



**HAL**  
open science

## Sensitivity of a one-line longshore shoreline change model to the mean wave direction

T. Chataigner, Marissa L. Yates, N. Le Dantec, M.D. Harley, K.D. Splinter,  
N. Goutal

► **To cite this version:**

T. Chataigner, Marissa L. Yates, N. Le Dantec, M.D. Harley, K.D. Splinter, et al.. Sensitivity of a one-line longshore shoreline change model to the mean wave direction. Coastal Engineering, 2022, 172, pp.104025. 10.1016/j.coastaleng.2021.104025 . hal-04382371

**HAL Id: hal-04382371**

**<https://enpc.hal.science/hal-04382371v1>**

Submitted on 22 Jul 2024

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

# Sensitivity of a one-line longshore shoreline change model to the mean wave direction

Chataigner T.<sup>1</sup>, Yates M.L.<sup>1</sup>, Le Dantec N.<sup>3</sup>, Harley M.D.<sup>4</sup>, Splinter K.D.<sup>4</sup>, and Goutal, N.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>LHSV, Ecole des Ponts, Cerema, EDF R&D, Chatou, France

<sup>3</sup>Geoscience Ocean Laboratory, University of Western Brittany, IUEM, Plouzané, France

<sup>4</sup>Water Research Laboratory, School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, UNSW Sydney, Sydney, Australia

E-mail addresses: teddy.chataigner@enpc.fr (T. Chataigner), marissa.yates@cerema.fr (M. Yates), nicolas.ledantec@univ-brest.fr (N. Le Dantec), m.harley@unsw.edu.au (M. Harley), k.splinter@unsw.edu.au (K. Splinter), nicole.goutal@edf.fr (N. Goutal)

Keywords: beach morphodynamics, one-line model, longshore transport, shoreline change, sensitivity analysis, wave angle bias

## Highlights:

- One-line shoreline change models often produce artifacts in beach planform
- One-line longshore models are highly sensitive to small incident wave angle biases
- Wave angle bias corrections can be obtained using a Monte Carlo approach
- Accurate observations or simulations of wave breaking conditions are necessary

## Abstract

The sensitivity of a one-line longshore shoreline change model to the incident wave direction is evaluated at Narrabeen Beach (Australia). As previously observed, the application of the one-line model using wave conditions generated along the 10-m depth contour produces a long-term reorientation of the coastline, with an initial transition period and then a new stable equilibrium during the 10-year period from 2005 to 2015. However, this coastline change in shoreline planform shape is not observed in the shoreline position measurements. The source of this error is investigated by assuming that it is caused by biases in the incident wave direction and by using a Monte Carlo approach to search for the optimal set of wave angle bias corrections to apply at each cross-shore transect. The obtained optimal values enable the one-line model to reproduce accurately the shoreline planform, and they are coherent with estimates of the wave breaking angle obtained independently using a nearshore wave propagation model. Then, using the corrected wave angle time series as a reference, a second Monte Carlo analysis is completed to investigate the sensitivity of the model to errors in the mean wave direction drawn from Gaussian distributions with varying standard deviations. The analysis shows the range of expected errors in shoreline position for an estimated range of errors in the mean wave direction at Narrabeen beach. This work highlights the importance of considering the sensitivity of one-line longshore model simulations to errors in the incident wave angle, which can be relatively large given the uncertainties in spectral wave model estimates of wave direction, in wave buoy observations, and in wave propagation methods or input bathymetry used to estimate wave breaking conditions.

## 1 Introduction

The littoral zone is a complex environment. It is both a physically dynamic interface, as well as a highly important social and economic zone, given the dense population and high concentration of human activities. In addition, the littoral zone and surrounding coastal areas are highly sensitive to marine flooding and erosion hazards, including shoreline retreat. Thus, it is essential to be able to understand and predict shoreline evolution, in particular at spatial scales of a beach and at medium to long temporal scales, as well as during extreme events.

43 To achieve this goal, a wide variety of morphological evolution models exist, ranging in complexity from  
44 three-dimensional, physics-based models (e.g. MIKE21 (Warren & Bach 1992), Delft3D (Roelvink & Banning  
45 1995), XBeach (Roelvink et al. 2009)) to one-line models representing only cross-shore (e.g. Miller & Dean  
46 2004, Yates et al. 2009, Davidson et al. 2013) or longshore (e.g. Ashton & Murray 2006, Turki et al. 2013,  
47 Bouchette et al. 2014) processes. The choice of an appropriate model thus depends on the dominant physical  
48 processes that must be represented or parameterized at the spatial and temporal scales of interest, and  
49 predicting coastal evolution at seasonal to decadal or longer timescales remains a significant challenge (Safak  
50 et al. 2017, Davidson et al. 2017, Montañó et al. 2020). Given the limits of numerical models at these  
51 temporal and spatial scales, empirical, process-based models may be an optimal alternative to physics-based  
52 models (Murray 2007, Ranasinghe R. 2013, French et al. 2016). This family of models allows simulating  
53 shoreline evolution at temporal and spatial scales given their numerical simplicity, low computational cost,  
54 and accuracy once calibrated.

55 At short (e.g. storm) to seasonal timescales, cross-shore processes are often dominant, while over longer  
56 time timescales (e.g. interannual to decadal), longshore processes may become increasingly important. To  
57 reproduce shoreline changes at these scales, both cross-shore and longshore processes must be taken into  
58 account. Recent work has thus focused on developing “hybrid” models that incorporate both cross-shore and  
59 longshore processes, including CoSMoS-COAST of Vitousek et al. (2017), LX-Shore of Robinet et al. (2018),  
60 the COCOONED model of Antolínez et al. (2019), and the combined model of Tran & Barthélemy (2020).  
61 These models are forced by hydrodynamic conditions (e.g. waves) and typically have several free parameters  
62 that must be calibrated for each study site.

63 In hybrid approaches, the one-line longshore transport model is the most commonly used approach to  
64 account for longshore processes (e.g., Vitousek et al. 2017, Robinet et al. 2018, Antolínez et al. 2019). For  
65 embayed beaches, additional approaches have been developed to simulate longshore processes, including semi-  
66 empirical approaches based on decomposing the mean and fluctuating components of the wave field (e.g. Tran  
67 & Barthélemy 2020, which is then combined with a cross-shore model), or by modeling directly the beach  
68 orientation using an equilibrium approach (Turki et al. 2013, Jaramillo et al. 2021).

69 Here, the focus is on the classical one-line model, which was first introduced by Pelnard-Considére (1956).  
70 It assumes that at long timescales, beach cross-shore profiles maintain an equilibrium shape in balance with  
71 the incoming wave field. The beach thus responds to perturbations by restoring the equilibrium shape.  
72 Therefore, gradients in longshore sediment fluxes cause landward or seaward shifts in the equilibrium profile,  
73 based on the hypothesis that cross-shore processes can be neglected at long temporal scales (Hanson 1989).  
74 The longshore sediment flux can be estimated using different formulae (e.g. CERC (1984) (USACE 1984),  
75 Kamphuis (1986) (Kamphuis et al. 1986)) that empirically relate the hydrodynamic conditions (e.g. breaking  
76 wave height and direction) and the beach geological characteristics (e.g. sediment porosity or grain size) to  
77 the longshore sediment flux. This simple approach depends on the quality of both the input data and the  
78 choice of model free parameters.

79 Recently, several studies have focused on identifying and evaluating sources of uncertainties in coastal  
80 morphological models. For example, Davidson et al. (2017) tested the sensitivity of the cross-shore empirical  
81 model ShoreFor (Davidson et al. 2013, Splinter et al. 2014) to variations in the potential future wave climate.  
82 D’Anna et al. (2020) went one step further using the hybrid LX-Shore model (where cross-shore changes  
83 are based on the ShoreFor model) by estimating the contribution of different input parameters to the total  
84 model uncertainty in a test case applied at Truc Vert beach. In addition, recent studies have also quantified  
85 uncertainties related to climate change impacts (Toimil et al. 2020), in particular focusing on the importance  
86 of changes in the mean water level on long-term shoreline change (Le Cozannet et al. 2019, Athanasiou et al.  
87 2020).

88 The one-line longshore model is a simple and therefore widely used model (Larson et al. 1997). It is  
89 thus important to study the uncertainties associated with this approach, and several recent studies have  
90 investigated the sensitivity of the model to a series of different assumptions and input parameters. Ruggiero  
91 et al. (2010) illustrated the relative importance of the wave climate (wave height, peak period and wave  
92 direction) and sediment supply (by varying the model sediment flux at the boundary) in simulations with  
93 the Unibest model (Delft Hydraulics 1994) by evaluating the model skill in reproducing observed shoreline  
94 changes. They showed that altering the offshore mean wave angle generated an important increase in the  
95 model error. Kroon et al. (2020) analyzed the relative contribution of errors in different model parameters  
96 and wave climate variability to the total model uncertainties as a function of the considered timescales. The  
97 model sensitivity to the wave climate is also demonstrated in George et al. (2019), where the longshore flux  
98 uncertainties are estimated by incorporating errors in the input wave height and direction. Previous studies  
99 have highlighted the sensitivity of the one-line model to wave climate uncertainties, including uncertainties  
100 in the wave direction, without directly quantifying the impacts on the modeled shoreline position.

101 Depending on the inherent complexity of the study site and the quality of the input data, the one-line

102 longshore model may generate changes in the beach planform (e.g. reorientation) that are different from  
103 observations. For example, this was observed recently using hybrid models when modeling shoreline changes  
104 in the North Beach Sub-cell of the Columbia River Littoral Cell (Washington, USA, (Antolínez et al. 2019)),  
105 and the highly studied Narrabeen Beach (Australia, (Robinet et al. 2020)).

106 The reorientation “artefact” is corrected for in Antolínez et al. (2019) by replacing the initial shoreline  
107 position with the computation of a new long-term average shoreline. This long-term average shoreline is  
108 generated by running their hindcast wave climate for 500 years, following Anderson et al. (2018). The  
109 authors assume that using the long-term average shoreline as the baseline should correct problems inherited  
110 from the wave climate, such as a wave direction bias in the offshore wave conditions or errors in the nearshore  
111 wave propagation.

112 Similarly, in Robinet et al. (2020), the beach reorientation observed in a 5-year-long simulation at  
113 Narrabeen Beach is corrected by running the model in two steps. First, the model simulates the 5-year  
114 period, and then the final shoreline position at the end of the first simulation is used as the initial shoreline  
115 position in the second simulation. The authors assume that the shoreline changes and not the shoreline  
116 position simulated in the second step are more accurate. Finally, the simulation results are corrected to  
117 account for the difference in the initial shoreline position in order to compare to the observations. Despite  
118 applying this two-step method, changes in the shoreline planform shape are still observed in the first year of  
119 the second simulation, and this time period is thus excluded from the remainder of their analysis.

120 These two studies (Antolínez et al. 2019, Robinet et al. 2020) used pre- and post-processing methods to  
121 manage the change in the coastline orientation introduced by the one-line longshore model. The authors  
122 suggest that the errors are potentially caused by errors in wave direction and/or nearshore propagation.  
123 However, they do not attempt to demonstrate this in their work. The current study is focused on under-  
124 standing the source of the coastline reorientation simulated by the one-line model, as well as applying a simple  
125 approach to correct for this error. This work therefore aims to study the overall sensitivity of the one-line  
126 modeling approach to biases or errors in the wave conditions. The epistemic uncertainties introduced by the  
127 longshore one-line model have two potential sources: the model formulation or the input wave conditions. In  
128 this study, it is assumed that the formulation of the one-line model is accurate, and the input wave direction  
129 is studied as a potential source of model uncertainties.

130 Previous studies have used Monte Carlo-based approaches in applications of the one-line model by gen-  
131 erating variations in the wave climate based on existing wave distributions (Wang & Reeve 2010, Bergillos  
132 et al. 2018) or from measured wave statistics (Reeve et al. 2014, Kroon et al. 2020). Here, two Monte Carlo  
133 approaches are used to evaluate the sensitivity of a one-line longshore model to the mean wave direction and  
134 wave height at Narrabeen Beach.

135 ~~In the first analysis, a spatially variable, random bias is added to the wave angle time series at each  
136 cross-shore transect to find the optimal values minimizing the difference in the simulated and observed  
137 shoreline position. Then, the second analysis starts with the wave angle time series corrected with the optimal  
138 values obtained in the first analysis, and then adds spatially variable random biases drawn from specified  
139 Gaussian distributions to test the sensitivity of the shoreline position results to these types of errors. Here,  
140 it is assumed that the distribution of potential errors in measured (e.g. wave buoy observations) or modeled  
141 (e.g. large-scale spectral wave models) wave direction are Gaussian. The sensitivity of the one-line longshore  
142 model to biases in the wave direction is evaluated by calculating the induced coastline reorientation. This  
143 study is applied at Narrabeen beach, where an optimal set of wave angle bias values are estimated to minimize  
144 the errors between the observed and modeled shoreline changes. Then, in the second analysis, the impacts  
145 of errors in the input wave angle on the modeled shoreline changes are quantified, and although this study is  
146 conducted using the data from Narrabeen Beach, the results can be generalized to other sites.~~

147 ~~In the first analysis, a spatially variable, random bias is added to the wave angle time series at each  
148 cross-shore transect to find the optimal values minimizing the difference between the simulated and observed  
149 shoreline position. Then, the second analysis aims to test the sensitivity of the shoreline model to spatially  
150 variable random biases drawn from specified Gaussian distributions. Here, it is assumed that the distribution  
151 of potential errors in measured (e.g. wave buoy observations) or modeled (e.g. large-scale spectral wave  
152 models) wave direction are Gaussian. Although this study is conducted using the data from Narrabeen  
153 beach, the results can be generalized to other sites.~~

154 In the following, the characteristics of the study site are presented (section 2) before describing the one-  
155 line longshore model (section 3) and the Monte Carlo approach applied in the analysis (section 4). The  
156 optimal bias values and the sensitivity of the model to the input wave angle and wave height are then  
157 evaluated (section 5), before discussing the hypotheses and limitations of this study, and the generalization  
158 of the approach to other sites (section 6). Finally, a synthesis of the results, as well as perspectives for future  
159 studies (section 7) are presented.




Figure 1: Study site location and wave characteristics: (a) map of Australia indicating the zoom shown in (b), (b) the area around Narrabeen beach, showing the location of Sydney and the offshore wave buoy. (c) The wave rose indicates the percent occurrence of each wave height (colorbar) and wave direction (between 1979-2015), and (d) a satellite image of Narrabeen-Collaroy Beach showing the location of the 5 surveyed cross-shore profiles (named PF1, PF2, PF4, PF6, and PF8) and the 5 locations where wave conditions are available (WP1, WP2, WP4, WP6, and WP8). The bathymetry contours are shown at 5 meter depth intervals (in grey).

161 The Narrabeen-Collaroy embayment is a 3.6 km-long sandy beach located in southeast Australia, to the  
 162 north of Sydney (Fig. 1). The embayment consists of Narrabeen beach at the northern end and Collaroy  
 163 beach at the southern end, and is hereafter referred to as Narrabeen beach for simplicity. The beach is  
 164 bordered by two rocky headlands at the northern and southern extremities, and the rocky substrate extends  
 165 underwater to approximately 60 m depth. Reefs are also present from 5 m to 10 m water depth in front of  
 166 both beach extremities (as can be seen partially in the satellite image in Fig. 1d in front of cross-shore profiles  
 167 PF1 and PF8). The beach is backed by low dunes at the northern end and by a seawall at the southern end.  
 168 An estuary forms a lagoon landward of the beach at the northern extremity, and the mouth of the estuary  
 169 breaches the dune intermittently.

170 The beach is characterized by fine to medium quartz sand ( $D_{50} \approx 0.3$  mm) that is nearly uniform  
 171 alongshore (Turner et al. 2016). The headlands at the extremities of the beach and the curvature of the

172 bay generate alongshore gradients in wave energy caused by wave sheltering and refraction processes. The  
173 effects of wave sheltering are more dominant at the southern end of the beach owing to the presence of the  
174 1.5 km-long rocky headland and the predominantly southeasterly incident waves, but wave sheltering also  
175 occurs at the northern end of the beach for less-frequent northerly incident waves. Differences in the wave  
176 exposure cause differences in the morphodynamic beach state, changing from a higher-energy, longshore-bar  
177 trough beach state in the north to a lower energy, low tide terrace/reflective beach state in the south (Wright  
178 & Short 1984, Harley et al. 2011).

179 Narrabeen beach is a semi-diurnal, micro-tidal environment with a mean spring tide of less than 1.5 m.  
180 The Sydney waverider buoy, located 11 km offshore in 80 m water depth (Fig. 1b), has recorded directional  
181 wave conditions since 1992, which are supplemented by hourly hindcast waves from the Centre for Australian  
182 Weather and Climate Research (Durrant et al. 2014) to fill data gaps due to buoy maintenance/dysfunction.  
183 The offshore wave climate ranges from moderate to high wave energy (mean  $H_s \simeq 1.6$  m and  $T_p \simeq 10$  s),  
184 with dominant long-period swell waves impacting the beach from the south-south-east (SSE) direction. In  
185 addition, storm waves (defined as  $H_s > 3$  m) are generated from tropical cyclones from the northeast,  
186 east-coast lows from the east, and cyclones from the south (Turner et al. 2016). The regional wave climate  
187 induces a relatively subtle seasonal cycle with higher energy conditions in the austral winter and lower energy  
188 conditions in the austral summer. Furthermore, the beach is influenced by the El Niño-Southern Oscillation  
189 (ENSO) at interannual timescales (approximately 3 to 7 years), resulting in more energetic and easterly waves  
190 impacting Narrabeen beach during La Niña periods and less energetic and more southerly waves during El  
191 Niño periods (Harley et al. 2010). Overall, nearshore currents dynamics are primarily driven by waves, given  
192 the generally mild wind conditions and microtidal regime.

193 Beach sand levels have been measured along 5 historical profiles (PF1, PF2, PF4, PF6, and PF8, as  
194 shown in Fig. 1d) at approximately monthly intervals since 1976. The offshore wave data is transformed  
195 into wave conditions along the 10 m depth contour in front of each profile (Fig. 2c-e) using a look-up table  
196 generated with a series of hundreds of SWAN spectral model runs (Turner et al. 2016). This high spatial  
197 and temporal resolution dataset consisting of topographic measurements and hourly wave conditions at 5  
198 cross-shore profiles along Narrabeen beach (described in detail by Turner et al. (2016)) is freely available at  
199 <http://narrabeen.wrl.unsw.edu.au>.

200 Observed morphological changes at the 5 cross-shore profiles show limited long-term changes (maximum  
201 linear trend =  $-0.54\text{m/yr}$  at PF4) in shoreline position (estimated as the cross-shore location of the  $z=0$  m  
202 altitude, Harley et al. 2011). However, significant seasonal, annual, and interannual variability is observed,  
203 with a mean value of 71 m for the overall range (min/max) of variability of the shoreline position, estimated  
204 across all profiles (e.g. PF4 and PF8, Fig. 2a,b). Seasonal variations in shoreline position show primarily  
205 accretion during the austral summer and erosion during the austral winter. Offshore of the 10m depth contour,  
206 bathymetric variations are nearly negligible, whereas in the surf zone, observed bathymetric variations are  
207 on the order of 1m, and thus may influence nearshore wave refraction.

208 The alongshore differences in wave conditions show more northerly waves and larger wave heights at PF4  
209 than at PF8 (Fig. 2c,e comparing the WP4 and WP8). The peak period ( $T_p$ , Fig. 2d) is assumed to be  
210 homogeneous along the 10 m depth contour for the 5 alongshore profiles since it is taken as equal to the  
211 offshore value (Turner et al. 2016). Fig. 2e also highlights the seasonal dependence of the variability in the  
212 wave direction, with reduced variability in wave direction during the austral winter.




Figure 2: Observations of the shoreline position ( $z=0$  m altitude) at (a) PF4 and (b) PF8, and the corresponding wave conditions at WP4 (blue) and WP8 (orange) showing the: (c) significant wave height ( $H_s$ ), (d) peak wave period ( $T_p$ ), and (e) wave direction. The gray-shaded areas indicate austral winters.

### 3 Model and sensitivity test description

#### 3.1 Mathematical model

In this study, alongshore sediment transport processes are modeled using a simple one-line approach based on the work of Pelnard-Considére (1956). The one-line model estimates changes in the shoreline position  $S$  generated by alongshore gradients in the alongshore sediment flux  $Q$ :

$$\frac{\partial S}{\partial t} = -\frac{1}{Dc} \frac{\partial Q}{\partial x}, \quad (1)$$

where  $Dc$  is the depth of closure. The longshore sediment flux  $Q$  is defined as:

$$Q = Q_0 \sin(2\alpha), \quad (2)$$

where

$$Q_0 = \frac{\rho K H_b^{2.5} \sqrt{g/\gamma_b}}{16(\rho_s - \rho)\lambda}, \quad (3)$$

and

$$\alpha = \alpha_b - \alpha_{shore}. \quad (4)$$

Here,  $K$  is a dimensionless empirical parameter,  $H_b$  is the breaking wave height,  $g$  is the gravitational acceleration,  $\gamma_b$  is the breaker index ratio,  $\rho$  and  $\rho_s$  are the water and sediment density, respectively,  $\lambda$  is the sediment porosity, and  $\alpha_b$  and  $\alpha_{shore}$  are the breaking wave angle and the shoreline angle (Fig. 3), respectively. The shoreline angle is calculated as:

$$\alpha_{shore} = \arctan\left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial x}\right). \quad (5)$$

Equation (1) thus can be rewritten as:

$$\frac{\partial S}{\partial t} = -\frac{1}{Dc} \frac{K \sqrt{g/\gamma_b}}{16(\rho_s - \rho)\lambda} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left[ H_b^{2.5} \sin(2(\alpha_b - \arctan \frac{\partial S}{\partial x})) \right]. \quad (6)$$

226 The mathematical model is discretized at predefined transects along the coast (Fig. 3), and first-order,  
 227 centered finite difference schemes are used:

$$\frac{S_n^{i+1} + S_n^i}{\Delta t} = -\frac{1}{Dc} \frac{Q_{n+1/2} - Q_{n-1/2}}{\Delta X_n}. \quad (7)$$

228 As shown in Fig. 3,  $n$  is the transect index,  $X_n$  is the alongshore distance between adjacent transects, and  $i$   
 229 is the time index.

230 Following Robinet et al. (2018), the wave characteristics at breaking (e.g.  $H_b$ ,  $\alpha_b$ , and  $\gamma_b$ ) are calculated  
 231 by numerically refracting and transforming the wave conditions from 10m water depth (e.g. WP points shown  
 232 in Fig. 1d) using the method of Larson et al. (2010).

233 The wave characteristics at breaking (e.g.  $H_b$ ,  $\alpha_b$ , and  $\gamma_b$ ) are calculated by numerically refracting and  
 234 transforming the wave conditions from 10 m water depth (e.g. WP points shown in Fig. 1d) using the method  
 235 of Larson et al. (2010). The limitations and hypotheses of this empirical approach are discussed in Section 6.




Figure 3: Schematic representation of the model setup for cross-shore transects (index  $n$ ), showing the shoreline position  $S$ , the relative wave angle  $\alpha$  (Eq.4), the alongshore sediment flux  $Q$ , and the local reference frame  $(X, Y)$ .

### 236 3.2 Model application at Narrabeen Beach

237 The one-line longshore model is applied at Narrabeen beach at 15 cross-shore transects distributed uniformly  
 238 alongshore ( $\Delta X = 250$  m). Wave conditions along the 10m depth contour were interpolated from the time  
 239 series provided at the 5 cross-shore profiles. Wave time series are unavailable at the 2 boundary transects, so  
 240 the wave conditions at these locations are initially assumed to be the same as those of the adjacent profiles.

241 Although measurements of sediment fluxes at the domain boundaries are unavailable, given the presence  
 242 of the rocky outcrops limiting alongshore sediment transport, they are assumed to be small, and zero-flux  
 243 conditions are applied at the boundaries. This hypothesis will be discussed further in section 6.



244 The  $K$  parameter is set to 0.02 for all transects based on qualitative comparisons of the amplitude  
245 of simulated and observed shoreline position variability. This parameter is often difficult to determine, and  
246 typical values in the literature range between 0.014 and 2.3 (Pilkey & Cooper 2002). The relative contribution  
247 of the  $K$  parameter in this study will be discussed further in section 6. The depth of closure  $D_c$  is estimated  
248 using the formula proposed by Hallermeier (1983), and an alongshore mean value of 12 m is used for all  
249 transects in agreement with the bathymetric observations of Turner et al. (2016).

250 The one-line model is applied for a 10-year time period, from 2005 to 2015, to simulate shoreline changes  
251 caused by longshore processes using a hourly time step. Cross-shore processes are neglected by assuming  
252 that they are dominant at interannual timescales and do not contribute significantly to observed trends at  
253 pluriannual timescales. Harley et al. (2015) completed an EOF (empirical orthogonal function) analysis of  
254 5 years of extensive 2D topographic surveys, identifying two principal modes of shoreline variability: cross-  
255 shore migration and beach rotation, explaining 55% and 22% of the variance, respectively. Beach rotation is  
256 typically attributed to longshore sediment processes, but the authors suggested that alongshore variability in  
257 cross-shore processes and differences in sandbar dynamics may also contribute. However, the contributions  
258 of these processes are not able to be quantified, and the temporal mode of the beach rotation EOF shows  
259 seasonal oscillations and no significant long-term trends.

260 Thus to compare the observations and the model, the mean annual shoreline position  $\bar{S}(t)$ , where the  
261 overline indicates the mean over a 12-month period, is calculated to focus predominantly on longshore pro-  
262 cesses and to evaluate the long-term trends in shoreline position. The simulation shows that, when forced  
263 with the wave time series along the 10 m depth contour, the one-line model causes a change in the shoreline  
264 planform shape, as seen in (Fig. 4b), where the final annual mean simulated ( $\bar{S}_{f,mod}$ ) and observed ( $\bar{S}_{f,obs}$ )  
265 shoreline position are compared.

266 In comparison to the observed shoreline position at the end of the simulated time period, the simulated  
267 coastline shows significant erosion at the southern end (around 150m at PF8), nearly no difference in the  
268 middle of the beach (with a pivot point near PF6), and accretion at the northern end (between +30m to  
269 +60m between PF1 and PF4)(Fig. 4b). Similar results producing large changes in the beach planform shape  
270 were also observed by Robinet et al. (2020) (as discussed previously) with the LX-Shore hybrid model over  
271 the 5-year time period from 2005 to 2010.

272 The beach reorientation simulated by the one-line model is caused by a disequilibrium between the  
273 coastline orientation and the incident wave direction. For a simplified case with a constant wave incidence  
274 angle, the one-line model is equivalent to a diffusion equation, bringing the shoreline position toward an  
275 equilibrium state. This equilibrium is reached when the coastline orientation is perpendicular to the incident  
276 wave direction. When the one-line model is applied at a natural site with temporal variations in the wave  
277 direction, the same response is achieved if the mean incident wave direction does not vary significantly in  
278 time. Thus, assuming that the one-line model concept is correct, the simulated beach reorientation observed  
279 here is hypothesized to be caused by errors in the model input variables or parameters, and in particular by  
280 biases in the incident wave direction. The potential contribution of bias errors in the wave height will be also  
281 be discussed in section 6.

## 282 4 Methods: wave angle bias assessment

283 To evaluate the sensitivity of the model to the incident wave angle, two different analyses are completed  
284 by: (1) first searching for the optimal set of bias values that minimize the differences between the simulated  
285 and observed shoreline evolution, and then (2) systematically testing the sensitivity of the model to sets of  
286 random wave angle biases generated from specified Gaussian distributions. For both analyses, Monte Carlo  
287 simulations are completed to evaluate the impacts of the wave angle biases on the simulated shoreline position  
288 and resultant coastline orientation.

289 In this analysis, it is important to distinguish between a wave angle bias and a wave angle error. A wave  
290 angle bias is variable in space but constant in time (systematic error), whereas a wave angle error is variable  
291 in both space and time (non-systematic or random error). In this study, wave angle biases are examined  
292 because in the long term, random wave angle errors were observed to compensate for each other in time (not  
293 show here) and did not generate long-term coastline reorientation in the one-line longshore model, as will be  
294 discussed further in section 6.4.

### 295 4.1 Wave angle bias estimation

296 In the first analysis, the impact of wave angle biases in the input wave time series at 10 m depth is evaluated  
297 with a 3-step method.




Figure 4: (a) Longshore model setup at Narrabeen beach, showing the 15 defined cross-shore transects. (b) Observed (green line) and simulated (red line) annual mean shoreline position at the end of the 10-year simulation. For each cross-shore transect, the red arrow indicates the temporal mean wave angle ( $\alpha_w$ ) at 10 m water depth.

298 First, at each position between adjacent transect, a random wave angle bias ( $\tau$ ) that is constant in time,  
 299 is drawn from a uniform, univariate distribution using a Monte Carlo approach. The uncorrelated  
 300 wave angle biases ( $\tau_{n+1/2}$ ) are then added to the wave direction time-series at each position  $n + 1/2$  such  
 301 that the new wave angle  $\tilde{\alpha}_{w,n+1/2}(t)$  in 10 m water depth is:

$$\tilde{\alpha}_{w,n+1/2}(t) = \alpha_{w,n+1/2}(t) + \tau_{n+1/2}. \quad (8)$$

302 Then, the one-line longshore model is run using the modified wave direction time series  $\tilde{\alpha}_{w,n+1/2}(t)$ , while  
 303 the input wave height  $H_{s,10}$  and wave period  $T_{p,10}$  remain unchanged.

304 Lastly, the normalized root mean square error (NRMSE) is computed to quantify the difference between  
 305 the observed and simulated shoreline position. The root mean square error (RMSE) is computed as:

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T (\tilde{S}_{mod,n}(t) - \tilde{S}_{obs,n}(t))^2} \quad (9)$$

307 with  $\tilde{S}_{obs}$  the annual moving average observation (to remove the seasonal variability) computed every month  
 308 and  $\tilde{S}_{mod}$  the simulated shoreline position at the corresponding time, summed over all observations times  $T$   
 309 and all transects  $N$ .

310 The NRMSE is calculated as the RMSE normalized by the minimum of the all the RMSE values after  
 311 the Monte Carlo process. This method is applied twice, in a nested approach. A first set of 15,000 Monte  
 312 Carlo realizations of wave angle biases is generated, allowing  $\tau$  to vary from  $-30^\circ$  to  $+30^\circ$ , following a uniform  
 313 univariate distribution. The results are then used to define smaller angle intervals for each transect  $n + 1/2$   
 314 (as shown by the vertical cyan bars in Fig. 5a), and a second set of 10,000 Monte Carlo realizations were  
 315 completed to determine the set of wave angle biases  $\tau_{n+1/2}$  yielding the minimum NRMSE.

316 Since morphological observations are not available at the domain boundaries during the simulated period,  
 317 the existing 2D survey data, which spans part of the simulated period, are used to estimate the long-term  
 318 trends at the two boundary transects. No trends are observed, thus it is assumed shoreline position remains  
 319 unchanged for the 10-year period.

## 4.2 Model sensitivity analyses

In order to test the sensitivity of the model to the magnitude of the wave angle bias, the wave angle time series  $\tilde{\alpha}_{w,n+1/2}(t)$  are corrected using the optimal set of biases obtained in the previous analysis. These new time series are then used as the reference simulation in the sensitivity analyses. Then, new randomly generated wave angle biases  $\tau'_{n+1/2}$  are drawn from Gaussian distributions with specified standard deviations and are added to each cross-shore transect. The new wave angle time series  $\alpha'_{w,n+1/2}(t)$  at each cross-shore transect are thus defined as:

$$\alpha'_{w,n+1/2}(t) = \tilde{\alpha}_{w,n+1/2}(t) + \tau'_{n+1/2}. \quad (10)$$

For each test, the  $\tau'_{n+1/2}$  values are drawn from independent Gaussian distributions with a specified standard deviation  $\sigma_{\tau'}$ . Six different tests with 1000 Monte Carlo realizations were carried out for  $\sigma_{\tau'}$  ranging from  $1^\circ$  to  $6^\circ$ .

A second sensitivity analysis testing the relative importance of biases in the wave height is carried out for comparison. The same approach is used, and the wave height time series are adjusted by a bias  $\beta'$  that is a percentage of the wave height, such that:

$$H'_{sw,n+1/2}(t) = (1 + \beta'_{n+1/2})H_{sw,n+1/2}(t). \quad (11)$$

For each test, the  $\beta'_{n+1/2}$  values are drawn from independent Gaussian distributions with a specified standard deviation  $\sigma_{\beta'}$ . Four different tests with 1000 Monte Carlo realizations were carried out for  $\sigma_{\beta'}$  ranging from 5% to 30%.

Finally, the associated error is quantified as the difference between the final, simulated annual mean shoreline position for each realization with a specified  $\sigma_{\tau'}$  or  $\sigma_{\beta'}$  and for the reference simulation.

The distribution of the differences is obtained for each value of  $\sigma_{\tau'}$  or  $\sigma_{\beta'}$ , which is then characterized by its standard deviation  $\sigma_{\Delta S}$ . The standard deviation serves as a metric to estimate the order of magnitude of shoreline position errors for a given distribution of wave angle bias errors.

## 5 Results

### 5.1 Optimal wave angle analysis

In Fig. 5a, the 50 best Monte Carlo realizations with a NRMSE within 30% of the minimum value vary within a range of up to  $10^\circ$  for each transect and show generally positive values of  $\tau$  in the north (with two exceptions just north of PF2 and PF4), and then increasingly negative values south of PF4. The optimum set of  $\tau$  values (purple curve, Fig. 5a) between PF1 to PF8 ranges from  $10^\circ$  to  $-20^\circ$  (Table 1).

Table 1: Approximate optimum set of  $\tau$  values for each cross-shore profile that minimize the NRMSE between the simulated and observed shoreline changes.

Profile	PF1	PF2	PF4	PF6	PF8
Optimum $\tau$	$-0.5^\circ$	$4.8^\circ$	$4.5^\circ$	$-13.2^\circ$	$-19.9^\circ$

It is important to note that the model depends not only on  $\tau_{n+1/2}$ , but also on alongshore gradients in  $\tau_{n+1/2}$ . In the one-line longshore model, changes in the shoreline position are caused by alongshore gradients in the sediment flux, which are calculated from alongshore gradients in the wave angle  $\alpha_b$  and in the wave height  $H_b$ , as shown in Eq.(7). The alongshore gradients in  $\tau_{n+1/2}$  for the 50 best realizations (Fig. 5b) have a similar, concave shape with the highest values at the extremities of the beach.

The optimal  $\tau$  values correct for the potential wave angle bias at breaking, caused either by biases in the 10 m depth wave time series or by wave refraction occurring between the 10 m depth contour and the wave breaking point. The large values of  $\tau_{n+1/2}$  obtained near the boundary transects (Fig. 5a) may also be attributed to two additional sources that impact more significantly the transects at or near the domain boundaries. They correct for errors induced by extrapolating the wave conditions from the WP points to the domain boundaries, likely generating the largest errors at these transects. They also correct for the assumption that there are no sediment fluxes at the boundaries.




Figure 5: Wave angle bias tests: (a) wave angle bias correction ( $\tau_{n+1/2}$ ) and (b) gradient in wave angle bias correction between adjacent transects plotted for the 50 best Monte Carlo realizations. The vertical cyan bars indicate the range of values used to define the second set of refined Monte Carlo realizations. The color of each curve indicates the NRMSE (gray color scale ranging from 1.0 to 1.3), and the optimal set of  $\tau_{n+1/2}$  values are shown in magenta.

## 5.2 Optimal wave angle bias values

Using the optimal set of  $\tau_{n+1/2}$  values in the one-line longshore model reproduces a simulated coastline shape similar to the observed coastline shape (Fig. 6a). The wave angle time series are corrected with small changes in the mean wave angle (e.g. Table 1 for PF1-PF8) relative to the original mean wave angle (Fig. 6a), except close to the domain boundaries at the extremities of the beach. The difference between the annual mean initial, observed and final, observed or modeled shoreline position is calculated as:  $\Delta \bar{S} = \bar{S}_f - \bar{S}_i$ . The difference  $\Delta \bar{S}$  calculated for the corrected wave time series is similar to the observed changes  $\Delta \bar{S}_{obs}$  (Fig. 6b).

The simulated shoreline position changes using the original wave angle time series ( $\alpha_{n+1/2}$  red triangles in Fig. 6b) are generally larger than or of the same order of magnitude as the seasonal variability over the 10-year period (Fig. 6b, gray bars). However, the simulated shoreline position changes using the corrected wave time series are smaller than the observed seasonal variability (Fig. 6b, gray bars) and agree more closely with the observations. Finally, this simple analysis demonstrates how a relatively small bias in the input wave angle can cause significant changes in the shoreline planform shape that are different from the observations.

## 5.3 Model sensitivity analyses

Using the wave angle time series  $\tilde{\alpha}_w$  corrected with the optimal set of bias values  $\tau_{n+1/2}$  as the reference case, a sensitivity analysis is completed to evaluate the impacts of randomly distributed wave angle biases on the simulated shoreline position.

Six different tests of 1000 Monte Carlo realizations were carried out for  $\sigma_{\tau'}$  ranging from  $1^\circ$  to  $6^\circ$ , and the model error is quantified as the standard deviation  $\sigma_{\Delta S}$  of a Gaussian distribution fit to the distribution of the estimated shoreline position differences (e.g. Fig. 7a,c, for  $\sigma_{\tau'} = 5^\circ$ ). The standard deviation of shoreline position errors  $\sigma_{\Delta S}$  increases approximately linearly as a function of the standard deviation of the wave angle biases  $\sigma_{\tau'}$  (Fig. 7b). Shoreline position errors are on the order of 5m for wave angle biases as small as  $1^\circ$ , and increase to more than 30m for wave angle biases of only  $5-6^\circ$ .

With respect to the sensitivity of the model to a bias in the wave height, with  $\sigma_{\beta'} = 5\%$ ,  $10\%$ ,  $20\%$ ,  $30\%$ , the associated shoreline position errors  $\sigma_{\Delta S}$  are approximately one order of magnitude smaller than for the wave angle bias tests (comparing Fig. 7d, e and f). For example, shoreline position errors are typically less than 1m for wave height biases of 5% and reach only 3m for wave height biases as large as 30%.




Figure 6: Comparison of the observed and simulated shoreline position: (a) aerial view of the observed initial  $\bar{S}_{i,obs}$  (cyan) and final  $\bar{S}_{f,obs}$  (green) shoreline position and the simulated final shoreline position for the original  $\bar{S}_f$  (red) and corrected  $\tilde{\bar{S}}_f$  (blue) wave angle time series. Also shown are the temporal mean wave direction of the original  $\alpha_w$  (red arrow) and corrected  $\tilde{\alpha}_w$  (blue arrow) time series and the wave direction envelop (grey shading) in 10 m water depth. (b) Difference in the shoreline position relative to the initial observations (cyan) for: the final observed ( $\Delta\bar{S}_{obs}$ , green) and simulated shoreline position for the original ( $\Delta\bar{S}$ , red) and corrected ( $\Delta\tilde{\bar{S}}$ , blue) wave angle time series, and beach shoreline position variance (gray).

## 388 6 Discussion

### 389 6.1 One-line model limitations

390 The one-line longshore model is a simple approach for estimating large-scale longshore sediment transport  
 391 that has several important conceptual limitations (see Pilkey & Cooper 2002). Two potential sources of error  
 392 can be distinguished: the conceptual framework of the one-line model and the longshore flux estimation.

393 In the conceptual model, one limitation is the estimation of the depth of closure  $D_c$ , which determines the  
 394 active profile length. The assumption that a well-defined depth of closure exists remains controversial, and it  
 395 is difficult to identify this limit *in situ*. While a physical, cross-shore limit to the active profile (zone within  
 396 which wave-breaking induced sediment transport occurs) likely exists, this limit varies in time as a function  
 397 of the wave characteristics and sediment characteristics and availability, and depends on the considered time  
 398 period (Valiente et al. 2019). Therefore, assuming a constant value in time and in space (e.g. for a beach)  
 399 is convenient for modeling purposes but may contribute to intrinsic errors in one-line models (D’Anna et al.  
 400 2021). A second limitation is the assumption of a constant equilibrium profile and a uniform cross-shore  
 401 distribution of the longshore sediment flux (Bayram et al. 2001). In addition, factors like the instantaneous  
 402 tide level, which would be more important on a meso- or macrotidal beach, or total water depth likely impact  
 403 the cross-shore distribution of sediments.

404 In estimating the longshore sediment flux, a second potential source of errors in the one-line model is  
 405 the choice or calibration of the  $K$  parameter in the CERC formula. This free parameter determines the  
 406 longshore flux magnitude, and its magnitude and even use are highly controversial (see Pilkey & Cooper  
 407 2002). However, in this study the value of  $K$  does not impact the estimation of  $\tau$  since  $K$  is constant for  
 408 all transects and thus the one-line model can be simplified to a diffusion equation. Therefore, in long-term  
 409 simulations where the coastline reaches a new equilibrium shape, the  $K$  value **primarily** impacts the value of




Figure 7: Wave angle bias sensitivity analysis: (a) wave angle bias distribution for  $\sigma_{\tau'} = 5^\circ$ , (b) standard deviation of shoreline position differences ( $\sigma_{\Delta\bar{S}'}$ ) as a function of  $\sigma_{\tau'}$ , showing the mean (black stars) and envelope (range of minimum and maximum values) over all transects (gray shading) (c) shoreline position difference (in comparison to the reference case) distribution for all transects for  $\sigma_{\tau'} = 5^\circ$ , (d)  $\beta'$  distribution for  $\sigma_{\beta'} = 10\%$ , (e) standard deviation of shoreline position differences ( $\sigma_{\Delta\bar{S}'}$ ) as a function of  $\sigma_{\beta'}$ , showing the mean (black stars) and envelope (range of minimum and maximum values) over all transects (gray shading), and (f) shoreline position difference distribution for all transects for  $\sigma_{\beta'} = 10\%$ .

410 the diffusion coefficient, which controls the coastline adjustment timescale to changes in the wave angle,   
 411 but does not impact the coastline shape.

412 Finally, the one-line model conserves sediment, and therefore the [choice of](#) boundary conditions may have   
 413 strong impacts on the simulated shoreline changes. In this study, it is assumed that there are no sediment   
 414 fluxes at the boundaries since the beach is bounded by rocky outcrops. The only likely sediment sources or   
 415 sinks are associated with the lagoon mouth at the northern end of the beach. [However, the corresponding](#)   
 416 [fluxes are unable to be quantified accurately and are assumed to be](#) negligible in comparison to the estimated   
 417 longshore fluxes (Harley et al. 2011), so they are not considered in the model.

## 418 6.2 Wave bias analysis assumptions and limits

419 In this study, several assumptions are made in applying a Monte Carlo approach to finding the optimal set   
 420 of wave angle bias corrections and then in completing sensitivity [analyses](#) to randomly generated wave angle   
 421 [and wave height](#) bias errors. Firstly, it is assumed that the errors observed in the one-line model simulation   
 422 (e.g. reorientation of the coastline) are caused by errors in the input wave angle time series and not in the   
 423 general model formulation.

424 This study focused on evaluating the effects of random wave angle biases rather than random, time-variable   
 425 errors because [in preliminary tests \(not shown here\), the effects of random wave angle errors compensated](#)   
 426 [for each other in time over the 10-year period, causing no long-term trends in shoreline position changes.](#)   
 427 Time-variable errors induce short-term shoreline changes, at timescales of the model time-step, which are   
 428 affected by the  $K$  parameter. Thus, the sensitivity of the model to time-variable errors is linked intrinsically   
 429 to the estimation of  $K$ , and therefore these two issues should be addressed simultaneously (as in Kroon et al.   
 430 2020).

431 Secondly, a Monte Carlo approach is chosen to generate the random wave angle biases  $\tau_{n+1/2}$ . A simpler

432 hypothesis would be to consider an alongshore homogeneous  $\tau$ , assuming that the wave angle bias originates  
 433 at the wave buoy **and remains constant as the waves propagate to the 10m depth contour**. In this case, the  
 434 corrected wave angle time series would become:

$$\alpha_{w,n+1/2}^*(t) = \alpha_{w,n+1/2}(t) + \tau. \quad (12)$$

435  
 436 The effects of adding an alongshore homogeneous  $\tau$  (ranging from  $-30^\circ \leq \tau \leq 30^\circ$ ) show that it is  
 437 insufficient to correct **changes in the shoreline planform shape because it induces different responses at**  
 438 **different alongshore locations**. For example, an alongshore homogeneous change in mean wave direction is  
 439 able to correct the shoreline **position changes** at PF8 with  $\tau \approx -10^\circ$  (Fig. 8b), but it is unable to **do so** at  
 440 PF4 (Fig. 8a). At PF4, adding a spatially homogeneous  $\tau$  value does not allow reproducing the observed  
 441 shoreline changes since all of the simulations predicted significant long-term trends that were not observed.

442 At Narrabeen beach, local wave refraction contributes to alongshore gradients in wave angle. **Alongshore**  
 443 **variable biases thus allow to correct** for errors associated with local wave refraction that varies alongshore  
 444 owing to the curvature of the coastline and the alongshore variable bathymetry. In particular, these errors  
 445 may become large at the extremities of the beach near PF1 and PF8 where reefs located in -5 to -10 m water  
 446 depth likely have significant impacts on wave refraction.

447 Extending this work beyond Narrabeen beach, this analysis emphasizes the importance in representing  
 448 well not only the wave angle time series, but also alongshore gradients in the wave angle time series used to  
 449 force one-line longshore models.




Figure 8: Sensitivity analysis with alongshore homogeneous  $\tau$  showing the shoreline position evolution from observations  $S_{obs}$  (green), the original model simulation  $S$  (black), the model simulation forced with the corrected wave angle time series  $\tilde{S}$  (purple), and the model simulations  $S^*$  forced with wave angle time series adjusted with alongshore homogeneous  $\tau$  ranging from  $-30^\circ$  to  $30^\circ$  (blue-red colorbar).

### 450 6.3 Planform beach orientation




Figure 9: Comparison of (a) Beach Orientation (BO) and (b) Beach Orientation Index (BOI) for shoreline observation (grey dotted), original model simulation (red) and model simulation forced with correct wave angle time series (black).

451 To evaluate the capacity of the one-line model to accurately reproduce the beach orientation and it  
 452 evolution in time, the Beach Orientation  $BO$  and Beach Orientation Index  $BOI$  were calculated following  
 453 Harley et al. (2014) and Jaramillo et al. (2021). The  $BO$  and  $BOI$  are calculated using the observed  
 454 shoreline position  $S_{obs}$  and both the original  $S$  and corrected  $\tilde{S}$  simulated shoreline positions at the 5 cross-  
 455 shore transects PF1-8 (Fig. 9a, b). During the simulated period, the observed beach orientation  $BO_{obs}$  and  
 456 beach orientation index  $BOI_{obs}$  show slightly negative trends and small seasonal oscillations (gray circles,  
 457 Fig. 9). In comparison, beach orientation  $BO_{mod}$  and beach orientation index  $BOI_{mod}$  calculated from the  
 458 simulations with the original wave angle time series (red curves, Fig. 9) shows significant differences with  
 459 the observations. After correcting the wave angle time series with the optimal set of biases, the agreement  
 460 between the observed and simulated beach orientation  $\tilde{BO}_{mod}$  and beach orientation index  $\tilde{BOI}_{mod}$  (black  
 461 curves, Fig. 9) increases significantly. Jaramillo et al. (2021) also modeled shoreline changes at Narrabeen  
 462 beach with an equilibrium-based shoreline rotation model, quantifying their model performance with the  
 463  $RMSE$  between the simulated and observed  $BO$  and  $BOI$  time series. The results presented here (using  
 464 only a one-line longshore model) obtain  $RMSE$  of the same order of magnitude as their study (which covered  
 465 a longer time period).

### 466 6.4 One-line model sensitivity to biases in the wave height and direction

467 Assuming that the one-line model is conceptually correct, this work shows that correcting a small wave  
 468 angle bias (approximately 5-10°) has significant impacts on simulated long-term shoreline change trends.  
 469 The comparison of the observed and corrected simulations of shoreline changes highlights that [this approach](#)  
 470 [allows improving long-term \(10-year\) simulations](#) of shoreline evolution ( $\tilde{S}$ , purple line compared to  $S_{obs}$ , the  
 471 dashed black line in Fig. 8). [As expected, the corrected mean wave angles in Fig. 6a are more perpendicular](#)  
 472 [to the coastline orientation.](#) However, the difference between the mean wave and shoreline angles is not  
 473 reduced to zero, which would result in no longshore sediment fluxes.



474 The sensitivity analyses quantified the impacts of a Gaussian distribution of wave angle biases in wave  
 475 direction and wave height. The wave angle sensitivity analysis showed significantly larger impacts on the  
 476 modeled final shoreline position than the wave height sensitivity analysis. For wave angle biases  $\tau'$  drawn  
 477 from a Gaussian distribution with a standard deviation of  $\sigma_{\tau'}$ , the associated alongshore gradients in wave  
 478 direction are even larger, following a Gaussian distribution with a standard deviation of  $\sqrt{2}\sigma_{\tau'}$ . The observed  
 479 increases in  $\sigma_{\Delta\bar{s}_i}$  are thus a result of the importance of alongshore gradients in wave angle and wave height in  
 480 the one-line model, as well as the uncorrelated sampling method used to obtain each Monte Carlo realization.  
 481 These gradients thus cause large gradients in alongshore sediment fluxes, resulting in significant shoreline  
 482 position changes (e.g. on the order of 5 m to 30 m for wave angle biases ranging from  $1^\circ$  to  $6^\circ$ ).

483 In this study, the set of optimal  $\tau$  values (section 5.1) are the same order of magnitude as the uncertainties  
 484 estimated by Turner et al. (2016) for transects PF1, 2, 4, and 6. The higher  $\tau$  values obtained at PF8 and  
 485 near the boundary transects BD1 and BD2 are likely caused by other factors, as suggested in section 5.1.  
 486 One such contribution is the assumption that the wave conditions at BD1 and BD2 are the same as those at  
 487 adjacent transects, even though the coastline angle changes. Secondly, the presence of reefs in the nearshore  
 488 zone may cause wave refraction between the 10 m depth contour and the location of wave breaking that is not  
 489 taken into account in the Larson et al. (2010) wave refraction approach used here. Finally, the assumption of  
 490 no sediment fluxes at the boundaries forces the longshore model to conserve sediment, although the sediment  
 491 budget is not necessarily strictly closed if sediment either bypasses the rocky outcrop at the southern end of  
 492 the beach or is gained or lost at the lagoon mouth at the northern end of beach.

493 Finally, biases in the wave height have significantly smaller impacts on the resultant shoreline changes  
 494 than biases in the wave angle (Fig. 7b,e), causing shoreline position changes on the order of 3 m for wave  
 495 height biases as large as 30%. When generating wave conditions from wind-forced wave models, Komen et al.  
 496 (1996) estimated that a 10% error in the surface wind speed can cause a 10–20% error in the wave height.  
 497 Thus, similar to George et al. (2019), the range of wave height bias errors  $\beta'$  tested in this study ranged from  
 498 5% to 30%, representing a potentially common range of errors encountered at sites with limited wave data.  
 499 However, these biases are significantly larger than the expected values at Narrabeen beach, where Turner  
 500 et al. (2016) estimated wave height biases on the order of only 3-4%.

## 501 6.5 Comparison of corrected and SWAN model breaking wave angles

502 To investigate the cause of the wave bias and the validity of the wave angle corrections  $\tau_{n+1/2}$  proposed here,  
 503 the corrected mean wave direction at the breaking point  $\tilde{\alpha}_{b,n+1/2}$  obtained in this analysis (after using the  
 504 Larson et al. (2010) method to propagate  $\tilde{\alpha}_{w,n+1/2}$  to the breaking point) is compared to the breaking wave  
 505 direction derived interdependently from a high resolution SWAN model (Harley et al. 2011) (Fig. 10b). These  
 506 data are produced using a look-up table similar to that described in Turner et al. (2016), after extending it  
 507 from producing wave conditions at 10 m water depth to the break point (thereby taking into account the  
 508 additional refraction caused by nearshore reefs). The SWAN simulations were run using a single directional  
 509 spreading value ( $30^\circ$ ) and were calibrated using nearshore wave data, showing a high correlation for the  
 510 wave height and a slightly lower correlation for the wave direction (approximately 0.9 and 0.7, respectively  
 511 Turner et al. 2016). While the SWAN model succeeds overall in reproducing the nearshore wave conditions, a  
 512 deterministic wave model such as XBeach may be able to reproduce better the breaking wave conditions for  
 513 this complex bathymetry. Before comparing the wave angles at the breaking point, it is important to note  
 514 that the refraction calculated by the Larson et al. (2010) method between 10 m depth and the breaking point  
 515 is small, ranging from  $0^\circ$  in the north to approximately  $-7^\circ$  in the south (Fig. 10a). The estimated refraction  
 516 effects are even smaller for the corrected wave angles  $\tilde{\alpha}_{w,n+1/2}$  since on average the difference between the  
 517 offshore wave angle and the coastline orientation decreased.

518 The comparison of the optimal breaking wave angles obtained in this analysis ( $\tilde{\alpha}_b$ ) with the SWAN  
 519 breaking wave angle ( $\alpha_{b,SWAN}$ ) shows good overall agreement (Fig. 10b), supporting the hypothesis that  
 520 the errors generated by the one-line model are caused by biases in the input wave angle. The corrected  
 521 breaking wave angles are in general close to the SWAN breaking wave angles. The largest differences are  
 522 observed at PF1, which is close to the model boundary, and PF6, where the wave angle bias is overestimated  
 523 in comparison to the SWAN model look-up table. The largest change (nearly  $20^\circ$ ) between the original ( $\alpha_b$ )  
 524 and corrected ( $\tilde{\alpha}_b$ ) wave angle time series occurred at PF8, where  $\tilde{\alpha}_b$  now agrees well with  $\alpha_{b,SWAN}$ . It is  
 525 assumed that the optimal wave angle bias at this location primarily corrects for the underestimation of local  
 526 wave refraction caused by a nearshore reef.




Figure 10: Temporal mean input and breaking wave angles: (a) Comparison between the mean original  $\alpha_w$  (purple triangles) and corrected  $\tilde{\alpha}_w$  (green points) 10 m depth wave angles, and the original  $\alpha_b$  (red triangles) and corrected  $\tilde{\alpha}_b$  (black points) breaking wave angles propagated using the Larson et al. (2010) method. (b) Comparison between the mean original (red triangles), corrected (black points), and SWAN (blue points) breaking wave angles, where the shaded zones indicate the standard deviation.

## 6.6 Wave data uncertainties

Morphological evolution models are forced with wave conditions derived from observations (e.g. wave buoys) and model outputs (e.g. spectral wave models). This study shows the sensitivity of a one-line longshore model to errors in the input wave direction, which then propagate through the modeling chain to cause errors in the predicted morphological changes. This is an important result because it is well known that the wave direction is difficult to estimate accurately with spectral wave models, often showing large uncertainties (e.g. Ardhuin & Roland 2013, Cavaleri et al. 2018), and that wave buoy observations also have errors in measured wave angles (e.g. Barstow et al. 2005). Even if the input wave conditions are known with high accuracy from one of these sources, wave conditions are often obtained at an offshore location and then must be propagated to the breaking point to be input in the one-line model flux calculation. Therefore, at the breaking point, it is often difficult to have highly accurate knowledge of the wave conditions, and in particular the incident wave angle, in particular in areas where refraction over complex bathymetry may be significant and not necessarily represented well when using simple wave transformation approaches. An additional limitation in one-line longshore models is that bulk wave parameters are used to force the model, and thus the potential complexity of the full-spectra is neglected (e.g. existence of secondary swells, bimodal spectra, or high wave angle spreading).

This study highlights the importance of propagating accurately offshore wave conditions to the nearshore zone to force morphological evolution models. One-line longshore models are particularly sensitive to the input wave angle, and even more so, to alongshore gradients in the input wave angle. In addition, this work also demonstrates that having high-quality estimates of nearshore wave conditions at 10 m depth may not be sufficient in particular cases where there is significant refraction shoreward of this location up to the breaking point (e.g. for embayed beach or beaches with complex nearshore bathymetry such as Narrabeen). However, it is not common to have access to high-quality, high-resolution, long-term estimates of wave conditions at the wave breaking point due to the high computational costs associated with nearshore wave propagation models. This emphasizes the need for further developments in nearshore in situ hydrodynamics monitoring and accurate and efficient nearshore wave propagation models, as well as the necessity to take into account uncertainties in morphological evolution studies.

## 7 Conclusions

In this study, the sensitivity of a commonly used one-line longshore sediment transport model to the input wave angle is evaluated using a statistical approach. The study is carried out at Narrabeen beach for the 10-year period from 2005 to 2015, where the model, forced with an available dataset of wave conditions at the 10 m depth contour, simulated a [change in the shoreline planform orientation that was different from that of the observations](#). The objective of the current work is to study the source of this error and to understand the sensitivity of the one-line longshore model to the input wave angle by using a Monte Carlo approach to correct the wave angle time series by adding randomly generated biases (spatially variable but temporally constant). The model sensitivity is further quantified by comparing the simulated shoreline position at the end of the 10-year period to the observations and to the reference test case corresponding to the optimal wave bias correction.

The results of the first analysis show that [by correcting the wave angle time series with the optimal set of biases](#) (in the range of  $-20^\circ$  to  $5^\circ$ ), [the simulated shoreline planform orientation agrees well with the observations](#). The shoreline position error distributions resulting from the wave angle and wave height bias sensitivity analyses [demonstrate that the one-line longshore model is highly sensitive to biases in the wave angle](#). For example, the standard deviation of the shoreline position errors increases by approximately 5 m for a  $1^\circ$  increase in the wave direction bias, [but by less than 1 m for a 10% bias in the wave height](#).

The breaking wave angles obtained from the optimal corrected [biases in this study generally agree well with the breaking wave angles obtained by propagating offshore wave conditions using the SWAN model](#). This comparison also demonstrated that [the corrections](#) to the mean wave direction are coherent with wave refraction processes in the nearshore zone, which are not taken into account in simple wave transformation models often used to estimate wave breaking conditions. Thus, the methodology presented in this paper is able to compensate for the lack of accurate breaking wave direction data by using available morphological observations.

Finally, this study highlights the need for high quality estimates of breaking wave conditions, and in particular, the wave breaking direction and its alongshore gradients, in longshore sediment transport models. Even when nearshore (e.g. 10 m depth) wave conditions are known, simple propagation methods like the approach of Larson et al. (2010) should be used with caution in areas with complex bathymetry, and the uncertainties associated with these simple modeling approaches should be evaluated.

## Acknowledgements

Teddy Chataigner's thesis is financed by the *Agence de l'Innovation de Défense* (AID) program of the *Direction Générale de l'Armement* (DGA), the Cerema, and the Ecole des Ponts.

## References

- Anderson, D., Ruggiero, P., Antolínez, J. A. A., Méndez, F. J. & Allan, J. (2018), 'A climate index optimized for longshore sediment transport reveals interannual and multidecadal littoral cell rotations', *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface* **123**(8), 1958–1981.
- Antolínez, J. A. A., Méndez, F. J., Anderson, D., Ruggiero, P. & Kaminsky, G. M. (2019), 'Predicting climate-driven coastlines with a simple and efficient multiscale model', *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface* **124**(6), 1596–1624.
- Ardhuin, F. & Roland, A. (2013), 'The development of spectral wave models: Coastal and coupled aspects', *Proceedings of Coastal Dynamics 2013: 7th International Conference on Coastal Dynamics* .
- Ashton, A. D. & Murray, A. B. (2006), 'High-angle wave instability and emergent shoreline shapes: 1. modeling of sand waves, flying spits, and capes', *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface* **111**(F4).
- Athanasίου, P., Van Dongeren, A. R., Giardino, A., Vousedoukas, M. I., Ranasinghe, R. & Kwadijk, J. (2020), 'Uncertainties in projections of sandy beach erosion due to sea level rise: an analysis at the european scale', *Sci Rep* **10**.
- Barstow, S. F., Bidlot, J.-R., Caires, S., Donelan, M. A., Drennan, W. M., Dupuis, H., Graber, H. C., Green, J. J., Gronlie, O., Guérin, C., Gurgel, K.-W., Günther, H., Hauser, D., Hayes, K., Hessner, K., Hoja, D., Icard, D., Kahma, K. K., Keller, W. C., Krogstad, H. E., Lefevre, J.-M., Lehner, S., Magnusson, A. K., Monbaliu, J., Nieto Borge, J. C., Pettersson, H., Plant, W. J., Quentin, C. G., Reichert, K., Reistad,

- 604 M., Rosenthal, W., Saetra, O., Schulz-Stellenfleth, J., Walsh, E. J., Weill, A., Wolf, J., Wright, C. W. &  
605 Wyatt, L. R. (2005), *Measuring and Analysing the directional spectrum of ocean waves*, COST 714; EUR  
606 21367, COST Office.
- 607 Bayram, A., Larson, M., Miller, H. C. & Kraus, N. C. (2001), Cross-shore distribution of longshore sediment  
608 transport: comparison between predictive formulas and field measurements, in ‘Coastal Engineering 2000’,  
609 American Society of Civil Engineers, pp. 3114–3127.
- 610 Bergillos, R., López-Ruiz, A., Principal-Gómez, D. & Ortega-Sánchez, M. (2018), ‘An integrated methodology  
611 to forecast the efficiency of nourishment strategies in eroding deltas’, *Sci Total Environ* **613-614**, 1175–  
612 1184.
- 613 Bouchette, F., Manna, M., Montalvo, P., Nutz, A., Schuster, M. & Ghienne, J.-F. (2014), ‘Growth of cusped  
614 spits’, *Journal of Coastal Research* pp. 47–52.
- 615 Cavaleri, L., Abdalla, S., Benetazzo, A., Bertotti, L., Bidlot, J., Breivik, O., Carniel, S., Jensen, R., Portilla-  
616 Yandun, J., Rogers, W., Roland, A., Sanchez-Arcilla, A., Smith, J., Staneva, J., Toledo, Y., Vledder, G.  
617 & Westhuysen, A. (2018), ‘Wave modelling in coastal and inner seas’, *Progress in Oceanography* **167**.
- 618 D’Anna, M., Idier, D., Castelle, B., Le Cozannet, G., Rohmer, J. & Robinet, A. (2020), ‘Impact of model  
619 free parameters and sea-level rise uncertainties on 20-years shoreline hindcast: the case of Truc Vert beach  
620 (SW France)’, *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* **45**(8), 1895–1907.
- 621 Davidson, M. A., Turner, I. L., Splinter, K. D. & Harley, M. D. (2017), ‘Annual prediction of shoreline erosion  
622 and subsequent recovery’, *Coastal Engineering* **130**, 14 – 25.
- 623 Davidson, M., Splinter, K. & Turner, I. (2013), ‘A simple equilibrium model for predicting shoreline change’,  
624 *Coastal Engineering* **73**, 191–202.
- 625 Delft Hydraulics, W. (1994), *UNIBEST, A software suite for the simulation of sediment transport processes  
626 and related morphodynamics of beach profiles and coastline evolution*.
- 627 Durrant, T., Greenslade, D., Hemer, M. & Trenham, C. (2014), A global wave hindcast focussed on the  
628 central and south pacific, Technical report, CAWCR Technical Report No. 070.
- 629 D’Anna, M., Castelle, B., Idier, D., Rohmer, J., Le Cozannet, G., Thieblemont, R. & Bricheno, L. (2021),  
630 ‘Uncertainties in shoreline projections to 2100 at truc vert beach (france): Role of sea-level rise and  
631 equilibrium model assumptions’, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface* .
- 632 French, J., Payo, A., Murray, B., Orford, J., Eliot, M. & Cowell, P. (2016), ‘Appropriate complexity for the  
633 prediction of coastal and estuarine geomorphic behaviour at decadal to centennial scales’, *Geomorphology*  
634 **256**, 3 – 16.
- 635 George, J., Sanil Kumar, V., Victor, G. & Gowthaman, R. (2019), ‘Variability of the local wave regime and  
636 the wave-induced sediment transport along the ganpatipule coast, eastern arabian sea’, *Regional Studies  
637 in Marine Science* **31**.
- 638 Hallermeier, R. J. (1983), ‘Sand transport limits in coastal structure design’, *Proceedings, Coastal Structures  
639 ’83, American Society of Civil Engineers* pp. pp. 703–716.
- 640 Hanson, H. (1989), ‘Genesis: A generalized shoreline change numerical model’, *Journal of Coastal Research*  
641 **5**(1), 1–27.
- 642 Harley, M., Andriolo, U., Armaroli, C. & Ciavola, P. (2014), ‘Shoreline rotation and response to nourishment  
643 of a gravel embayed beach using a low-cost video monitoring technique: San michele-sassi neri, central  
644 italy’, *Journal of Coastal Conservation* **18**, 551–565.
- 645 Harley, M. D., Turner, I. L. & Short, A. D. (2015), ‘New insights into embayed beach rotation: The importance  
646 of wave exposure and cross-shore processes’, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface* **120**(8), 1470–  
647 1484.
- 648 Harley, M. D., Turner, I. L., Short, A. D. & Ranasinghe, R. (2010), ‘Interannual variability and controls of  
649 the sydney wave climate’, *International Journal of Climatology* **30**(9), 1322–1335.

- 650 Harley, M. D., Turner, I. L., Short, A. D. & Ranasinghe, R. (2011), ‘A reevaluation of coastal embayment  
651 rotation: The dominance of cross-shore versus alongshore sediment transport processes, collaroy-narrabeen  
652 beach, southeast australia’, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Earth Surface* **116**(F4).
- 653 Jaramillo, C., González, M., Medina, R. & Turki, I. (2021), ‘An equilibrium-based shoreline rotation model’,  
654 *Coastal Engineering* **163**, 103789.
- 655 Kamphuis, J., Davies, M., Nairn, R. & Sayao, O. (1986), ‘Calculation of littoral sand transport rate’, *Coastal*  
656 *Engineering* **10**(1), 1–21.
- 657 Komen, G. J., Cavaleri, L., Donelan, M., Hasselmann, K., Hasselmann, S. & Janssen, P. A. E. M. (1996),  
658 *Dynamics and Modelling of Ocean Waves*.
- 659 Kroon, A., De Schipper, M., Gelder, P. & Aarninkhof, S. (2020), ‘Ranking uncertainty: Wave climate  
660 variability versus model uncertainty in probabilistic assessment of coastline change’, *Coastal Engineering*  
661 **158**, 103673.
- 662 Larson, M., Hanson, H. & Kraus, N. C. (1997), ‘Analytical solutions of one-line model for shoreline change  
663 near coastal structures’, *Journal of Waterway, Port, Coastal, and Ocean Engineering* **123**(4), 180–191.
- 664 Larson, M., Hoan, L. & Hanson, H. (2010), ‘Direct formula to compute wave height and angle at incipient  
665 breaking’, *Journal of Waterway Port Coastal and Ocean Engineering* **136**.
- 666 Le Cozannet, G., Bulteau, T., Castelle, B., Ranasinghe, R., Wöppelmann, G., Rohmer, J., Bernon, N., Idier,  
667 D., Louisor, J. & Salas-Y-Mélia, D. (2019), ‘Quantifying uncertainties of sandy shoreline change projections  
668 as sea level rises’, *Scientific reports* **9**(1), 42.
- 669 Miller, J. K. & Dean, R. G. (2004), ‘A simple new shoreline change model’, *Coastal Engineering* **51**(7), 531–  
670 556.
- 671 Montaña, J., Coco, G., Antolínez, J. A. A., Beuzen, T., Bryan, K. R., Cagigal, L., Castelle, B., Davidson,  
672 M. A., Goldstein, E. B., Ibaceta, R., Idier, D., Ludka, B. C., Masoud-Ansari, S., Méndez, F. J., Murray,  
673 A. B., Plant, N. G., Ratliff, K. M., Robinet, A., Rueda, A., Sénéchal, N., Simmons, J. A., Splinter, K. D.,  
674 Stephens, S., Townend, I., Vitousek, S. & Vos, K. (2020), ‘Blind testing of shoreline evolution models’,  
675 *Scientific Reports* **10**.
- 676 Murray, A. B. (2007), ‘Reducing model complexity for explanation and prediction’, *Geomorphology* **90**(3), 178  
677 – 191. Reduced-Complexity Geomorphological Modelling for River and Catchment Management.
- 678 Pelnard-Considère, R. (1956), ‘Essai de théorie de l’évolution des formes de rivages en plages de sable et de  
679 galets’, *La Houille Blanche* pp. 289–301.
- 680 Pilkey, O. & Cooper, A. (2002), ‘Longshore transport volumes: A critical view’, *Journal of Coastal Research*  
681 **36**, 572–580.
- 682 Ranasinghe R., Callaghan D., R. D. (2013), ‘Does a more sophisticated storm erosion model improve proba-  
683 bilistic erosion estimates?’, *Coastal Dynamic* .
- 684 Reeve, D., Pedrozo-Acuña, A. & Spivack, M. (2014), ‘Beach memory and ensemble prediction of shoreline  
685 evolution near a groyne’, *Coastal Engineering* **86**, 77–87.
- 686 Robinet, A., Castelle, B., Idier, D., Harley, M. & Splinter, K. (2020), ‘Controls of local geology and cross-  
687 shore/longshore processes on embayed beach shoreline variability’, *Marine Geology* **422**, 106118.
- 688 Robinet, A., Idier, D., Castelle, B. & Marieu, V. (2018), ‘A reduced-complexity shoreline change model  
689 combining longshore and cross-shore processes: The lx-shore model’, *Environmental Modelling & Software*  
690 **109**, 1 – 16.
- 691 Roelvink, D., Reniers, A., van Dongeren, A., van Thiel de Vries, J., McCall, R. & Lescinski, J. (2009),  
692 ‘Modelling storm impacts on beaches, dunes and barrier islands’, *Coastal Engineering* **56**(11), 1133 – 1152.
- 693 Roelvink, J. & Banning, G. (1995), ‘Design and development of delft3d and application to coastal morpho-  
694 dynamics’, *Oceanographic Literature Review* **11**, 925.
- 695 Ruggiero, P., Buijsman, M., Kaminsky, G. & Gelfenbaum, G. (2010), ‘Modeling the effects of wave climate  
696 and sediment supply variability on large-scale shoreline change’, *Marine Geology* **273**, 127–140.

- 697 Safak, I., List, J., Warner, J. & Kumar, N. (2017), ‘Observations and 3D hydrodynamics-based modeling of  
698 decadal-scale shoreline change along the Outer Banks, North Carolina’, *Coastal Engineering* **120**, 78 – 92.
- 699 Splinter, K. D., Turner, I. L., Davidson, M. A., Barnard, P., Castelle, B. & Oltman-Shay, J. (2014), ‘A  
700 generalized equilibrium model for predicting daily to interannual shoreline response’, *Journal of Geophysical*  
701 *Research: Earth Surface* **119**(9), 1936–1958.
- 702 Toimil, A., Camus, P., Losada, I., Le Cozannet, G., Nicholls, R., Idier, D. & Maspataud, A. (2020), ‘Climate  
703 change-driven coastal erosion modelling in temperate sandy beaches: Methods and uncertainty treatment’,  
704 *Earth-Science Reviews* **202**, 103110.
- 705 Tran, Y. H. & Barthélemy, E. (2020), ‘Combined longshore and cross-shore shoreline model for closed embayed  
706 beaches’, *Coastal Engineering* **158**, 103692.
- 707 Turki, I., Medina, R., Coco, G. & González, M. (2013), ‘An equilibrium model to predict shoreline rotation  
708 of pocket beaches’, *Marine Geology* **346**, 220–232.
- 709 Turner, I., Harley, M., Short, A., Simmons, J., Bracs, M., Phillips, M. & Splinter, K. (2016), ‘A multi-decade  
710 dataset of monthly beach profile surveys and inshore wave forcing at narrabeen, australia’, *Scientific data*  
711 **3**.
- 712 USACE (1984), Shore Protection Manual, Technical report, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Vicksburg, Mis-  
713 sissippi.
- 714 Valiente, N. G., Masselink, G., Scott, T., Conley, D. & McCarroll, R. J. (2019), ‘Role of waves and tides on  
715 depth of closure and potential for headland bypassing’, *Marine Geology* **407**, 60–75.
- 716 Vitousek, S., Barnard, P. L., Limber, P., Erikson, L. & Cole, B. (2017), ‘A model integrating longshore and  
717 cross-shore processes for predicting long-term shoreline response to climate change’, *Journal of Geophysical*  
718 *Research: Earth Surface* **122**(4), 782–806.
- 719 Wang, B. & Reeve, D. (2010), ‘Probabilistic modelling of long-term beach evolution near segmented shore-  
720 parallel breakwaters’, *Coastal Engineering* **57**(8), 732–744.
- 721 Warren, I. & Bach, H. (1992), ‘Mike 21: a modelling system for estuaries, coastal waters and seas’, *Envi-  
722 ronmental Software* **7**(4), 229–240. 3rd International Software Exhibition for Environmental Science and  
723 Engineering.
- 724 Wright, L. D. & Short, A. D. (1984), ‘Morphodynamic variability of surf zones and beaches: A synthesis’,  
725 *Mar. Geol.* **56**, 93–118.
- 726 Yates, M. L., Guza, R. T. & O’Reilly, W. C. (2009), ‘Equilibrium shoreline response: Observations and  
727 modeling’, *J. Geophys. Res.* **114**(C09014).