

1 **Bubble plume depths and surface wave development as**
2 **a control on ambient sound in the ocean**

3 **Jim Thomson¹, Jie Yang¹, Robert Taylor², E.J. Rainville¹, Kristin Zeiden¹,**
4 **Luc Rainville¹, Samuel Brenner^{1,3}, Megan Ballard², Meghan F. Cronin⁴**

5 ¹Applied Physics Laboratory, University of Washington, Seattle WA 98117 USA

6 ²Applied Research Laboratories, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78713, USA

7 ³Dept. of Earth, Environmental, and Planetary Sciences, Brown University, Providence RI 02912, USA

8 ⁴Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory, NOAA, Seattle WA, USA

9 **Key Points:**

- 10 • Underwater sound from 1-10 kHz is usually associated with wind forcing and the
11 generation of bubbles.
12 • Considering surface waves in addition to surface winds can improve interpretation
13 of underwater sound.
14 • Wind and wave forcing can be combined to give a proxy estimate for the depth
15 of active and passive bubbles that control underwater sound.

Corresponding author: Jim Thomson, jthomson@apl.washington.edu

Abstract

Wind, wave, and acoustic observations are used to test a scaling for ambient sound levels in the ocean that is based on the relative penetration depth of active bubbles during surface wave breaking. The focus is on acoustic frequencies in the range 1-10 kHz, which are typically scaled by wind speed alone. Wind and wave information are combined in a parametric form to describe the depth of the active bubble layer (which produces sound) relative to the depth of the passive bubble layer (which attenuates sound). The relative depth scaling has a primary dependence on wind speed and a secondary dependence on any departure of significant wave height from fully-developed, open-ocean conditions. The scaling is tested with long time-series observations of winds and waves at Ocean Station Papa (North Pacific Ocean), as well as with a case study with fetch limitation near the island of Jan Mayen (Norwegian Sea). When waves are less developed (e.g., limited by fetch) at a given wind speed, the attenuating layer is relatively thin and the sound levels are higher. The scaling is a plausible explanation for the observed reduction in sound levels during high wind events (winds greater than 15 m/s).

Plain Language Summary

Recordings of sound in the open ocean are usually louder when it is windy. This is because winds cause breaking waves at the surface of the ocean (whitecaps). The bubbles created when waves break cause the increase in sound, but these bubbles can also reduce the sound when they make a foamy layer near the surface. Our study uses measurements of winds, waves, and underwater sound to understand these effects. We show that including wave measurements can improve interpretation of sound in the ocean, relative to using wind measurements alone.

1 Introduction

The level of ambient sound in the ocean at mid-frequencies (1-10 kHz) has long been related to surface wind speed. The classic (Wenz, 1962) curves have provided decades of prognostic estimates for the so-called ‘wind noise’ that increases with wind speed. Many subsequent updates have followed (Hildebrand et al., 2021), including the recent work of Yang et al. (2023) who show that the level of ambient sound saturates, and even decreases, for wind speeds greater than 15 m/s. This phenomenon is spectral; the saturation occurs first at the higher frequencies (e.g, 10 kHz) for a given wind speed (15 m/s), and progresses to lower frequencies with increasing wind speeds. The frequency dependence suggests a length-scale dependence in either the generation or absorption of the sound. The present study explores surface wave height as an essential length scale for the attenuating layer, based on literature showing this to be the region of persistent turbulence and bubbles (Gemrich, 2010; Sutherland & Melville, 2015; Thomson et al., 2016). The overall idea is that ambient sound in the ocean is a function of winds *and* waves, rather than winds alone.

Although it is still called ‘wind noise’, the literature is clear that the generation mechanism for this ambient sound is actually surface wave breaking and subsequent bubble activity. This is perhaps best shown at the coasts, where mid-frequency sound production in the surf zone is closely related to incident wave energy (Deane, 2000). In the open ocean, the relation of mid-frequency ambient sound to the dissipation rate of breaking surface waves was shown by Felizardo and Melville (1995). The relationship is sufficiently clear that Manasseh et al. (2006) used ambient sound to detect and quantify breaking waves. The aim of this paper is to re-connect the ‘wind noise’ to the breaking wave process by understanding the relative depth of bubble plumes generated under breaking waves, and thus explore a mechanism for the scale-dependent saturation of ambient sound during high wind conditions. There are some parallels in this work for the recent results of Dragan-Górska et al. (2023), who show significant wave control on ambient sound

66 levels in the Baltic Sea and discuss differences from classic wind dependence that may
67 be caused by fetch-limitation of the wave field.

68 1.1 Bubble layers

69 Surface wave breaking generates bubbles, which resonate as they are freshly gen-
70 erated to produce mid-frequency underwater sound (Deane & Stokes, 2002). A large dis-
71 tribution of bubble sizes is generated within the plume beneath each breaking wave. The
72 larger bubbles are active in the turbulent flow and either rise to the surface or collapse
73 (generating more sound). The smaller bubbles do not have sufficient rise velocity and
74 become passive (Na et al., 2016). In high sea states, repeated breaking forms a persis-
75 tent layer of passive bubbles that can trap sound in a near-surface waveguide (Farmer
76 & Vagle, 1989) and attenuate sound as it propagates (Ainslie, 2005). This persistent bub-
77 ble layer has been suggested as the cause of reductions in received levels under high winds
78 (Yang et al., 2023).

79 This paper introduces a simple conceptual model as a competition, or ratio, of the
80 penetration depth of active bubble plumes (which generate sound) to the thickness of
81 the passive bubble layer (which traps and attenuates sound). The framework retains wind
82 speed as a primary variable determining ambient sound, and introduces wave height as
83 a secondary dependence.

84 Wind speed U is used to prescribe the depth of active bubble plumes, D_{bp} follow-
85 ing the recent work of Derakhti et al. (2024). That study used down-looking echosounder
86 measurements to develop a parametric scaling

$$D_{bp} = 0.13U^{1.6} \quad (1)$$

87 that can be applied to measured wind speeds U at a 10 m reference height ($U = U_{10}$).
88 Direct measurements of bubble plume depths were not collected concurrently with the
89 acoustic measurements of the present study, and thus we rely on the wind speed rela-
90 tion of Eq. 1. Although this may introduce scatter to the analysis, it retains the conven-
91 tion for wind speed to be the primary dependence of ambient sound.

92 Significant wave height H_s is used as a proxy for the thickness of the passive bub-
93 ble layer, following the observations of Thomson et al. (2016) showing homogenization
94 of surface turbulence via orbital advection with vertical extent H_s . The significant wave
95 heights H_s is calculated over entire surface gravity wave spectrum ($H_s = 4\sqrt{\int E(f)df}$,
96 where $0.05 < f < 0.5$ Hz), which includes both wind-sea and swell components. This
97 choice is driven by the surface kinematics; passive bubbles are advected by wave orbital
98 motion from the entire surface gravity wave spectrum, even though breaking is primar-
99 ily a short-wave process (Thomson & Jessup, 2009; Thomson et al., 2013).

100 Combining these estimates using measured wind speeds and wave heights, the hy-
101 pothesis to be tested is that sound spectra $S(f)$ have a dependence

$$S(f) \propto \frac{D_{bp}}{H_s} = 0.13 \frac{U^{1.6}}{H_s}, \quad (2)$$

102 where that ratio $\frac{D_{bp}}{H_s}$ is referred to as the relative bubble plume depth. Key to this con-
103 struct is for H_s to be measured (or forecast with a spectral wave model). Prescription
104 of H_s from a parametric wind dependence would defeat the purpose of this scaling and
105 reduce it to a conventional approach to ambient sound that is purely based on wind speed.
106 Winds and waves in the open ocean are typically highly correlated, such that it can be
107 difficult to separate the distinct effects of one or the other. Indeed, existing wind-speed
108 relations for ambient sound are largely successful because long-term average conditions
109 in the open ocean have ‘fully-developed’ wave heights (which are wind-speed dependent
110 themselves, following Hasselmann et al. (1973) and Pierson and Moskowitz (1964)).

111 Observations at synoptic time scales (i.e., hours-to-days) indicate that open-ocean
 112 wave heights rarely conform to ‘fully-developed’ conditions, mostly because of the pres-
 113 ence of swell (Portilla-Yandún, n.d.). The long-wave swell components do not partici-
 114 pate directly in the wave breaking process (Banner et al., 2002), but swell components
 115 are important to setting H_s and the overall surface kinematics (Cifuentes-Lorenzen et
 116 al., 2018). Fetch-limitation is another reason for H_s to deviate from pure wind formu-
 117 lations, because waves at a given wind speed grow as a function of the distance (i.e., fetch)
 118 from boundaries and the long-waves take the most space and time to develop (Dobson
 119 et al., 1989; Schwendeman et al., 2014; Thomson & Rogers, 2014). Refraction in coastal
 120 zones may also reduce wave heights relative to fully-developed conditions (Ellenson &
 121 Özkan-Haller, 2018). We use wind speed measurements as the proxy for sound *gener-*
 122 *ation*, and we use independent wave height measurements as the proxy for sound *atten-*
 123 *uation*.

124 The present study lacks direct measurements of bubble plume depths by echosounders
 125 (Dahl & Jessup, 1985; Dahl, 2000; Strand et al., 2020) or optical methods (Al-Lashi et
 126 al., 2016). Instead, the scaling of Derakhti et al. (2024) has prompted a new look at ex-
 127 isting data with only wind and wave measurements available. In particular, Derakhti et
 128 al. (2024) has already shown that 1) active bubble plumes regularly penetrate to depths
 129 2-3 times H_s , and 2) there is an inflection in the ratio $\frac{D_{bp}}{H_s}$ at high winds (> 15 m/s).
 130 The inflection occurs at the same wind speed that ambient sound saturates (Yang et al.,
 131 2023), though Derakhti et al. (2024) did not make the connection to ambient sound. The
 132 present study explores the high wind regime and the acoustic implications of a distinct
 133 change in the relative depth of the sound generation region (D_{bp}) compared with the per-
 134 sistent sound attenuating layer (H_s). This new approach is not intended as a definitive
 135 prescriptive model for ambient sound, but rather as motivation to develop ambient sound
 136 models that explicitly include surface wave and bubble plume characteristics.

137 2 Methods

138 The relation of mid-frequency ambient sound to relative bubble depth is explored
 139 using two datasets, both with measured winds, waves, and ambient underwater sound.
 140 The first is a long-term record, using two years of mooring data from Ocean Weather
 141 Station Papa in the North Pacific Ocean. The second is a short-term record, with two
 142 weeks of data from multiple SWIFT drifters in the Norwegian Sea. The drifter dataset
 143 includes a unique case study in which SWIFT drifters were placed at various fetch dis-
 144 tances downwind of the Jan Mayen volcanic island. The first dataset has the benefit of
 145 many realizations; the second dataset has the benefit of distributed sampling and the
 146 fetch case study that explicitly changes H_s without changing U_{10} in Eq. 2. The hydrophone
 147 depths are quite different between the two datasets (500 vs 10 m, respectively), but the
 148 measurements are roughly comparable assuming the ambient sound source behaves as
 149 a surface dipole layer, where the acoustic spreading loss resulting from a greater receiver
 150 depth is offset by the increased number of observable surface sources (Urlick, 1975).

151 2.1 Ocean Station Papa (North Pacific) moorings

152 Ocean Weather Station Papa (OWS-P) is located at 50 N, 145 W in the North Pa-
 153 cific Ocean and is one of the longest time series in the world’s oceans. Data from this
 154 location extend back to the World War II era (Freeland, 2007), including a remarkable
 155 dataset of visual wave observations (Belka et al., 2014). The modern data at OWS-P are
 156 centered around a series of moorings, including a Datawell waverider maintained by the
 157 Applied Physics Laboratory at the University of Washington (Thomson et al., 2013, 2015)
 158 and a surface meteorological / upper ocean mooring maintained by the Pacific Marine
 159 Environmental Laboratory at the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Adminis-
 160 tration (NOAA) (Cronin et al., 2015, 2023). The waverider mooring has been replaced




Figure 1. Time series of observations at Ocean Weather Station Papa (OWS-P) from 2010 to 2012. Acoustic spectra (top panel) are measured with a sub-surface PAL. Wind speeds (middle panel) are measured with anemometers on the NOAA surface buoy. Significant wave heights (bottom panel) are measured with a Datawell waverider buoy.

161 every 1-2 years and usually has included a Passive Aquatic Listener (PAL) at 500 m depth.
 162 For this study, we select the period of 2010-2012 and utilize the ambient sound record-
 163 ings and wave data from the waverider mooring, along with the winds from the NOAA
 164 mooring.

165 Figure 1 are the 2010-2012 time series from OWS-P, which has a strong seasonal
 166 signal of storms in winter and mild conditions in summer. All parameters are statisti-
 167 cal measures produced hourly: the ensemble ambient sound spectra, the significant wave
 168 height from the first moment of the wave energy spectra, and the average wind adjusted
 169 to 10 meter reference height. The ensemble sound spectra come from recordings that are
 170 4.5 seconds in duration, at an interval of 8 minutes. The acoustic sampling rate is 100
 171 kHz. The recordings are split into 450 windows with 50% overlap, then spectra from these
 172 windows are averaged to produce ensemble spectra every 8 minutes.

173 2.2 Jan Mayen drifters

174 Jan Mayen is a volcanic island at the west edge of the Norwegian Sea. Data from
 175 this location were collected as part of a 2021 pilot cruise for the Northern Ocean Rapid
 176 Surface Evolution (NORSE) project (M. Ballard et al., 2022). Data collection used drift-
 177 ing SWIFT buoys (Thomson, 2012) which measure winds, waves, and turbulence in a
 178 wave-following reference frame. For these deployments, two of the SWIFTs included a
 179 Loggerhead SNAP hydrophone suspended at a depth of 10 m. The SNAP hydrophone
 180 spectra used herein come from recordings that are 60 seconds in duration, at an inter-
 181 val of 300 seconds. The acoustic sampling rate is 48 kHz. The SNAP hydrophone is mounted
 182 in a downward orientation, causing the coupled interaction between the electronics hous-
 183 ing and the hydrophone, resulting in anomalous features in the acoustic spectra that were

184 especially evident in the 900 Hz-2 kHz band. This is discussed at length in the appendix,
 185 and these bands are interpolated across in the results that follow.

186 Figure 2 shows the wind and wave conditions measured by the SWIFT buoys dur-
 187 ing NORSE 2021. The SWIFTs without hydrophones are included to evaluate the widest
 188 possible range of $\frac{D_{bp}}{H_s}$, including the effects of reduced fetch in the shadow of Jan Mayen.




Figure 2. Time series of wind speeds (top panel) and significant wave heights (bottom panel) from drifting SWIFT buoys near the island of Jan Mayen in the Norwegian Sea. Square symbols are used for buoys with hydrophones and crosses are used for buoys without hydrophones. The extreme wave heights from SWIFT 11 on 24 Sep 2021 were measured as it transited the surf zone and beached on Jan Mayen.




Figure 3. Relative bubble plume depths versus wind speed from two years of waverider observations at OWS-P (left) and two weeks of drifting SWIFTs near Jan Mayen (right). The waverider values are hourly and binned for better visualization; the black line shows means and standard deviations. The SWIFT values are individual symbols every 12 minutes, with a black curve showing binned averages.

3 Results

3.1 Relative bubble plume depths

The wind- and wave-based scaling of $\frac{D_{bp}}{H_s}$ from Eq. 2 is shown for both datasets in Figure 3 as a function of wind speed. There is a general trend for increasing values with wind speed, but there is not a 1:1 correspondence with wind speed. The highest values of relative bubble plume depths are several multiples of the significant wave height and occur around $U_{10} \sim 15$ m/s. There is almost no dependence on wind speed for $U_{10} > 15$ m/s.

The lack of a 1:1 correspondence with wind speed in Figure 3 is essential to this study and to the wave-informed framework. These datasets demonstrate that surface layer thickness (as given by wave height H_s) is not uniquely determined by wind speed, and thus ambient sound level also should not be monotonic nor unique with wind speed. The values from Ocean Weather Station Papa have a wide range of conditions and robust statistics. The values near Jan Mayen have some specific patterns that are related to wave sheltering and fetch limitation on the leeward side of the island; these will be addressed in the case study.

3.2 Binned acoustic spectra

Ensemble acoustic spectra are shown in Figure 4 for OWS-P data and Figure 5 for Jan Mayen data. Each includes a panel (left) using a conventional wind-only approach to bin the ensembles and another panel (right) using the relative bubble plume depth $\frac{D_{bp}}{H_s}$ to bin the ensembles. The wind-only ensembles (left panels) are well-sorted at low winds, but at higher winds the spectra collapse and decrease with increasing frequency. The relative bubble plume depth ensembles (right panels) are well-sorted for all conditions and retain their spectral shape at high frequencies. The sound levels across 1-10 KHz show a robust increase with relative bubble plume depths. The right panels still have a strong wind dependence implicit in the parametric specification of $D_{bp} \approx U^{1.6}$, but the spectra are better sorted because the attenuating surface layer effects are represented by normalizing the wind speed effects with the wave effects H_s .




Figure 4. Ensemble acoustic spectra from two years of data at OWS-P that are binned by wind speed (left panel) and by relative bubble plume depth (right panel).




Figure 5. Ensemble acoustic spectra from two weeks of drifter data near Jan Mayen that are binned by wind speed (left panel) and by relative bubble plume depth (right panel). The dashed portion of each curve shows the interpolation across the frequency bands with directional effects (see appendix).

217

3.3 Fetch-limited case study

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

The NORSE 2021 pilot experiment sampled a particularly strong wind event for a few days in September 2021, during which four SWIFT buoys were deployed at increasing fetch distances downwind of Jan Mayen. The island acted as a barrier to the local wave field (i.e., the wind sea), such that the fetch is effectively zero at Jan Mayen and increases with distance from the island. As a practical application of this fetch dependence, the R/V Neil Armstrong took shelter at the short fetch behind Jan Mayen during the most intense portion of the event. Figure 6 shows the wave and wind conditions from the four buoys. For the one-hour timeseries used in this case study, the wind is nearly constant at 15 m/s for all of the buoys, but the wave field is a strong function of fetch distance x . This creates a natural laboratory for studying the dependence on wave height distinct from the dependence on wind speed in Eq. 2.




Figure 6. Time series of wind speeds (top panel), significant wave heights (middle panel), and positions (lower left panel) of drifting SWIFT buoys near the island of Jan Mayen. Shading in the lower left panel indicates water depth (green is land). The wind speeds are similar for all buoys, while the wave heights are a strong function of the fetch distance x downwind of the island (lower right panel).

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

Figure 7 shows the wave conditions scaled by the non-dimensional fetch distance downwind of Jan Mayen. This is a classic analysis in which wind speed U_{10} and gravity g are used to scale the fetch as gx/U_{10}^2 and the wave height as gH_s/U_{10}^2 (Dobson et al., 1989). The expectation is a quasi-linear, or a weak power-law, relation between the non-dimensional variables (Fontaine, 2012; Stiassnie, 2012), which is shown by the dashed line in Figure 7. The observations from this case study are more complex than the classic fetch law, and this is probably because the island does not completely block all of the waves generated upwind of the island. The point is not to achieve a perfect fetch scaling, but rather to show that the differences in wave heights between SWIFT 11 and SWIFT 12 (which have the two hydrophones) are reasonable given the differences in fetch. In particular, there is a clear reason for these two buoys to measure the same wind speed while measuring very different wave heights.




Figure 7. Non-dimensional wave height versus non-dimensional fetch during the Jan Mayen case-study. The dashed line shows the theoretical grow of waves with fetch, assuming steady-state winds and the absence of swell. Gray lines show uncertainty around the theoretical fetch relation.

241 Figure 8 shows ambient sound spectra from the two SWIFTs with hydrophones down-
 242 wind of Jan Mayen. Though they have essentially the same wind speed, they have dif-
 243 ferent wave heights (according to a fetch dependence). The qualitative difference is con-
 244 sistent with the relative bubble plume depth hypothesis. If wind speed was the only de-
 245 pendence, the two spectra in Figure 8 would plot on top of each other. At short fetch,
 246 measured sound is louder because the active bubble plumes penetrate deeper, relative
 247 to the layer of persistent attenuation by passive bubbles that is set by wave height ($D_{bp}/H_s =$
 248 3.5). At long fetch, measured sound is quieter because the attenuation layer is deeper,
 249 such that a greater portion of active bubble plumes are confined within the attenuation
 250 layer ($D_{bp}/H_s = 1.8$). The fetch dependence is qualitatively similar to the recent re-
 251 sults of Dragan-Górska et al. (2023) in the Baltic Sea.

252 Implicit to this case study is an assumption that the wind scaling for bubble plume
 253 depth (Eq. 1) is not itself a function of fetch. This asserts that only H_s changes and D_{bp}
 254 does not, because the winds are $U_{10} = 15$ m/s throughout. This assumption is supported
 255 by prior work showing that wave breaking is predominantly a short-wave process in bal-
 256 ance with the local winds (Thomson & Jessup, 2009; Sutherland & Melville, 2013). This
 257 is different from H_s , which integrated over the whole surface wave spectrum. Thus, there
 258 is a scale separation between the short waves that break to generate bubble plumes and
 259 the longer waves that grow with fetch to control the total H_s (Schwendeman et al., 2014).

260 4 Discussion

261 The combined results suggest that ambient sound in the ocean is as a function of
 262 winds and waves, rather than winds alone. As with any observational study, there re-
 263 main numerous other factors to consider.

264 4.1 Shallow-water effects near Jan Mayen

265 In contrast to the deep-water conditions of OWS-P, the bathymetry around Jan
 266 Mayen is complex and includes shallow regions close to the island (Figure 6). The lo-
 267 cation of SWIFT 11 relative to Jan Mayen and the direction of the wind results in both




Figure 8. Acoustic spectra from the two SWIFT buoys during the Jan Mayen case study. The buoys observe the same winds, but SWIFT 11 has a larger relative bubble plume depth because of the fetch dependence of wave height. The larger relative depth is associated with higher acoustic levels.

268 a shorter fetch and a shallower water depth than that of SWIFT 12. Shallow water depths
 269 are frequently associated with elevated ambient acoustic spectra (Wenz, 1962). Wenz con-
 270 sidered depths less than 100 fathoms (~ 200 m) to be shallow water¹, and suggested
 271 adding 2 to 3 dB to the average empirical wind noise curves in such environments. At
 272 a water depth of ~ 250 m over the duration of the measurements presented, SWIFT 11
 273 is near the transition depth defined by Wenz. Significant differences in both water depth
 274 and measured acoustic level between SWIFT 11 and SWIFT 12 warrant an exploration
 275 into the impact of water depth on the ambient sound environment.

276 A range-independent ambient acoustic model was implemented to investigate the
 277 influence of the water depth on the ambient sound level. The ray-based model traces the
 278 propagation paths that arrive at the receiver for a range of elevation angles $-90^\circ < \theta <$
 279 90° . The model provides the incoherent contribution of all surface dipole sources that
 280 reach the receiver, accounting for acoustic absorption and reflection losses along each path.
 281 Other than water depth, the model environmental inputs for SWIFT 11 and SWIFT 12
 282 were kept the same.

283 The empirical Wenz level N_w , a function of both wind speed U and frequency f ,
 284 was used for the surface dipole strength $N_w \sin \theta / \pi$. The normalization of the surface
 285 dipole strength by π enables a return to the input ambient level N_w when integrating
 286 over solid angle in a lossless and bottomless isotropic-sound-speed environment (Ainslie,
 287 2010; APL-UW, 1994), representing the acoustic level as measured by an omnidirectional
 288 hydrophone. Following the work of M. S. Ballard et al. (2023), the bottom was modeled
 289 as a gravel sediment halfspace, providing a fairly reflective fluid bottom with a critical
 290 grazing angle of $\sim 30^\circ$. Reflection losses from sea surface interactions were calculated
 291 using Ainslie’s mid-frequency model (Ainslie, 2005). The sound speed profile used con-
 292 tained a surface duct in the upper 50 m of the water column consistent with measured

¹ This is shallow water in terms of the acoustics, but not in terms of the surface gravity waves. At 200 m, much of the surface gravity wave spectrum is in deep water, though the longer swells are intermediate water depth.




Figure 9. Modeled ambient acoustic spectra for shallow-water and deep-water environments for multiple wind speeds. Increases to the ambient level resulting from the shallower environment are on the order of ~ 1 dB and decrease with increasing wind speeds.

293 sound speed profiles from the experiment. Model results for the two different environ-
 294 nments for several wind speeds are displayed in Figure 9.

295 In the shallow water environment, the low-loss gravel bottom intensifies the con-
 296 tribution of small grazing angle energy near horizontal that propagates over long distances.
 297 However, the modeled differences in spectral level shown in Fig. 9 are not significant enough
 298 to explain the measured differences between SWIFT 11 and SWIFT 12, particularly at
 299 high wind speeds, where the increase in surface loss prohibits long distance propagation,
 300 negating the impact of the reflective bottom. The model’s inability to represent the in-
 301 creased ambient acoustic spectral levels measured at SWIFT 11 for the associated wind
 302 speeds indicates that water depth is not responsible for the raised levels.

303 This modeling analysis supports the interpretation that differences in the ambient
 304 sound levels are the result of differences in the surface wave conditions (and thus rela-
 305 tive bubble plume depth) at the two locations. The significant wave heights at SWIFT 11
 306 are much less than those of for fully-developed conditions in the open ocean (Pierson &
 307 Moskowitz, 1964; Hasselmann et al., 1973), because there is insufficient fetch to develop
 308 the lower frequency surface waves. The higher frequency surface waves associated with
 309 breaking (and active bubble plumes) respond to wind forcing on shorter space and time
 310 scales, so the similar wind speeds observed at SWIFT 11 and SWIFT 12 should produce
 311 similar active bubble plume depths D_{bp} . The significant wave heights H_s used for the
 312 passive layer depth are integrated over the full surface wave spectra, and thus the lack
 313 of longer waves at SWIFT 11 creates a different acoustic environment. The fetch-limited
 314 conditions at SWIFT 11 are likely responsible for the increase in the relative bubble plume
 315 depth, resulting in the greater ambient acoustic spectra when compared with that mea-
 316 sured at SWIFT 12.

317 The historical measurements of Lemon et al. (1984) are also relevant to the ques-
 318 tion of shallow water effects. That study found elevated ambient sound levels at a coastal
 319 site, relative to open ocean levels, for a range of wind speeds (APL-UW, 1994). Although
 320 that study did not include wave measurements or consider wave effects, we can review
 321 the wind record and estimate that the storm duration was too short to produce fully-
 322 developed waves. We can also examine the site and assert that refraction along the coast
 323 may have further reduced the wave heights. Applying the scaling of our present study,




Figure 10. Ensemble acoustic spectra from two years of data at OWS-P that are binned by entirely by wave parameters, using the ratio of mean square slope mss to the square root of the significant wave height $H_s^{1/2}$.

324 the H_s denominator in Eq. 2 would be smaller for Lemon et al. (1984) than an open ocean
 325 H_s . Thus, it would make sense for ambient sound levels to be elevated in that study, be-
 326 cause D_{bp}/H_s would be higher for a given wind speed.

327 4.2 Additional wave effects: limitation of wave slopes at high winds

328 Other wave characteristics beyond H_s setting the vertical scale of the attenuating
 329 layer are also ripe for more examination. The observed saturation of ambient sound (Yang
 330 et al., 2023) occurs at the same wind speed ($U_{10} \sim 15$ m/s) for which wave slopes sat-
 331 urate (Davis et al., 2023). A common metric is the mean square slope (mss) of the waves,
 332 which is the fourth moment of the scalar wave spectrum and integrates over the wave
 333 scales spanning f_1 to f_2 ,

$$mss = \int_{f_1}^{f_2} \frac{(2\pi)f^4 E(f)}{g^2} df. \quad (3)$$

334 We use $f_1 = 0.2$ Hz and $f_2 = 0.4$ Hz, following prior work relating mss to wave
 335 breaking rates (Schwendeman & Thomson, 2014). We thus expected a relation between
 336 mss and ambient sound generation. Further, it is now common practice to use mss mea-
 337 sured by wave buoys to give a proxy wind speed estimate (Voermans et al., 2020) based
 338 on the concept of wind-wave equilibrium (Thomson et al., 2013). Thus, mss is a reason-
 339 able parameter to characterize the generation of active bubbles causing ambient sound.
 340 Continuing with the total H_s as a parameter characterizing the attenuation of sound by
 341 the persistent bubbles, we can define new scaling for ambient sound that is entirely wave-
 342 based: the ratio of mss/H_s .

343 Figure 10 tests a ratio $mss/H_s^{1/2}$ scaling with the 2-year OWS-P dataset. The square
 344 root of H_s is used so as to have a dynamic range more similar to the range of mss . The
 345 monotonic sorting of ambient sound spectra is similar to the relative bubble plume depth
 346 result from before; it is again more monotonic than the conventional wind speed ap-
 347 proach. This suggests that wave spectral measurements (and/or models) alone may be
 348 useful in prescribing ambient sound levels. This result does not intend to unravel decades
 349 of ‘wind noise’ literature, but rather illuminate the highly coupled wave dynamics that
 350 mediate the wind forcing.

5 Conclusions

Mid-frequency ambient sound in the ocean has a primary dependence on wind speed, which is a proxy for surface wave breaking and the generation of active bubble plumes in the upper ocean. This sound likely is attenuated by smaller bubbles, which are persistent in a layer with a proxy depth of one significant wave height (H_s). At high wind speeds (> 15 m/s), this persistent layer becomes significant relative to the active bubble plume depth layer, and the net effect is to attenuate more of the generated sound before it can propagate farther into the ocean. This may explain the observations of Yang et al. (2023), which show a saturation of measured sound for high wind speeds. An empirical scaling for the depth ratio of active and passive bubbles, based on measured winds and waves, is successful in sorting ambient sound spectra and may be useful approach for the future development of prognostic models.

The D_{bp}/H_s scaling may not become a predictive model for ambient sound, and it does not directly address the shape of the ambient sound spectra $S(f)$. Yet it is a clear indicator that including surface waves and bubble plume characteristics can improve predictions relative to wind alone. The bubble plumes that cause sound generation and attenuation need more detailed characterization as a function of wind and wave conditions. In addition to bubble depth penetration and persistence, void fractions and bubble size distributions need to be quantified over the full range of open-ocean and coastal conditions. Such measurements would enable more detailed acoustic propagation modeling, including distinguishing between the passive (small) bubbles and active (large) bubbles. For the common inverse problem of obtaining proxy winds (and rain rates) from ambient acoustic measurements, the results herein provide a framework to explore the scatter in those methods and potential avenues to improve those estimates.

Open Research Section

Station Papa wind data were retrieved from <https://www.pmel.noaa.gov/ocs/Papa>. Station Papa wave data were retrieved from <http://thredds.cdip.ucsd.edu/thredds/catalog/cdip/archive/166p1/catalog.html>. The complete data and processing codes from this work are publicly available at <http://hdl.handle.net/1773/51039>.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the Office of Naval Research (Awards N00014-20-1-2417 and N00014-21-1-2743). The waverider mooring at Ocean Station Papa is maintained using NSF support (award OCE-2122317) and the surface wind mooring at Ocean Station Papa is maintained by NOAA PMEL through funding from NOAA's Global Ocean Monitoring and Observing program. This is PMEL paper number 5604.

Appendix A Directionality of Loggerhead SNAP Recorders

The time-averaged ambient sound spectra collected with the Loggerhead Snap recorders showed evidence of anomalous features. The most severe features were in the 900 Hz to 2 kHz band, which were removed from Fig. 5 and replaced with a dashed line representing an interpolation over the affected frequency band. These features were present throughout the data set, independent of wind speed and wave height. These irregularities in the ambient sound spectra were attributed to the acoustic response of the Snap recorders due to the proximity of the hydrophone to the air-filled pressure housing.

The Snap recorder has a PVC housing roughly 0.5 m long and 5 cm in diameter, with the power supply and data acquisition system contained internally. The external HTI 96 hydrophone is connected to the housing by a 3 cm long semi-rigid cable. The




Figure A1. Measured acoustic directivity of the Loggerhead Snap recorder. Positive/negative dB levels indicate the amplification/suppression of received signals at each receiver orientation angle (hydrophone facing source at $\theta = 0^\circ$).

398 proximity of the hydrophone to the housing, the deployed orientation with the hydrophone
 399 pointed away from the sea surface, shadowing and diffraction around the housing, and
 400 the acoustic resonances of the cavity are all possible contributing factors to the irreg-
 401 ularities observed in the measurements.

402 To determine the acoustic sensitivity of the Snap recorder as a function of direc-
 403 tion and frequency, calibrated measurements were taken at the Lake Travis Test Station
 404 in Austin, Texas. The lake bed below the test station has a gradual slope, with an av-
 405 erage water depth of 20 m directly below the experimental setup. During testing, the
 406 water column consisted of a 30 °C isothermal layer in the upper 12 m, followed by a ther-
 407 mocline reducing the temperature to 20 °C at 20 m. The response of the system is as-
 408 sumed symmetric about the axis of the recorder. To measure the change in response as
 409 a function of receive angle θ of the incident sound wave, the Snap recorder was sus-
 410 pended horizontally by 10 m of fishing line, with its axis parallel to the water surface. The fish-
 411 ing line was connected to a rotating column, with the hydrophone centered on the col-
 412 umn's axis of rotation.

413 The Snap recorder collected data continuously at 48 kHz as it was rotated at a speed
 414 of approximately 1 deg/s, with the 360° rotation lasting roughly 6 minutes. A Navy stan-
 415 dard J9 projector² was used for the calibration. It was placed at 10 m depth 1 m from
 416 the center of the rotating column. For the J9 projector, far-field propagation is attained
 417 roughly 10 cm from the source. The calibration signal was a 10 ms linear frequency mod-
 418 ulated chirp from 50 Hz to 20 kHz, repeated every 250 ms. The length of the chirp was
 419 chosen to prevent reflections from contaminating the received signal.

420 Reference measurements of the projector signal were collected with a calibrated Navy
 421 standard H56 hydrophone³ placed at 10 m depth below the rotating column, i.e. in the
 422 location previously occupied by the Snap recorder hydrophone. The difference of the re-
 423 ceived power spectral density level as measured by the reference hydrophone to that mea-
 424 sured by the Snap recorder provides the nominal response of the Snap recorder for each
 425 receive angle. Figure A1 shows the calibrated acoustic response of the Snap recorder as
 426 a function of angle and frequency for the full rotation. Note that a 200 Hz high-pass fil-

² https://www.navsea.navy.mil/Portals/103/Documents/NUWC_Newport/USRD/J9.pdf

³ https://www.navsea.navy.mil/Portals/103/Documents/NUWC_Newport/USRD/H56.pdf

427 ter was applied to both the Snap recorder data and the H56 data to remove environmen-
428 tal noise.

429 The directivity of the Snap recorder is significant, with variations of ± 10 dB at
430 different orientations for many frequencies in the 500 Hz to 4 kHz band. With the de-
431 ployed orientation facing away from the sea surface, direct path sea surface sound ar-
432 rives at angles $|\theta| \geq 90^\circ$, with sound from directly overhead arriving at $|\theta| = 180^\circ$
433 and surface generated sound from more distant patches arriving at lower angles. The strong
434 frequency-generated directionality is an important consideration in the interpretation
435 of ambient sound data collected with the Snap recorders. Compared to the HIFEVA model
436 ambient sound curves (APL-UW, 1994), the spectra shown in Fig. 5 are biased toward
437 higher ambient sound levels. This result is broadly consistent with the measured direc-
438 tivity shown in Fig. A1, which on average shows a higher response in the 500 Hz to 4
439 kHz range for angles between $\pm 90^\circ$ and $\pm 180^\circ$.

440 Although only one Snap recorder was calibrated at the Test Station, the overall angle-
441 and frequency-dependence is expected to be consistent between units owing to their sim-
442 ilar construction. However, the two Snap recorders used for the NORSE ambient sound
443 measurements showed high-frequency oscillations that were slightly offset from one an-
444 other between 900 Hz and 2 kHz. These oscillations roughly align with the narrow-band,
445 wide-angle elevated response near 1 kHz in the calibration measurement shown in Fig. A1.
446 Slight variations in the construction and preparation of the Snap recorders could be re-
447 sponsible for small shifts in the characteristics of the acoustic response. These features
448 were removed from Fig. 5 to facilitate a cleaner comparison between the two recorders.
449 While the absolute values of the measurements are influenced by the acoustic response
450 of the recorders, the differences in the observed ambient sound levels between SWIFT 11
451 and SWIFT 12 can be attributed to differences in the ambient sound generation and prop-
452 agation environment.

453 References

- 454 Ainslie, M. A. (2005). Effect of wind-generated bubbles on fixed range acoustic
455 attenuation in shallow water at 1–4kHz. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society*
456 *of America*, 118(6), 3513–3523. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.1121/1](https://doi.org/10.1121/1.2114527)
457 [.2114527](https://doi.org/10.1121/1.2114527) doi: 10.1121/1.2114527
- 458 Ainslie, M. A. (2010). *Principles of sonar performance modelling* (Vol. 707).
459 Springer.
- 460 Al-Lashi, R. S., Gunn, S. R., & Czernski, H. (2016). Automated processing of
461 oceanic bubble images for measuring bubble size distributions underneath
462 breaking waves. *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, null.
463 Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JTECH-D-15-0222.1> doi:
464 [10.1175/JTECH-D-15-0222.1](https://doi.org/10.1175/JTECH-D-15-0222.1)
- 465 APL-UW. (1994). *High-frequency ocean environmental acoustic models handbook*
466 (Tech. Rep. No. TR9407). Applied Physics Laboratory, University of Washing-
467 ton, Seattle, WA.
- 468 Ballard, M., MacKinnon, J., Rainville, L., Simmons, H., Abbot, P., Bergentz, K.,
469 ... Zeiden, K. (2022). *Northern ocean rapid surface evolution (norse): Sci-*
470 *ence and experiment plan* (Tech. Rep. No. 2102). Applied Physics Laboratory,
471 University of Washington.
- 472 Ballard, M. S., Sagers, J. D., Poulain, P.-M., Mackinnon, J., Lucas, A. J., &
473 Sanchez-Rios, A. (2023). Out-of-plane arrivals recorded by drifting hy-
474 drophones during the northern ocean rapid surface evolution experiment.
475 *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 154(5), 2757–2768.
- 476 Banner, M., Gemmrich, J., & Farmer, D. (2002). Multiscale measurements of ocean
477 wave breaking probability. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, 32, 3364–3375.
- 478 Belka, D., Schwendeman, M., Thomson, J., & Cronin, M. (2014). *Historical wave*

- 479 *and wind observations at ocean station p* (Tech. Rep. No. 1407). Applied
 480 Physics Laboratory, University of Washington.
- 481 Cifuentes-Lorenzen, A., Edson, J. B., & Zappa, C. J. (2018). Air-sea inter-
 482 action in the southern ocean: Exploring the height of the wave boundary
 483 layer at the air-sea interface. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, *169*(3), 461–
 484 482. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10546-018-0376-0> doi:
 485 10.1007/s10546-018-0376-0
- 486 Cronin, M. F., Anderson, N. D., Zhang, D., Berk, P., Wills, S. M., Serra, Y., ...
 487 Meinig, C. (2023, October). Pmel ocean climate stations as reference
 488 time series and research aggregate devices. *Oceanography*. Retrieved from
 489 <https://doi.org/10.5670/oceanog.2023.224>
- 490 Cronin, M. F., Pelland, N. A., Emerson, S. R., & Crawford, W. R. (2015). Estim-
 491 ating diffusivity from the mixed layer heat and salt balances in the north pacific.
 492 *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, *120*(11), 7346-7362. Retrieved
 493 from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/2015JC011010)
 494 [2015JC011010](https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JC011010) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JC011010>
- 495 Dahl, P. (2000). Bubble clouds and their transport within the surf zone as mea-
 496 sured with a distributed array of upward-looking sonars. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*,
 497 *109*(1).
- 498 Dahl, P., & Jessup, A. T. (1985). On bubble clouds produced by breaking waves' an
 499 event analysis of ocean acoustic measurements. *J. Geophys. Res.*, *100*(C3).
- 500 Davis, J., Thomson, J., Houghton, I. A., Doyle, J. D., Komaromi, W., Fairall,
 501 C. W., & Thompson, E. J. (2023). Saturation of ocean surface wave
 502 slopes observed during hurricanes. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *50*. Retrieved from
 503 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023GL104139> doi: 10.1029/2023GL104139
- 504 Deane, G. B. (2000). Long time-base observations of surf noise. *The Journal of*
 505 *the Acoustical Society of America*, *107*(2), 758-770. Retrieved from [https://](https://doi.org/10.1121/1.428259)
 506 doi.org/10.1121/1.428259 doi: 10.1121/1.428259
- 507 Deane, G. B., & Stokes, M. D. (2002). Scale dependence of bubble creation mecha-
 508 nisms in breaking waves. *Nature*, *418*.
- 509 Derakhti, M., Thomson, J., Bassett, C. S., Malila, M. P., & Kirby, J. T. (2024,
 510 feb). Statistics of bubble plumes generated by breaking surface waves. *J.*
 511 *Geophys. Res.*, *accepted*. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.22541/essoar](https://doi.org/10.22541/essoar.167751591.11265648/v1)
 512 [.167751591.11265648/v1](https://doi.org/10.22541/essoar.167751591.11265648/v1) doi: 10.22541/essoar.167751591.11265648/v1
- 513 Dobson, F., Perrie, W., & Toulany, B. (1989). On the deep-water fetch laws for
 514 wind-generated surface gravity waves. *Atmos.-Ocean*, *27*, 210-236.
- 515 Dragan-Górska, A., Górska, N., Markuszewski, P., & Klusek, Z. (2023). Infl-
 516 uence of wind and waves on ambient noise and bubble entrainment depth
 517 in the semi-enclosed baltic sea. *Oceanologia*. Retrieved from [https://](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0078323423000921)
 518 www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0078323423000921 doi:
 519 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oceano.2023.12.003>
- 520 Ellenson, A., & Özkan-Haller, H. T. (2018). Predicting large ocean wave
 521 events characterized by bimodal energy spectra in the presence of a low-
 522 level southerly wind feature. *Weather and Forecasting*, *33*(2), 479-499.
 523 Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1175/WAF-D-17-0035.1> doi:
 524 10.1175/WAF-D-17-0035.1
- 525 Farmer, D. M., & Vagle, S. (1989). Waveguide propagation of ambient sound in the
 526 ocean-surface bubble layer. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*,
 527 *86*(5), 1897-1908. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.398568> doi:
 528 10.1121/1.398568
- 529 Felizardo, F., & Melville, W. (1995). Correlation between ambient noise and the
 530 ocean surface wave field. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, *25*, 513-532.
- 531 Fontaine, E. (2012, 2013/04/06). A theoretical explanation of the fetch-
 532 and duration-limited laws. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, *43*(2), 233-247. doi:
 533 10.1175/JPO-D-11-0190.1

- 534 Freeland, H. (2007). A short history of Ocean Station Papa and Line P. *Progress in*
535 *Oceanography*, 75, 120-125.
- 536 Gemmrich, J. (2010). Strong turbulence in the wave crest region. *J. Phys.*
537 *Oceanogr.*, 40, 583-595. Retrieved from DOI:10.1175/2009JP04179.1
- 538 Hasselmann, K., Barnett, T. P., Bouws, E., Carlson, H., Cartwright, D. E., Enke,
539 K., ... others (1973). Measurements of wind-wave growth and swell decay dur-
540 ing the joint north sea wave project (jonswap). *Ergaenzungsheft zur Deutschen*
541 *Hydrographischen Zeitschrift, Reihe A*.
- 542 Hildebrand, J. A., Frasier, K. E., Baumann-Pickering, S., & Wiggins, S. M. (2021,
543 06). An empirical model for wind-generated ocean noise. *The Journal*
544 *of the Acoustical Society of America*, 149(6), 4516-4533. Retrieved from
545 <https://doi.org/10.1121/10.0005430> doi: 10.1121/10.0005430
- 546 Lemon, D. D., Farmer, D. M., & Watts, D. R. (1984). Acoustic measurements
547 of wind speed and precipitation over a continental shelf. *J. Geophys. Res.*,
548 89(C3), 3462-3472.
- 549 Manasseh, R., Babanin, A. V., Forbes, C., Rickards, K., Bobevski, I., & Ooi, A.
550 (2006, 04). Passive Acoustic Determination of Wave-Breaking Events and
551 Their Severity across the Spectrum. *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic*
552 *Technology*, 23(4), 599-618. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.1175/](https://doi.org/10.1175/JTECH1853.1)
553 [JTECH1853.1](https://doi.org/10.1175/JTECH1853.1) doi: 10.1175/JTECH1853.1
- 554 Na, B., Chang, K.-A., Huang, Z.-C., & Lim, H.-J. (2016). Turbulent flow field and
555 air entrainment in laboratory plunging breaking waves. *Journal of Geophys-*
556 *ical Research: Oceans*, n/a-n/a. Retrieved from [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2015JC011377)
557 [2015JC011377](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2015JC011377) doi: 10.1002/2015JC011377
- 558 Pierson, W. J., & Moskowitz, L. (1964). A proposed spectral form for fully devel-
559 oped wind seas based on the similarity theory of A. A. Kitaigorodskii. *J. Geo-*
560 *phys. Res.*, 69, 5181-5190.
- 561 Portilla-Yandún, J. (n.d.). The global signature of ocean wave spectra. *Geophys-*
562 *ical Research Letters*, n/a-n/a. Retrieved from [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2017GL076431)
563 [2017GL076431](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2017GL076431) (2017GL076431) doi: 10.1002/2017GL076431
- 564 Schwendeman, M., & Thomson, J. (2014, 2015/01/21). A horizon-tracking method
565 for shipboard video stabilization and rectification. *Journal of Atmospheric and*
566 *Oceanic Technology*, 32(1), 164-176. Retrieved from [http://dx.doi.org/10](http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JTECH-D-14-00047.1)
567 [.1175/JTECH-D-14-00047.1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JTECH-D-14-00047.1) doi: 10.1175/JTECH-D-14-00047.1
- 568 Schwendeman, M., Thomson, J., & Gemmrich, J. (2014). Wave breaking dissipation
569 in a young wind sea. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, 44(1), 104-127.
- 570 Stiassnie, M. (2012, 02). Fetch-limited growth of wind waves. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117.
571 doi: 10.1029/2011JC007579
- 572 Strand, K. O., Breivik, Ø., Pedersen, G., Vikebø, F. B., Sundby, S., & Chris-
573 tensen, K. H. (2020). Long-term statistics of observed bubble depth ver-
574 sus modeled wave dissipation. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*,
575 125(2), e2019JC015906. Retrieved from [https://agupubs.onlinelibrary](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2019JC015906)
576 [.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2019JC015906](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2019JC015906) (e2019JC015906
577 10.1029/2019JC015906) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JC015906>
- 578 Sutherland, P., & Melville, W. K. (2013). Field measurements and scaling
579 of ocean surface wave-breaking statistics. *Geophysical Research Letters*,
580 n/a-n/a. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/grl.50584> doi:
581 10.1002/grl.50584
- 582 Sutherland, P., & Melville, W. K. (2015, 2015/04/28). Field measurements of sur-
583 face and near-surface turbulence in the presence of breaking waves. *Journal of*
584 *Physical Oceanography*, 45(4), 943-965. Retrieved from [http://dx.doi.org/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JPO-D-14-0133.1)
585 [10.1175/JPO-D-14-0133.1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JPO-D-14-0133.1) doi: 10.1175/JPO-D-14-0133.1
- 586 Thomson, J. (2012). Wave breaking dissipation observed with SWIFT drifters.
587 *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, 29(12), 1866-1882. Retrieved
588 from <https://doi.org/10.1175/JTECH-D-12-00018.1> doi: 10.1175/JTECH

- 589 -D-12-00018.1
- 590 Thomson, J., D'Asaro, E. A., Cronin, M., Rogers, E., Harcourt, R., & Scherbina,
591 A. (2013). Waves and the equilibrium range at Ocean Weather Sta-
592 tion P. *J. Geophys. Res.*, *118*, 1-12. Retrieved from [https://agupubs](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/2013JC008837)
593 [.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/2013JC008837](https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JC008837) doi:
594 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JC008837>
- 595 Thomson, J., & Jessup, A. (2009). A fourier-based method for the distribution of
596 breaking crests from video observations. *J. Atmos. Ocean. Tech.*, *26*.
- 597 Thomson, J., & Rogers, W. E. (2014). Swell and sea in the emerging Arctic Ocean.
598 *Geophysical Research Letters*, n/a–n/a. Retrieved from [http://dx.doi.org/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2014GL059983)
599 [10.1002/2014GL059983](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2014GL059983) doi: 10.1002/2014GL059983
- 600 Thomson, J., Schwendeman, M. S., Zippel, S. F., Moghimi, S., Gemmrich, J., &
601 Rogers, W. E. (2016). Wave-breaking turbulence in the ocean surface layer.
602 *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, *46*(6), 1857-1870. Retrieved from [http://](http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JPO-D-15-0130.1)
603 dx.doi.org/10.1175/JPO-D-15-0130.1 doi: 10.1175/JPO-D-15-0130.1
- 604 Thomson, J., Talbert, J., de Klerk, A., Brown, A., Schwendeman, M., Goldsmith,
605 J., ... Meinig, C. (2015, 2015/06/18). Biofouling effects on the response of a
606 wave measurement buoy in deep water. *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic*
607 *Technology*, *32*(6), 1281–1286. Retrieved from [http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JTECH-D-15-0029.1)
608 [JTECH-D-15-0029.1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JTECH-D-15-0029.1) doi: 10.1175/JTECH-D-15-0029.1
- 609 Urick, R. J. (1975). *Principles of Underwater Sound*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- 610 Voermans, J. J., Smit, P. B., Janssen, T. T., & Babanin, A. V. (2020). Esti-
611 mating wind speed and direction using wave spectra. *Journal of Geophys-*
612 *ical Research: Oceans*, *125*(2), e2019JC015717. Retrieved from [https://](https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2019JC015717)
613 agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2019JC015717
614 (e2019JC015717 10.1029/2019JC015717) doi: 10.1029/2019JC015717
- 615 Wenz, G. (1962). Acoustic ambient noise in the ocean: Spectra and sources. *J.*
616 *Acoust. Soc. Am.*, *34*, 1936-1956.
- 617 Yang, J., Nystuen, J. A., Riser, S. C., & Thorsos, E. I. (2023). Open ocean
618 ambient noise data in the frequency band of 100 hz to 50 khz from the
619 pacific ocean. *JASA Express Letters*, *3*(3), 036001. Retrieved from
620 <https://doi.org/10.1121/10.0017349> doi: 10.1121/10.0017349