \cdot \mathbf{u}^E}_{XKE} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}^S|^2}_{SKE}. \quad (5.12)$$

Above LKE is the Lagrangian kinetic energy (which produces $E_{i\circ}$ when integrated in z), EKE is the Eulerian kinetic energy, XKE is the kinetic energy in the ‘cross term’ $\mathbf{u}^E \cdot \mathbf{u}^S$ and SKE is the Stokes kinetic energy. The lower panel of figure 2 shows these four kinetic energy densities in the $\alpha/f = 1$ solution. LKE is smaller in magnitude than the three terms on the right of (5.12) and, unlike EKE and XKE, has simple monotonic evolution. The same conclusions are drawn by Czeschel & Eden (2023).

In the long-time limit $e^{-\alpha t} \rightarrow 0$, the decomposition in (5.12) is

$$\underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \frac{\alpha^2 \mathbf{p}_*^2}{\alpha^2 + f^2}}_{\text{LKE}} = \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}^E|^2 + \mathbf{u}^E \cdot \mathbf{u}^S}_{\text{EKE} + \text{XKE}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{p}_*^2}_{\text{SKE}}. \quad (5.13)$$

EKE and XKE both oscillate at the inertial frequency, but their sum is steady and negative:

$$\text{EKE} + \text{XKE} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{f^2 \mathbf{p}_*^2}{\alpha^2 + f^2} \leq 0. \quad (5.14)$$

In the long-time limit XKE is negative and greater in magnitude than EKE for all values of α/f .

When viewed in terms of the monotonically increasing LKE in figure 2, the energetics of Hasselmann’s problem is straightforward: wave forcing via $\mathbf{p}(z, t)$ is steadily increasing the LKE of the currents. But when viewed in terms of EKE and XKE this simple result is obscured and the problem seems complicated and confusing. This Lagrangian simplicity is because $|\mathbf{u}^L|^2/2$ is the current kinetic energy that participates in the complete and consistent energy conservation law in (3.15) and (3.16).

The Doppler velocity takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U} + i\mathcal{V} &= \int_{-d}^0 Q(\kappa, z)(u^L + iv^L) dz \\ &= \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - if} (e^{-ift} - e^{-\alpha t}) \int A(\kappa, \kappa') \mathcal{N}_*(\mathbf{k}') \mathbf{k}' d\mathbf{k}', \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

where

$$A(\kappa, \kappa') = \int_{-d}^0 Q(\kappa, z) Q(\kappa', z) dz = \frac{2\kappa\kappa'}{\kappa + \kappa'} \frac{\kappa \coth(2\kappa'd) - \kappa' \coth(2\kappa d)}{\kappa - \kappa'}. \quad (5.16)$$

The general argument of §3.3 shows that introducing (5.15) into the right-hand side of (5.11) recovers $\partial_t E_{i\circ}$.

6. Discussion

CWCM, the model of two-way coupling between surface waves and ocean currents introduced in §2, is perhaps the simplest that conserves momentum and energy. This simplicity is achieved in part by adopting a wave–mean separation that differs from standard GLM to ensure (i) that the mean current is exactly divergence free, and (ii) that the mean free surface is flat. Property (ii) amounts to restricting mean configurations to those that minimise gravitational potential energy. Such a restriction is standard in the treatment of dynamical systems under a strong constraining potential (e.g. Takens 1980). It has the benefit of filtering surface waves from the mean equations. Property (ii) does not preclude capturing mean deformations in the free-surface elevation: in principle, these mean deformations are represented through non-zero mean perturbations, $\bar{\xi} \neq 0$.

Our formulation, however, ignores these by following Whitham and using the linear approximation (4.13) for ξ .

The simplicity of the CWCM also stems from the variational approach used for its derivation. Compared with formal asymptotic expansions carried out at the level of the dynamical equations, the variational approach has the advantage of preservation of symmetry-related conservation and ease of implementation. (Exploratory calculations indicate that systematic asymptotics to fourth order in wave steepness, as required to capture terms such as $|\mathbf{u}^s|^2/2$ in the energy equation, is exceedingly complicated.) Against this, an inconvenience is the difficulty in ascertaining the asymptotic accuracy of the variational model. But for a problem as complex as the two-way interactions between surface gravity waves and currents, involving multiple small parameters and regimes of physical interest, we believe that the variational formulation has overwhelming advantages.

The CWCM in §2, with conservation laws on display in §3, follows from the application of Hamilton's principle to the Lagrangian \mathcal{L}_{CWC} in (4.23). The primary approximation used in the construction \mathcal{L}_{CWC} is Whitham's linear-wave approximation in (4.12) and (4.13). We then make a few secondary approximations, such as simplification of the Doppler shift as in (4.18). These secondary approximations can be avoided at the expense of a more complicated model. For example, retaining $w^L \hat{\xi}_z$ in (4.15) results in a three-dimensional pseudomomentum. Presumably this more complicated model is also a more accurate representation of the two-way interaction between currents and waves.

Controversial issues such as the divergence and vertical component of $\mathbf{p} \approx \mathbf{u}^s$ or whether the current kinetic energy involves \mathbf{u}^E or \mathbf{u}^L do not arise in our formulation. Only the Lagrangian mean velocity \mathbf{u}^L and pseudomomentum \mathbf{p} play a dynamical role. The pseudomomentum \mathbf{p} appears as the variational derivative of the wave Lagrangian with respect to \mathbf{u}^L , a vector directly related to wave action, rather than as an approximation to the general three-dimensional form of Andrews & McIntyre (1978). The primacy of \mathbf{u}^L and \mathbf{p} over \mathbf{u}^E and \mathbf{u}^s is an unavoidable feature of variational formulations of coupled wave-mean models. This aspect of the CWCM will remain if some of the approximations we have made are relaxed.

The CWCM provides a sound basis for revisiting problems that have previously been examined with prescribed \mathbf{u}^s or \mathbf{p} . The generation of inertial oscillations by a uniform field of surface waves considered in §5 is the simplest such problem. Because of the assumption of horizontal homogeneity, the dynamics of action is not affected the mean current that is generated. The main benefit of the CWCM is then to provide a consistent picture of the energy exchanges between wind, waves and currents. It will be interesting to consider problems in which currents and wave action vary in the horizontal so that the two-way interactions come into play. These problems include instabilities such as the Craik–Leibovich instability responsible for the formation of Langmuir cells. Stratification effects can be included straightforwardly by treating buoyancy as a passive scalar, as in (3.30), and adding the buoyancy force in the momentum equation.

Applications of the Craik–Leibovich system to realistic ocean conditions often involve turbulence. The exchanges between waves and currents are then complicated by the separation of the currents into mean and turbulent components and the need to parameterise turbulent fluxes (e.g. Suzuki & Fox-Kemper 2016; Czeschel & Eden 2023). Work along these lines should use the CWCM or a similar model that recognises the importance of the Lagrangian kinetic energy $|\mathbf{u}^L|^2/2$.

Acknowledgments. We thank Onno Bokhove, Lars Czeschel and Greg Wagner for useful discussions.

Funding. JV is supported by the UK Natural Environment Research Council (grant NE/W002876/1). WRY is supported by the National Science Foundation award 2048583.

Declaration of interests. The authors report no conflict of interest.

Author ORCID. J. Vanneste, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0319-589X>, W.R. Young, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1842-3197>.

Appendix A. Variable depth in pseudomomentum law (3.3)

We first establish a useful identity: $\partial/\partial x_\alpha$ of the $Q(\mathbf{x}, z, \kappa)$ normalization integral (2.6) produces

$$\int_{-d}^0 Q_{,\alpha} dz + [Q]_{-d} d_{,\alpha} = 0. \quad (\text{A } 1)$$

Above, recall that $[\cdot]_{-d}$ denotes evaluation at $z = -d(\mathbf{x})$. Substituting

$$Q_{,\alpha} = \frac{\partial Q}{\partial x_\alpha} = \frac{\partial Q}{\partial d} d_{,\alpha} \quad (\text{A } 2)$$

into (A 1) and cancelling $d_{,\alpha}$ produces the identity

$$\int_{-d}^0 \frac{\partial Q}{\partial d} dz + [Q]_{-d} = 0. \quad (\text{A } 3)$$

Turning to (3.2) and recalling the definition of $\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}) = \sigma + \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{U}$, with the Doppler velocity $\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k})$ in (2.4), we have

$$\iint \Omega_{,\alpha} \mathcal{N} d\mathbf{k} = \iint \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial d} \mathcal{N} d\mathbf{k} d_{,\alpha} + \iint \mathbf{k} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\alpha} \left(\int_{-d}^0 Q \mathbf{u}^\perp dz \right) \mathcal{N} d\mathbf{k} \quad (\text{A } 4a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \iint \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial d} \mathcal{N} + \mathbf{k} \cdot \left(\int_{-d}^0 \frac{\partial Q}{\partial d} \mathbf{u}^\perp dz + [Q \mathbf{u}^\perp]_{-d} \right) \mathcal{N} d\mathbf{k} d_{,\alpha} \\ &+ \iint \mathbf{k} \cdot \int_{-d}^0 Q \mathbf{u}_{,\alpha}^\perp dz \mathcal{N} d\mathbf{k}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A } 4b)$$

Using (A 3), one of the terms on the right of (A 4b) can be written more compactly as

$$\int_{-d}^0 \frac{\partial Q}{\partial d} \mathbf{u}^\perp dz + [Q \mathbf{u}^\perp]_{-d} = \int_{-d}^0 \frac{\partial Q}{\partial d} (\mathbf{u}^\perp - [\mathbf{u}^\perp]_{-d}) dz. \quad (\text{A } 5)$$

Then switching the order of the z and \mathbf{k} integrals in the final term of (A 4b), and recalling the definition of the pseudomomentum $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}, z)$ in (2.11), produces

$$\begin{aligned} \iint \frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial x_\alpha} \mathcal{N} d\mathbf{k} &= \iint \underbrace{\left(\frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial d} + \mathbf{k} \cdot \int \frac{\partial Q}{\partial d} (\mathbf{u}^\perp - [\mathbf{u}^\perp]_{-d}) dz \right)}_{\partial \Omega / \partial d} \mathcal{N} d\mathbf{k} d_{,\alpha} \\ &+ \int \mathbf{p}_\beta u_{\beta,\alpha}^\perp dz. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A } 6)$$

Appendix B. Variational derivation of the rotating Euler equation

We derive the rotating incompressible Euler equations from Hamilton's principle applied to the Lagrangian (4.2) with constrained variations (4.4). We start by deriving the constrained variations (4.4) and (4.25) following Newcomb (1962), Bretherton (1970) and Dewar (1970).

B.1. Variations δu and δs

The variations $\delta \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ of the velocity field are induced by variations $\delta \boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t)$ of the flow map. Taking the time derivative of (4.3) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \delta \boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t) &= \partial_t \mathbf{q}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t), t) + \partial_t \boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{q}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t), t) \\ &= \partial_t \mathbf{q}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t), t) + \mathbf{u}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t), t) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{q}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t), t). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B1})$$

Another expression for the left-hand side is obtained by taking variations of $\partial_t \boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t) = \mathbf{u}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t), t)$ and using the equality $\delta \partial_t = \partial_t \delta$ of mixed derivatives to find

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \delta \boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t) &= \delta \mathbf{u}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t), t) + \delta \boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t), t) \\ &= \delta \mathbf{u}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t), t) + \mathbf{q}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t), t) \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}(\boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{a}, t), t). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B2})$$

Equating (B1) and (B2) gives (4.4a).

The form (4.4b) of δs is obtained by relating free surface elevation and flow map via

$$s(\varphi_1(a, b, 0), \varphi_2(a, b, 0), t) = \varphi_3(a, b, 0, t), \quad (\text{B3})$$

where $\mathbf{a} = (a, b, 0)$ parameterises the free surface in label space. Taking variations gives

$$\delta s(\mathbf{x}, t) + \delta \varphi_1(a, b, 0, t) \partial_x s(\mathbf{x}, t) + \delta \varphi_2(a, b, 0, t) \partial_y s(\mathbf{x}, t) = \delta \varphi_3(a, b, 0, t), \quad (\text{B4})$$

that is,

$$\delta s(\mathbf{x}, t) + q_1(\mathbf{x}, t) \partial_x s(\mathbf{x}, t) + q_2(\mathbf{x}, t) \partial_y s(\mathbf{x}, t) = q_3(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad (\text{B5})$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (\varphi_1(a, b, 0, t), \varphi_2(a, b, 0, t))$. Rearranging gives (4.4b). The assumption of volume preserving flow map implies that $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{q} = 0$.

B.2. Hamilton's principle applied to (4.2)

Hamilton's principle states that

$$\delta \int \mathcal{L} dt = \delta \int dt \iint d\mathbf{x} \left(\int_{-d}^s \mathbf{u}^a \cdot \delta \mathbf{u} dz + \left(\left[\frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{u}|^2 + \mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{u} \right]_s - g s \right) \delta s \right) = 0, \quad (\text{B6})$$

where $\mathbf{u}^a = \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{h}$ and $[\cdot]_s$ denotes evaluation at $z = s$. We use (4.4a) and manipulate the z integral:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-d}^s \mathbf{u}^a \cdot \delta \mathbf{u} dz &= \int_{-d}^s \mathbf{u}^a \cdot (\partial_t \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}) dz, \\ &= \int_{-d}^s \left(\partial_t (\mathbf{u}^a \cdot \mathbf{q}) + \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{u}^a \cdot \mathbf{q} \mathbf{u}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (\partial_t \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}^a + \nabla \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u}^a) \cdot \mathbf{q} \right) dz. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B7})$$

In $\nabla \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u}^a$, the contraction is between \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{u}^a . Integrating (B7) with respect to \mathbf{x} and using the Reynolds transport theorem gives

$$\begin{aligned} \iint d\mathbf{x} \int_{-d}^s \mathbf{u}^a \cdot \delta \mathbf{u} dz &= \frac{d}{dt} \iint d\mathbf{x} \int_{-d}^s \mathbf{u}^a \cdot \mathbf{q} dz \\ &\quad - \iint d\mathbf{x} \int_{-d}^s (\partial_t \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}^a + \nabla \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u}^a) \cdot \mathbf{q} dz. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B8})$$

Here we impose the kinematic boundary condition $\partial_t s + u \partial_x s + v \partial_y s = w$ at $z = s(\mathbf{x}, t)$ and the no-normal flow condition $w + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} d = 0$ at $z = -d(\mathbf{x})$.

The exact time derivative on the first line of (B8) does not contribute to (B6) because

\mathbf{q} is assumed to vanish at the endpoints of the time integral. The second line makes a contribution that vanishes for all divergence-free \mathbf{q} , as required, provided that

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}^a + \nabla \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u}^a = -\nabla \pi \quad (\text{B } 9)$$

for some scalar field π . (This follows from Helmholtz decomposing $\partial_t \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}^a + \nabla \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u}^a$ and observing that the vanishing of (B 8) implies that the rotational part is zero.) Using vector calculus identities, (B 9) can be rewritten as

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u} + (\nabla \times \mathbf{u}^a) \times \mathbf{u} = -\nabla(\pi + \mathbf{u}^a \cdot \mathbf{u}), \quad (\text{B } 10)$$

then as

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{f} \times \mathbf{u} = -\nabla p, \quad (\text{B } 11)$$

where $p = \pi + \frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}|^2 + \mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{u}$. This is the familiar form of the rotating Euler equation.

With (B 9) and using $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{q} = 0$, the second line in (B 8) becomes

$$\iint \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \int_{-d}^s \nabla \cdot (\pi \mathbf{q}) \, dz = \iint \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} [\pi \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{q}]_s = \iint \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} [\pi]_s \delta s, \quad (\text{B } 12)$$

where $\mathbf{n} = (-\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} s, 1)$ and we use the form (4.4b) of δs and that \mathbf{q} is tangent to the bottom boundary. This reduces Hamilton's principle (B 6) to surface terms:

$$\delta \int \mathcal{L} \, dt = \delta \int \mathrm{d}t \iint \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \left(\left[\pi + \frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{u}|^2 + \mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{u} \right]_s - g s \right) \delta s. \quad (\text{B } 13)$$

Imposing that these vanish leads to the dynamic boundary condition

$$p = g s. \quad (\text{B } 14)$$

Appendix C. Variational derivation of the CWCM

We derive the coupled model governed by (2.1)–(2.12) from Hamilton's principle applied to the averaged Lagrangian \mathcal{L}_{CWC} in (4.20) with variations (4.24) and (4.25). The variations $\delta \mathcal{N}$ are unconstrained, hence Hamilton's principle implies that

$$\frac{\delta \bar{\mathcal{L}}}{\delta \mathcal{N}} = \sigma^{-1}(\omega - \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{U})^2 - \sigma = 0. \quad (\text{C } 1)$$

The dispersion relation $\omega = \sigma + \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{U} = \Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k})$ follows. Using this, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta \bar{\mathcal{L}}}{\delta \mathbf{u}^{\perp}} &= \mathbf{u}^{\perp} + \mathbf{h} - \iint Q(\mathbf{x}, z, \kappa) \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}) \mathbf{k} \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{k} \\ &= \mathbf{u}^{\perp} + \mathbf{h} - \mathbf{p} = \mathbf{v}^a \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C } 2)$$

and

$$\frac{\delta \bar{\mathcal{L}}}{\delta \omega} = \mathcal{N}. \quad (\text{C } 3)$$

With these results, Hamilton's principle reduces to

$$\delta \int \mathcal{L} \, dt = \delta \int \mathrm{d}t \iint \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x} \left(\int_{-d}^0 \mathbf{v}^a \cdot \delta \mathbf{u}^{\perp} \, dz + \iint \mathcal{N} \delta \omega \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{k} \right) = 0. \quad (\text{C } 4)$$

The variations $\delta \mathbf{u}^{\perp}$ and $\delta \omega$ are independent and can be treated separately.

For $\delta \mathbf{u}^L$, (4.24) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \iint d\mathbf{x} \int_{-d}^0 \mathbf{v}^a \cdot \delta \mathbf{u}^L dz &= \iint d\mathbf{x} \int_{-d}^0 \mathbf{v}^a \cdot (\partial_t \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{u}^L \cdot \nabla \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u}^L) dz \\ &= \iint d\mathbf{x} \int_{-d}^0 \partial_t (\mathbf{v}^a \cdot \mathbf{q}) + \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{v}^a \cdot \mathbf{q} \mathbf{u}^L) \\ &\quad - (\partial_t \mathbf{v}^a + \mathbf{u}^L \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}^a + \nabla \mathbf{u}^L \cdot \mathbf{v}^a) \cdot \mathbf{q} dz. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C5})$$

The terms on the first line make no contributions to (C4), bar boundary terms that vanish provided that the boundary conditions (2.12) and (2.13) hold. The terms on the second line vanish for all divergence-free \mathbf{q} provided that

$$\partial_t \mathbf{v}^a + \mathbf{u}^L \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v}^a + \nabla \mathbf{u}^L \cdot \mathbf{v}^a = -\nabla \hat{\pi} \quad (\text{C6})$$

for some scalar $\hat{\pi}$. We recognise (C6) as version (2.16) of the Craik–Leibovich equation in vector form and with $\mathbf{u}^\circ = 0$.

For $\delta \omega$, (4.25) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \iint d\mathbf{x} \iint \mathcal{N} \delta \omega d\mathbf{k} &= \iint d\mathbf{x} \iint \mathcal{N} (\partial_t r + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} r \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{k}} \omega - \nabla_{\mathbf{k}} r \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \omega) d\mathbf{k} \\ &= \iint d\mathbf{x} \iint \left(\partial_t (\mathcal{N} r) + \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \cdot (\mathcal{N} r \nabla_{\mathbf{k}} \omega) - \nabla_{\mathbf{k}} \cdot (\mathcal{N} r \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \omega) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (\partial_t \mathcal{N} + \nabla_{\mathbf{k}} \omega \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{N} - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \omega \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{k}} \mathcal{N}) r \right) d\mathbf{k} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C7})$$

Again, the terms in the first line are total derivatives and make no contribution to (C4). The vanishing of the remaining terms for arbitrary r implies the wave action transport equation (2.1) with $\mathcal{N}^\circ = 0$.

Appendix D. Constrained variation $\delta \omega$

The variation $\delta \omega$ in (4.25) arises from unconstrained the variation $\delta \theta(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, t)$ via the change of dependent and independent variables

$$(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \theta(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, t)) \mapsto (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}, \omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}, t)) \quad (\text{D1})$$

with

$$\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \theta(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, t) \quad \text{and} \quad \omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, t), t) = -\partial_t \theta(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, t). \quad (\text{D2})$$

We define the function $r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{k}, t)$ by

$$r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, t), t) = -\delta \theta(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, t). \quad (\text{D3})$$

Taking the variation at fixed $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ of the second equation in (D2) and using (D3) gives

$$\delta \omega = \partial_t r + \partial_t \mathbf{K} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{k}} r - \delta \mathbf{K} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{k}} \omega. \quad (\text{D4})$$

On the other hand, the variation and time derivative of the first of (D2) give

$$\delta \mathbf{K} = -\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} r - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{K} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{k}} r, \quad (\text{D5a})$$

$$\partial_t \mathbf{K} = -\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \omega - \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{K} \cdot \nabla_{\mathbf{k}} \omega, \quad (\text{D5b})$$

where the contractions are between \mathbf{K} and $\nabla_{\mathbf{k}}$. Introducing (D5) into (D4) and using that $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{K} = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \theta$ is a symmetric tensor leads to expression (4.25) for $\delta \omega$.

REFERENCES

- ANDREWS, D. G. & MCINTYRE, M. E. 1978 An exact theory of nonlinear waves on a Lagrangian-mean flow. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **89** (04), 609–646.
- ARDHUIN, F., RASCLE, N. & BELIBASSAKIS, K. A. 2008 Explicit wave-averaged primitive equations using a generalized Lagrangian mean. *Ocean Modelling* **20** (1), 35–60.
- BANIHASHEMI, S. & KIRBY, J.T. 2019 Approximation of wave action conservation in vertically sheared mean flows. *Ocean Modelling* **143**, 101460.
- BANIHASHEMI, S., KIRBY, J.T. & DONG, Z. 2017 Approximation of wave action flux velocity in strongly sheared mean flows. *Ocean Modelling* **116**, 33–47.
- BREIVIK, Ø., MOGENSEN, K., BIDLOT, J.-R., BALMASEDA, M. A. & JANSSEN, P. A. E. M. 2015 Surface wave effects in the NEMO ocean model: Forced and coupled experiments. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans* **120** (4), 2973–2992.
- BRETHERTON, F.P. & GARRETT, C.J.R. 1968 Wavetrains in inhomogeneous moving media. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences* **302** (1471), 529–554.
- BRETHERTON, F. P. 1970 A note on Hamilton’s principle for perfect fluids. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **44**, 19–31.
- BRETHERTON, F. P. 1971 The general linearized theory of wave propagation. In *Mathematical Problems in the Geophysical Sciences, Lectures in Applied Mathematics*, vol. 13, pp. 61–102. American Mathematical Society.
- CLEMENTI, E., ODDO, P., DRUDI, M., PINARDI, N., KORRES, G. & GRANDI, A. 2017 Coupling hydrodynamic and wave models: first step and sensitivity experiments in the Mediterranean Sea. *Ocean Dynamics* **67**, 1293–1312.
- COUVELARD, X., LEMARIÉ, F., SAMSON, G., REDELSPERGER, J.-L., ARDHUIN, F., BENSILHA, R. & MADEC, G. 2020 Development of a two-way-coupled ocean–wave model: assessment on a global NEMO (v3. 6)– WW3 (v6. 02) coupled configuration. *Geoscientific Model Development* **13** (7), 3067–3090.
- CRAIK, A. D. D. & LEIBOVICH, S. 1976 A rational model for Langmuir circulations. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **73** (03), 401–426.
- CZESCHEL, L. & EDEN, C. 2023 Energy transfers in surface wave-averaged equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.13354* .
- DEWAR, R. L. 1970 Interaction between hydromagnetic waves and a time-dependent, inhomogeneous medium. *The Physics of Fluids* **13** (11), 2710–2720.
- GALLET, B. & YOUNG, W. R. 2014 Refraction of swell by surface currents. *Journal of Marine Research* **72**, 105–126.
- GILBERT, A. D. & VANNESTE, J. 2018 Geometric generalised Lagrangian mean theories. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **839**, 95–134.
- GILBERT, A. D. & VANNESTE, J. 2025 Geometric approaches to Lagrangian averaging. *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics* **57**, 117–140.
- GJAJA, I. & HOLM, D.D. 1996 Self-consistent Hamiltonian dynamics of wave mean-flow interaction for a rotating stratified incompressible fluid. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* **98** (2), 343 – 378.
- GRIMSHAW, R. 1984 Wave action and wave-mean flow interaction, with application to stratified shear flows. *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics* **16**, 11–44.
- HASSELMANN, K. 1970 Wave-driven inertial oscillations. *Geophysical and Astrophysical Fluid Dynamics* **1** (3-4), 463–502.
- HOLM, DARRYL D. 1996 The ideal Craik-Leibovich equations. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* **98** (2), 415 – 441.
- HOLM, D. D., HU, R. & STREET, O. D. 2023 Lagrangian reduction and wave mean flow interaction. *Physica D* **454**, 133847.
- HOLM, D. D., MARSDEN, J. E. & RATIU, T. S. 1998 The Euler–Poincaré equations and semidirect products with applications to continuum theories. *Advances in Mathematics* **137**, 1–81.
- HOLTHUIJSEN, L. H. 2010 *Waves in Oceanic and Coastal Waters*. Cambridge University Press.
- HUANG, N.E. 1979 On surface drift currents in the ocean. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **91** (1), 191–208.
- JANSSEN, P. 2004 *The interaction of ocean waves and wind*. Cambridge University Press.

- KIRBY, J. T. & CHEN, T.-M. 1989 Surface waves on vertically sheared flows: approximate dispersion relations. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans* **94** (C1), 1013–1027.
- KOMEN, G. J., CAVALERI, L., DONELAN, M., HASSELMANN, K., HASSELMANN, S. & JANSSEN, P. A. E. M. 1996 *Dynamics and Modelling of Ocean Waves*. Cambridge University Press.
- LEIBOVICH, S. 1980 On wave-current interaction theories of Langmuir circulations. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **99** (04), 715–724.
- MCINTYRE, M.E. 1988 A note on the divergence effect and the Lagrangian-mean surface elevation in periodic water waves. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **189**, 235–242.
- MCINTYRE, M. E. 1981 On the ‘wave momentum’ myth. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **106**, 331–347.
- MCWILLIAMS, J. C. 2022 *Quasi-linear Theory for Surface Wave-Current Interactions*. Springer.
- MCWILLIAMS, J. C., RESTREPO, J. M. & LANE, E. M. 2004 An asymptotic theory for the interaction of waves and currents in coastal waters. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **511**, 135–178.
- MCWILLIAMS, J. C., SULLIVAN, P. P. & MOENG, C.-H. 1997 Langmuir turbulence in the ocean. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **334**, 1–30.
- NEWCOMB, W.A. 1962 Lagrangian and Hamiltonian methods in magnetohydrodynamics. *Nuclear Fusion Supplement Part 2* **2**, 451–463.
- PIZZO, N. & SALMON, R. 2021 Particle description of the interaction between wave packets and point vortices. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **925**, A32.
- PORCILE, G., BENNIS, A.-C., BOUTET, M., LE BOT, S., DUMAS, F. & JULLIEN, S. 2024 Implementation of additional spectral wave field exchanges in a three-dimensional wave-current coupled WAVEWATCH-III (version 6.07) and CROCO (version 1.2) configuration: assessment of their implications for macro-tidal coastal hydrodynamics. *Geoscientific Model Development* **17** (7), 2829–2853.
- SALMON, R. 1988 Hamiltonian fluid mechanics. *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics* **20** (1), 225–256.
- SALMON, R. 2016 Variational treatment of inertia-gravity waves interacting with a quasi-geostrophic mean flow. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **809**, 502–529.
- SALMON, R. 2020 More Lectures on Geophysical Fluid Dynamics.
- SESHASAYANAN, K. & GALLET, B. 2019 Surface gravity waves propagating in a rotating frame: The Ekman-Stokes instability. *Physical Review Fluids* **4** (10), 104802.
- SKYLLINGSTAD, E.D. & DENBO, D.W. 1995 An ocean large-eddy simulation of langmuir circulations and convection in the surface mixed layer. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans* **100** (C5), 8501–8522.
- SOWARD, A.M. & ROBERTS, P.H. 2010 The hybrid Euler–Lagrange procedure using an extension of Moffatt’s method. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **661**, 45–72.
- STEWART, R. H. & JOY, J. W. 1974 HF radio measurements of surface currents. *Deep Sea Research and Oceanographic Abstracts* **21** (12), 1039–1049.
- SUN, R., COBB, A., VILLAS BÔAS, A. B., LANGODAN, S., SUBRAMANIAN, A. C., MAZLOFF, M. R., CORNUELLE, B. D., MILLER, A.J., PATHAK, R. & HOTEIT, I. 2023 Waves in SKRIPS: WAVEWATCH III coupling implementation and a case study of tropical cyclone Mekunu. *Geoscientific Model Development* **16** (12), 3435–3458.
- SUZUKI, N. & FOX-KEMPER, B. 2016 Understanding Stokes forces in the wave-averaged equations. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans* **121** (5), 3579–3596.
- TAKENS, F. 1980 Motion under the influence of a strong constraining force. In *Global Theory of Dynamical Systems: Proceedings of an International Conference Held at Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, June 18–22, 1979*, pp. 425–445. Springer.
- URSELL, F. & DEACON, G. E. R. 1950 On the theoretical form of ocean swell on a rotating earth. *Geophysical Journal International* **6**, 1–8.
- VANNESTE, J. & YOUNG, W. R. 2022 Stokes drift and its discontents. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A* **380** (2225), 20210032.
- VILLAS BÔAS, AB & YOUNG, WR 2020 Directional diffusion of surface gravity wave action by ocean macroturbulence. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **890**, R3.
- VILLAS BÔAS, A. B., CORNUELLE, B. D., MAZLOFF, M. R., GILLE, S. T. & ARDHUIN, F. 2020 Wave-current interactions at meso and submesoscales: Insights from idealized numerical simulations. *Journal of Physical Oceanography* **50** (12), 3483–3500.

- WAGNER, G. L., CHINI, G. P., RAMADHAN, A., GALLET, B. & FERRARI, R. 2021 Near-inertial waves and turbulence driven by the growth of swell. *Journal of Physical Oceanography* **51** (5), 1337–1351.
- WAGNER, G. L., PIZZO, N., LENAIN, L. & VERON, F. 2023 Transition to turbulence in wind-drift layers. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **976**, A8.
- WANG, H., VILLAS BÔAS, A. B., VANNESTE, J. & YOUNG, W. R. 2025 Scattering of surface waves by ocean currents: the U2H map. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **1005**, A12.
- WANG, H., VILLAS BÔAS, A. B., YOUNG, W. R. & VANNESTE, J. 2023 Scattering of swell by currents. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **975**, A1.
- WHITHAM, G. B. 1965 A general approach to linear and nonlinear dispersive waves using a Lagrangian. *J. Fluid Mech.* **22**, 135–147.
- WHITHAM, G. B. 1974 *Linear and Nonlinear Waves*. Wiley.
- XIE, J.-H. & VANNESTE, J. 2015 A generalised-Lagrangian-mean model of the interactions between near-inertial waves and mean flow. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **774**, 143–169.