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Thetis coastal ocean model

- **Thetis**: an adjoint-capable finite element coastal ocean model
- Implemented within Firedrake finite element framework
- Pyadjoint for adjoint code generation
- P1DG-P1DG finite element pair and Crank-Nicolson timestepper (others available)

Thetis-2D has been used for:

- Tides
- Storm surge
- Tsunami
- Inundation
- Tidal energy
Thetis model setup: North Sea
Research questions

• What are the spatial and temporal patterns of storm surge model sensitivity to its uncertain inputs?
  • Bathymetry
  • Bottom friction coefficient
  • Wind stress

• What are the similarities/differences between the sensitivities of model outputs at different locations?

• Can we compare the magnitudes of sensitivity to each of these inputs?
Adjoint methods

- Provide different information to ensemble-based methods
- Insightful, computationally efficient
- Functional $J$ is the peak residual at a given ‘target’

Model inputs $m$ → Forward model → Output $J$ → Adjoint model → Sensitivity $\frac{\partial J}{\partial m}$
Sensitivity Results
Sensitivity of peak surge residual to bathymetry
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Sensitivity of peak surge residual to bathymetry

- Net influence of bathymetry is negative
- Defensive property of sand bank
- High sensitivity magnitudes in highly localised regions
- Similar far-field sensitivity patterns
- Immingham shows greatest overall (space-integrated) sensitivity
- Likely due to shallow water in vicinity of Immingham
Sensitivity of peak surge residual to bottom friction coefficient
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Sensitivity of peak surge residual to bottom friction coefficient

- Net influence of bottom friction coeff is negative
- High sensitivity magnitudes in highly localised regions, especially in shallow water
- Similar far-field sensitivity patterns
- Increasing total (space-integrated) sensitivity moving south
- Due to cumulative effect as surge propagates south
- Implications for the use of spatially varying bottom friction coefficient
Sensitivity of peak surge residual to wind stress

- Wind stress is time varying; so is sensitivity
- Perturbations due to wind stress travel at approximately the shallow water wave speed
- Sensitivity pattern is like shallow water wave, spreading out from observation location backwards in time (Wilson et al, 2013)
- This is both intuitive and simple to prove (Warder et al, 2019)
Sensitivity of peak surge residual to wind stress
Sensitivity of peak surge residual to wind stress
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Sensitivity of peak surge residual to bathymetry

- Peak surge is mostly influenced by wind stresses in 24 hours prior to peak
- Immingham shows greatest sensitivity
- Similar far-field sensitivity patterns, plus local effects
- Errors in north of the domain propagate south with surge
Comparison of sources of uncertainty

• Comparison of sensitivity to each input requires estimate of input uncertainty

• Use multiple datasets for bathymetry, literature for Manning coeff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North Shields</th>
<th>Immingham</th>
<th>Lowestoft</th>
<th>Coastline section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bathymetry (± 2.7 m)</td>
<td>0.047 m</td>
<td>0.074 m</td>
<td>0.035 m</td>
<td>0.22 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning coeff (± 0.005)</td>
<td>0.097 m</td>
<td>0.16 m</td>
<td>0.19 m</td>
<td>0.18 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Uncertainty in meteorological inputs varies with lead time; typical ensemble range at 24 hour lead time is O(1m)
Conclusions

• Uncertainty in surge predictions has been analysed using an adjoint surge model
• Spatial patterns of sensitivity to bathymetry and bottom friction coeff show local effects, and similarity in far field
• Implications for model calibration using spatially varying friction coeff
• Confirms what we already know – uncertainties in meteorological forcing are most important
• Adjoint-derived sensitivity is a tool for mapping input uncertainties onto surge uncertainty
• And many more?
Thank you for your attention
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