

Investigation on the energy absorption performance of a fixed-bottom pressure-differential wave energy converter

Aurélien Babarit, Fabian Wendt, Yi-Hsiang Yu, Jochem Weber

▶ To cite this version:

Aurélien Babarit, Fabian Wendt, Yi-Hsiang Yu, Jochem Weber. Investigation on the energy absorption performance of a fixed-bottom pressure-differential wave energy converter. Applied Ocean Research, 2017, 65, pp.90-101. 10.1016/j.apor.2017.03.017 . hal-01505559

HAL Id: hal-01505559 https://hal.science/hal-01505559

Submitted on 18 Apr 2017

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.

Investigation on the energy absorption performance of a fixed-bottom pressure-differential wave energy converter

A. Babarit^{a,*}, F. Wendt^b, Y.-H. Yu^b, J. Weber^b

⁴ ^aLHEEA Lab, Ecole Centrale de Nantes - CNRS, 1 rue de la Noe, 44300 Nantes, France

⁵ ^bNational Renewable Energy Laboratory, 15013 Denver West Parkway, Golden, CO, 80401, USA

6 Abstract

3

In this article, we investigate the energy absorption performance of a fixed-bottom pressure-differential wave energy converter. Two versions of the technology are considered: one has the moving surfaces on the bottom of the air chambers whereas the other has the moving surfaces on the top. We developed numerical models in the frequency domain, thereby enabling the power absorption of the two versions of the device to be assessed. It is observed that the moving surfaces on the top allow for easier tuning of the natural period of the system. Taking into account stroke limitations, the design is optimized. Results indicate that the pressure-differential wave energy converter is a highly efficient technology both with respect to energy absorption and selected economic performance indicators.

7 Keywords: Renewable energy, wave energy converter, pressure differential,

⁸ numerical model, optimization, energy performance

9 1. Introduction

Ocean waves are a largely untapped natural renewable energy resource [1]. Since the early 1980s, hundreds of wave energy converters (WECs) have been studied and developed. Review of technologies can be found in [2] or [3]. Several fullscale prototypes have been tested at sea, however WECs have still not reached the commercial stage. This is mainly because of their high cost of energy in comparison with other renewable energy technologies such as wind or solar photovoltaics [4, 5, 6].

 * Corresponding author

Preprint submitted to Applied Ocean Research

Email addresses: aurelien.babarit@ec-nantes.fr (A. Babarit), fabian.wendt@nrel.gov (F. Wendt), yi-hsiang.yu@nrel.gov (Y.-H. Yu), jochem.weber@nrel.gov (J. Weber)

The cost of wave energy may decrease in the long term with industrialization 16 and mass production of successful WEC prototypes. However, it is uncertain that 17 a sufficient level of cost reduction can be achieved with WEC technologies based on 18 well-known working principles (see for example [3] for a review of working principles 19 of wave energy converters). That is why it is crucial to carry on basic research 20 of new wave energy concepts and components as it may lead to a breakthrough in 21 energy and economic performance. Examples of potential revolutionary technologies 22 include flexible WECs such as the Anaconda WEC [7] or the S3 WEC [8]; passively 23 phase-controlled WECs such as the CorPower WEC [9]; or WECs with variable 24 geometry such as the National Renewable Energy Laboratory's (NREL's) oscillating 25 wave energy converter [10]. 26

Another example is the M3 flexible WEC [11], known as a pressure-differential device. It takes advantage of the spatially varying pressure differentials in the wave field to drive a fluid flow. The working principle of the M3 WEC is described in [12]:

(It) consists of two deformable air chambers separated by a distance on
the order of half a wavelength. The chambers are connected by a pipe
with an internal bidirectional turbine. The device is fully submerged and
fixed near the sea floor. Due to dynamic wave pressure, one air chamber compresses while the other expands forcing air through the turbine.
As the wave pressure progresses, the pressure differential switches signs,
reversing the direction of the air flow.

Figure 1 shows a picture of a scale prototype of the M3 WEC that was deployed and tested offshore the coast of Oregon in September 2014.

In [12], the separating distance and orientation of the device was optimized to maximize the excitation pressure on the device assuming diffraction is negligible. It was found that for a nondirectional spectrum, the optimal distance between the chambers is close to half the wavelength of the spectrum peak frequency.

The WEC itself was not modeled in [12]. To our knowledge, there are no other publicly available studies that cover the energy performance of pressure-differential WECs (such as the M3 WEC). Thus, the energy performance of fixed-bottom pressuredifferential wave energy converters is an open question, and is therefore the motivation for this study.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, numerical models of two versions of the pressure-differential WECs are presented. A frequency domain approach was used. One version has the moving surfaces on the bottom of the air chambers whereas the other version has the moving surfaces on the top. Fundamental differences between the two versions are discussed. In Section 3, we provide



Figure 1: The scale prototype of the M3 WEC during its deployment offshore the coast of Oregon in September 2014.

comparisons of numerical results for energy performance. The most promising design is further investigated and compared to other WEC technologies for energy and economic performance.

⁵⁶ 2. Numerical model

57 2.1. Ocean waves model and wave resource

In this study, ocean waves were modeled by unidirectional irregular waves. Irregular waves are a more realistic model for real ocean waves than regular waves. Only unidirectional waves were considered because the pressure-differential WEC device is designed for small water depths where directional spreading is expected to be negligible thanks to refraction.

In this work, we considered the wave resource for a site located on the west 63 coast of France. The scatter diagram for the wave resource at this site is shown 64 in Figure 2, which was obtained from actual measurements of the wave elevation 65 [13]. However, only the joint probability distributions for the significant height, 66 $H_{\rm S}$, and the spectrum peak period, $T_{\rm p}$, are available. The measured sea spectra 67 were not retained. Therefore, it is necessary to assume a spectral shape for the 68 wave spectrum. The JONSWAP spectrum was used in this study with a frequency 69 spreading parameter $\gamma = 3.3$. 70



Figure 2: Measured wave scatter diagram offshore Yeu island on the west coast of France (GPS coordinates 046°40,000' N - 02°25,000' N).

The mean water depth is 47 m at the point where the wave resource was measured. 71 The targeted deployment water depth of the pressure-differential WEC is shallower. 72 The effect of water depth on the wave spectrum and wave resource must be taken 73 into account. The waves were assumed to propagate into shallow water according to 74 linear refraction. Because of bottom friction and wave breaking, the wave resource 75 is expected to be less near-shore than offshore. In [14], it was shown that the gross 76 wave resource from a 50-m water depth site to a 10-m water depth site is reduced 77 by 20% to 44%. At first, we assumed a constant energy loss of $\epsilon = 30\%$ for each and 78 every wave component in the wave spectrum. Thus, the following ad-hoc near-shore 79 wave spectrum S_h was used: 80

$$S_h(f) = \frac{1 - \epsilon}{\tanh(kh) + \frac{kh}{\cosh(kh)}} S_\infty(f) \tag{1}$$

where f is the frequency, h is the water depth, k is the wavelength, and S_{∞} is the well-known JONSWAP spectrum. The factor $1 - \epsilon$ accounts for the fraction ϵ of the wave energy that is dissipated. The factor $\frac{1}{\tanh(kh) + \frac{kh}{\cosh(kh)}}$ takes into account the wave amplitude modulation caused by shoaling.



Figure 3: Sketch of version 1 of the pressure-differential wave energy device with moving surfaces on the bottom.

2.2. Version 1 of the pressure-differential WEC: moving surfaces on the bottom of the air chambers

Figure 3 shows a sketch of the pressure-differential wave energy device. This version is inspired by the M3 WEC, which has the deformable membranes on the bottom of the air chambers. For simplicity, the supporting frame shown in Figure 1 was excluded in the numerical model. Note that there may be other significant and important differences both in geometry and configuration between the studied device and the system that we used as a source of inspiration, thus also the performance may differ.

The studied device consists of a structure standing on the sea bottom and two identical air chambers. The air chambers are connected with a pipe that allows air to be exchanged between the chambers. The power take-off (PTO) is an air turbine that converts the kinetic energy of the air flow in the pipe into mechanical rotational energy. Then, the mechanical rotational energy can be converted into electricity using a generator. The waves are propagating from left to right.

In this analysis, we assumed that the air chambers are identical square boxes with length L_c , width B, and height H. Their cross section is denoted by $S = L_c B$. The bottom surfaces of the air chambers are assumed to move only vertically, which may be achieved in practice by using bellows. The distance from the free surface at rest and the bottom of the chambers at rest is denoted as D. The vertical motion of the front chamber is denoted as Z_1 . The vertical motion of the back chamber is denoted as Z_2 . The length of the pipe connecting the two chambers is L and its cross-section area is s. The air turbine is assumed to be located in the middle of the pipe. The volume of each air chamber at static equilibrium is denoted by $V_S = SH + \frac{1}{2}sL$.

¹⁰⁹ 2.2.1. Modeling of the deformations of the chambers

The mass of the moving surfaces is assumed to be negligible in comparison with their added mass. Thus, at each time t, the moving surfaces are at static equilibrium:

$$\begin{cases} -KZ_1(t) + \iint_{S_1} \left(p_{\rm e}^*(M,t) - p_i^*(M,t) \right) dS = 0\\ -KZ_2(t) + \iint_{S_2} \left(p_{\rm e}^*(M,t) - p_i^*(M,t) \right) dS = 0 \end{cases}$$
(2)

where K is the chamber stiffness coefficient, $p_{\rm e}^*$ is the total pressure on the water side, p_i^* is the total pressure in the chamber with index i, and M is a point on the surface. It is assumed that the stiffness is provided by the bellows or other appropriate mechanisms. Let us denote the dynamic outer pressure $p_{\rm e}$ and the inner dynamic pressure p_i . The difference between the total pressure and the dynamic pressure is the static pressure.

¹¹⁸ 2.2.2. Modeling of the outer flow

It is assumed that the deformations of the air chambers and that the amplitude of the waves are small so that linear potential theory is applicable for the modeling of the outer flow. Thus, the outer pressure can be written:

$$p_{\rm e}^*(M,t) = p_{ex}(M,t) + p_{\rm rad}(M,t) + p_0 - \rho gz$$
(3)

where p_{ex} is the excitation pressure from the incident wave, p_{rad} is the dynamic pressure from the radiated wave, p_0 is the atmospheric pressure, ρ is the water density, g is the gravity, and z is the vertical coordinate. z = 0 defines the ocean water surface at rest.

The symbol indicates the Fourier transform and ω is the wave frequency. $\tilde{p}_e(M, \omega) = \tilde{p}_{ex}(M, \omega) + \tilde{p}_{rad}(M, \omega)$ is the total dynamic pressure in the frequency domain. Let us define:

• The generalized modes [15] that correspond to the modes of deformation of air chambers 1 and 2:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \Phi_j}{\partial n}(M,\omega) = -1 \text{ on the bottom of air chamber } j \\ \frac{\partial \Phi_j}{\partial n}(M,\omega) = 0 \text{ everywhere else} \end{cases}$$
(4)

• The corresponding generalized forces
$$\tilde{F}_{ij} = \iint_{S_i} \tilde{p}_{\mathrm{rad},j}(M,\omega) dS = -\rho \iint_{S_i} \frac{\partial \tilde{\Phi}_j}{\partial t}(M,\omega) dS$$

Mode 1 corresponds to an oscillatory motion with unit amplitude velocity and 132 wave frequency ω of the bottom surface of the air chamber 1. Mode 2 corresponds 133 to an oscillatory motion with unit amplitude velocity of the bottom surface of the 134 air chamber 2. $\tilde{\Phi}_j$ is the elementary velocity potential for mode j. Any particular 135 motion of chamber 1 and chamber 2 can be written as the superimposition of the two 136 modes 1 and 2 with appropriate modal amplitudes. Thanks to linearity, the velocity 137 potential for this particular deformation is the combination of the elementary velocity 138 potentials. 139

The elementary velocity potentials (and diffraction potential) may be obtained 140 by solving—in the frequency domain—the linear free-surface potential flow boundary 141 volume problem with the appropriate boundary conditions on the body surface. In 142 this study, the boundary-element-method solver WAMIT was used. Results are 143 excitation force coefficients on the bottom surfaces of the chambers $F_{ex,i}$, and added 144 masses A_{ij} and radiation damping coefficients B_{ij} for the radiation force on the air 145 chamber i for a unit amplitude deformation of chamber j. Therefore, the dynamic 146 outer pressure on the bottom surface of chamber j can be written in the frequency 147 domain: 148

$$\iint_{S_i} \tilde{p}_{e}(M,\omega) dS = a(\omega) F_{ex,i}(\omega) - \sum_{j=1}^{2} A_{ij}(\omega) \tilde{\ddot{Z}}_{j}(\omega) - \sum_{j=1}^{2} B_{ij}(\omega) \tilde{\dot{Z}}_{j}(\omega)$$
(5)

where a is the incident wave amplitude.

150 2.2.3. Modeling of the internal flow

¹⁵¹ Now we consider the internal flow. The internal pressure at static equilibrium is ¹⁵² p_S . According to equation (2), $p_S = p_0 + \rho g D$.

With the density of air being small, it can be assumed that the thermodynamic processes in the chambers are quasi-static (dynamics effects are neglected). Pressure losses at the inlet and outlet of the pipes are neglected as well as losses caused by friction on the pipe walls. Thus, the pressure is homogeneous in the chambers including the portion of the pipe from the chamber to the air turbine.

Temperature of sea water is constant at the wave period timescale. The device has a large surface of heat exchanges with the surrounding seawater. Thus, it is assumed that thermodynamic processes in the chambers and connecting pipe are isothermal (the air temperature in the chambers is constant and equal to the temperature of the surrounding seawater). Using the perfect gas model for air [16], one can show:

$$\frac{\dot{p}_j^*}{p_j^*} = \frac{\dot{\rho}_j}{\rho_j} \tag{6}$$

where ρ_j is the air density in chamber j.

The mass of air in chamber j is denoted as m_j . $m_j = \rho_j V_j$ where V_j is the volume for air chamber j. $\dot{m}_j = \dot{\rho}_j V_j + \rho_j \dot{V}_j$ is the opposite of the mass flow rate from air chamber j through the turbine. The variation of the chamber volume is $\dot{V}_j = -S\dot{Z}_j$. We further assume small variations around static equilibrium for the physical quantities of the internal flow. Using equation (6) and neglecting higher order terms, it can be shown:

$$\frac{V_{\rm S}}{p_{\rm S}}\dot{p}_j^* - S\dot{Z}_j = \frac{\dot{m}_j}{\rho'} \tag{7}$$

where ρ' is the air density in the chambers at static equilibrim.

Let us define the volume flow rate through the turbine $Q = -\frac{\dot{m}_1}{\rho'}$. Because of mass conservation, $\dot{m}_1 + \dot{m}_2 = 0$, thus $Q = \frac{\dot{m}_2}{\rho'}$. By combining with equation (7), it can be shown that the time derivative of the pressure in the chambers is related to the deformations of the chambers and the volume flow rate through the turbine:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{p}_{1} = \frac{p_{\rm S}}{V_{\rm S}}S\dot{Z}_{1} - \frac{p_{\rm S}}{V_{\rm S}}Q\\ \dot{p}_{2} = \frac{p_{\rm S}}{V_{\rm S}}S\dot{Z}_{2} + \frac{p_{\rm S}}{V_{\rm S}}Q \end{cases}$$
(8)

To close the problem, a relationship between the internal pressure in the air chambers and the flow rate in the connecting pipe can be written. It is assumed that the head loss through the turbine is proportional to the volume flow rate Q, which is a reasonable assumption for a Wells turbine [17]. Let $B_{\rm PTO}$ be the proportionality coefficient. Thus, the pressure difference between the air chambers and the volume flow rate are related by the following equation:

$$p_2 - p_1 = -B_{\rm PTO}Q\tag{9}$$

181 2.2.4. Assembled model for version 1 of the pressure-differential WEC

Finally, by combining equations (2), (5), (8), and (9) and by recalling that the internal static pressure $p_{\rm S}$ is equal to $p_{\rm S} = p_0 + \rho g D$, the equation of motion for version 1 of the pressure-differential WEC can be written in the frequency domain ¹⁸⁵ and for a unit wave amplitude as:

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{j=1}^{2} A_{1j} \ddot{Z}_{j} + \sum_{j=1}^{2} B_{1j} \dot{Z}_{j} + \tilde{p}_{1}S + (K + (\rho - \rho')gS)\tilde{Z}_{1} = F_{\text{ex},1} \\ \sum_{j=1}^{2} A_{2j} \ddot{Z}_{j} + \sum_{j=1}^{2} B_{2j} \dot{Z}_{j} + \tilde{p}_{2}S + (K + (\rho - \rho')gS)\tilde{Z}_{2} = F_{\text{ex},2} \\ \tilde{p}_{1} - \frac{p_{\text{S}}}{V_{\text{S}}}S\dot{Z}_{1} + \frac{p_{\text{S}}}{V_{\text{S}}}\frac{\tilde{p}_{1}}{B_{\text{PTO}}} - \frac{p_{\text{S}}}{V_{\text{S}}}\frac{\tilde{p}_{2}}{B_{\text{PTO}}} = 0 \\ \tilde{p}_{2} - \frac{p_{\text{S}}}{V_{\text{S}}}S\dot{Z}_{2} - \frac{p_{\text{S}}}{V_{\text{S}}}\frac{\tilde{p}_{1}}{B_{\text{PTO}}} + \frac{p_{\text{S}}}{V_{\text{S}}}\frac{\tilde{p}_{2}}{B_{\text{PTO}}} = 0 \end{cases}$$
(10)

The average absorbed power is given by the time average of the product of the head loss through the turbine times the flow rate. For a regular wave of unit amplitude (a = 1) and by using equation (9), the power function (in W/m²) can be written:

$$\bar{p} = \frac{1}{2B_{\rm PTO}} |\tilde{p}_2 - \tilde{p}_1|^2 \tag{11}$$

For an irregular wave, the average absorbed power (in Watt) is the sum of the power contribution from each frequency in the spectrum:

$$\bar{P} = \int_0^\infty S_h(f)\bar{p}(f)df \tag{12}$$

2.3. Version 2 of the pressure-differential WEC: moving surfaces on the top of the
 air chambers

Figure 4 shows a sketch of the second version of a pressure-differential wave energy device. The difference with the first version is that the moving surfaces are on top of the air chambers.

We conducted a similar analysis to the one performed for version 1. Only the equations that are different from version 1 are mentioned in the following. The equation for the motion of the moving surfaces for version 2 is:

$$\begin{cases} -KZ_1(t) - \iint_{S_1} \left(p_{\rm e}^*(M,t) - p_i^*(M,t) \right) dS = 0\\ -KZ_2(t) - \iint_{S_2} \left(p_{\rm e}^*(M,t) - p_i^*(M,t) s \right) dS = 0 \end{cases}$$
(13)

The generalized modes that correspond to the modes of deformation of air chambers 1 and 2 are defined as:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \Phi_j}{\partial n} = 1 \text{ on the top of air chamber } j \\ \frac{\partial \Phi_j}{\partial n} = 0 \text{ everywhere else} \end{cases}$$
(14)

and the generalized forces become $F_{ij} = \rho \iint_{S_i} \frac{\partial \Phi_j}{\partial t} dS$.



Figure 4: Sketch of version 2 of the pressure-differential wave energy device with moving surfaces on the top.

Equation (8) for the time derivative of the pressure in the air chambers becomes:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{p}_1 = -\frac{p_{\rm S}}{V_{\rm S}}S\dot{Z}_1 - \frac{p_{\rm S}}{V_{\rm S}}Q\\ \dot{p}_2 = -\frac{p_{\rm S}}{V_{\rm S}}S\dot{Z}_2 + \frac{p_{\rm S}}{V_{\rm S}}Q \end{cases}$$
(15)

Finally, the equation of motion for version 2 of the pressure-differential WEC can be written in the frequency domain and for a unit wave amplitude as:

$$\begin{pmatrix}
\sum_{j=1}^{2} A_{1j} \ddot{\tilde{Z}}_{j} + \sum_{j=1}^{2} B_{1j} \ddot{\tilde{Z}}_{j} - \tilde{p}_{1}S + (K - (\rho - \rho')gS)\tilde{Z}_{1} = F_{\text{ex},1} \\
\sum_{j=1}^{2} A_{2j} \ddot{\tilde{Z}}_{j} + \sum_{j=1}^{2} B_{2j} \ddot{\tilde{Z}}_{j} - \tilde{p}_{2}S + (K - (\rho - \rho')gS)\tilde{Z}_{2} = F_{\text{ex},2} \\
\tilde{p}_{1} + \frac{p_{\text{S}}}{V_{\text{S}}} S \tilde{\tilde{Z}}_{1} + \frac{p_{\text{S}}}{V_{\text{S}}} \frac{\tilde{p}_{1}}{B_{\text{PTO}}} - \frac{p_{\text{S}}}{V_{\text{S}}} \frac{\tilde{p}_{2}}{B_{\text{PTO}}} = 0 \\
\tilde{p}_{2} + \frac{p_{\text{S}}}{V_{\text{S}}} S \tilde{\tilde{Z}}_{2} - \frac{p_{\text{S}}}{V_{\text{S}}} \frac{\tilde{p}_{1}}{B_{\text{PTO}}} + \frac{p_{\text{S}}}{V_{\text{S}}} \frac{\tilde{p}_{2}}{B_{\text{PTO}}} = 0
\end{cases}$$
(16)

The average absorbed power for version 2 in regular and irregular waves is calculated by applying the same equations (11) and (12) used for version 1.

208 2.4. Discussion on the basic differences between version 1 and version 2

By comparing equations (10) and (16), it is evident that the differences between the two versions are in the signs of the coupling terms between the internal pressures and the velocities of the moving surfaces; and in the signs of the hydrostatic stiffness term $(\rho - \rho')gS$.

In the case in which the moving surfaces are on top of the chambers, the sign in front of the term $(\rho - \rho')gS$ is negative. This implies that if the additional stiffness coefficient K is not large enough $(K < (\rho - \rho')gS)$, the equilibrium position is unstable. Any small disturbance from the equilibrium position will increase until one of the air chambers is fully inflated whereas the other is fully deflated. The system cannot work if $K < (\rho - \rho')gS$.

Thus, sufficient additional stiffness must be provided $(K \ge (\rho - \rho')gS)$. Assuming it is technically feasible, this feature of version 2 of the pressure-differential WEC has a key advantage over version 1 because it provides a mean to tune the natural frequency of the chambers to the dominant wave frequency. Indeed, in the case of version 1, wherein the moving surfaces are on the bottom, the stiffness coefficient is $(K + (\rho - \rho')gS)$. The natural frequency cannot be tuned to frequencies below $\approx \sqrt{\frac{(\rho - \rho')gS}{A_{11}}}$.

Figure 5 shows the hydrodynamic coefficients for the two versions of the pressure-226 differential WEC. The top figures show the meshes that were used to calculate the 227 hydrodynamic coefficients. The connecting pipe and foundations were not taken into 228 account in this first analysis for the sake of simplicity. It is believed that their effect 229 can be made negligible with appropriate design. Dimensions of the chambers are 230 given in Table 1. Left figures represent version 1 of the pressure-differential device. 231 Right figures represent version 2. The general dimensions of the two versions are 232 the same. In particular, the submergence of the active surfaces is the same in both 233 versions. 234

When comparing the two versions for the added-mass coefficients, it can be observed that they are significantly smaller for version 2 than for version 1. In the case of version 1, the added-mass coefficients are increased because the device is closer to the seabed. The wall effect adds additional added mass to the system. The added-mass coefficients A_{jj} are approximately halved in version 2 than in version 1, which is expected to be an advantage for version 2 because it could lead to a greater bandwidth for power absorption.

Unlike the added mass coefficients, the radiation damping coefficients are similar
for the two versions. They appear to be slightly greater for version 2 than version 1.
Again, this increase is expected to be an advantage for version 2 because it shows a



Figure 5: Hydrodynamic coefficients for the two versions of the pressure-differential WEC. The top figures show the meshes that were used for the calculation of the hydrodynamic coefficients. Dimensions are given in Table 1. Left figures are for version 1 of the pressure-differential device. Right figures represent version 2. The most noticeable difference is the added mass coefficients for version 2 that are significantly smaller than for version 1. Excitation force coefficients appear to be identical (wave direction is 0 degrees, i.e., waves are propagating along the x-axis).

Dimension	Unit	Version 1 or 2
Water depth h	m	10
Submergence D	m	9
Length $L_{\rm c}$	m	8
Width B	m	8
Height H	m	1
Pipe length L	m	30
Pipe section s	m^2	0.785

Table 1: Dimensions of the pressure-differential WECs considered in this study. The dimensions are the same in the two versions including the submergence depth of the moving surfaces.

greater potential for wave cancellation, which is the physical process by which wave energy is absorbed [2], [19].

For the excitation force coefficient, it can be observed that the amplitude of the hydrodynamic coefficients is the same for the front and back chambers ($|F_{\text{ex},1}| = |F_{\text{ex},2}|$) for the two versions. It shows that diffraction effects are negligible for this size of the air chambers. As expected, the excitation increases with decreasing wave frequency. The limit for $\omega \to 0$ is in agreement with $\rho gS = 640$ kN/m. Because diffraction effects are negligible, the excitation force coefficients are identical for the two versions. Neither version 1 nor 2 has an advantage on this aspect.

²⁵⁴ 3. Energy performance of the pressure-differential WECs

255 3.1. Comparison of energy performance of version 1 and version 2

The energy performance of version 1 of the pressure-differential WEC is investi-256 gated first. The equation of motion (10) was implemented in Matlab, which allows 257 for the calculation of the power function \bar{p} using equation (11) and in irregular waves 258 \overline{P} using equation (12). By varying the sea state characteristics $H_{\rm S}$ and $T_{\rm p}$, the power 259 matrix of the device can be built. Then, the annual average of power absorption can 260 be obtained by combining the power matrix with the sea state statistics of Figure 2. 261 The dimensions given in Table 1 were used for the geometry of the device. Once 262 the geometric dimensions are set, the two remaining variables are the chamber stiff-263 ness coefficient K and the air turbine damping coefficient $B_{\rm PTO}$. Several discrete val-264 ues for the stiffness coefficient K were considered and the $B_{\rm PTO}$ damping coefficient 265 was systematically optimized to maximize the annual average of power absorption. 266

²⁶⁷ A brute-force search was used for the optimization.



Figure 6: Annual average of power absorption for version 1 of the pressure-differential WEC at an hypothetical near-shore site as a function of the chamber stiffness coefficient. Note that no stroke limitation has been taken into account for the moving surface motion.

Figure 6 shows the annual average of power absorption as a function of the cham-268 ber stiffness coefficient K for version 1. It can be observed that the maximum power 269 is obtained with zero chamber stiffness. Indeed, as discussed in Section 2.4, version 1 270 is inherently stiffer than version 2 because of its geometrical configuration. Accord-271 ing to equation (10), the minimum stiffness coefficient is equal to the hydrostatic 272 stiffness $(\rho - \rho')qS$. It is approximately equal to 640 kN/m with the dimensions in 273 Table 1. The added mass is on the order of 400 kN/m.s², according to Figure 5, 274 which results in a maximum natural period of 5 s for the device. It is in the bottom 275 range of periods for the wave resource (5-15 s, as shown in Figure 2). Any increase 276 in the stiffness coefficient leads to a decrease in the device's natural period, leading 277 to a poorer agreement between the bandwidth of the device and the wave resource 278 and thus a decrease in power absorption as shown in Figure 6. 279

On the other hand, it can be expected that the power absorption would increase 280 with the negative stiffness coefficient. According to Figure 2, it seems that a nat-281 ural period close to 10 s would provide the best agreement between the device's 282 bandwidth and the wave resource. It would require a negative spring with stiffness 283 coefficient on the order of -480 kN/m. Figure 7 shows that the annual average ab-284 sorbed power peaks at K = -500 kN/m, which is very close to the estimate. The 285 annual average absorbed power is six times greater for the optimal negative stiffness 286 coefficient than for zero stiffness. Including a system that provides a negative spring 287 effect is highly beneficial to version 1 of the pressure-differential WEC with respect 288 to energy performance. 289



Figure 7: Annual average of power absorption for version 1 of the pressure-differential WEC at an hypothetical near-shore site as a function of the chamber stiffness coefficient (negative stiffness coefficients were considered in comparison to Figure 6). Note that no stroke limitation has been taken into account for the moving surface motion.

Mechanical arrangements that can provide a negative spring effect have been 290 proposed recently [9]. The same effect may also be obtained with active control of 291 actuators, but in that case the actuator's efficiency is critical to the overall effective-292 ness of the control [18]. In the case of the pressure-differential WEC, the hydrostatic 293 term in the equation of motion can behave as a negative spring if the moving sur-294 faces are set to the top of the air chambers instead of the bottom (see Section 2.4). 295 As follows, we show that it allows the negative spring requirement to be suppressed 296 while maintaining high energy absorption performance. 297

Version 2 of the pressure-differential WEC is now considered (the moving surfaces are on the top). The geometric dimensions of version 2 are identical to the those of version 1 except for the vertical position, which is chosen to have the submergence depth of the active surfaces at 9 m in both versions.

For version 2, the chamber stiffness coefficient K must be greater than the hydro-302 static stiffness $(\rho - \rho')gS \approx 640$ kN/m. Otherwise, the static equilibrium position is 303 unstable and the system cannot work. Figure 8 shows the annual average of power 304 absorption and capture width as a function of the chamber stiffness coefficient. It can 305 be seen that the power absorption peaks for a stiffness coefficient close to 720 kN/m. 306 For version 2, Figure 5 shows that the added mass is close to 200 kN/m.s^2 . Thus, 307 the natural period is approximately 10 s. For version 2 of the pressure-differential 308 WEC, it is possible to make the device's bandwidth match the wave periods with 309 a positive stiffness coefficient. In practice, it should be relatively easy to achieve 310 the appropriate stiffness by using simple springs that connect the top and bottom 311



Figure 8: Annual average of power absorption and capture width for version 2 of the pressuredifferential WEC at a hypothetical, near-shore site as a function of the chamber stiffness coefficient. Note that no stroke limitation has been taken into account for the moving surface motion.

³¹² surfaces of the air chambers. Note that the bellows may provide the appropriate ³¹³ stiffness by themselves.

When comparing Figures 7 and 8, it can be observed that the shape of the curves 314 is similar. This result was expected because the main difference in the equation of 315 motion of the two versions is in the hydrostatic stiffness coefficient as discussed in 316 Section 2.4. The response of version 2 for a stiffness coefficient of K_2 is close to the 317 response of version 1 for a stiffness coefficient of $K_1 + (\rho - \rho')gS = K_2 - (\rho - \rho')gS$. 318 The peak power for version 2 is obtained for $K_2 \approx 720$ kN/m, which corresponds to 319 $K_1 = -560 \text{ kN/m}$. $K_1 = -560 \text{ kN/m}$ is close to the stiffness of the peak in Figure 320 7. Note that it appears that the peak power is slightly greater for version 2 than for 321 version 1 and that the bandwith is slightly wider. This increase can be explained 322 by the slightly greater radiation damping coefficient (higher peak power) and the 323 smaller added mass (greater bandwidth). 324

325 3.2. Energy performance of version 2 with motion constraint

Version 2 of the pressure-differential WEC with K = 720 kN/m appears to be the most promising design with respect to energy performance. It is further investigated in this section, particularly with respect to stroke limitation. The motion of the moving surface is limited because of practical constraints. Also, the linear potential theory that was used to model the outer flow assumes small amplitude motion. If the motion is too large, the actual power performance may deviate significantly from the numerical prediction.

Figure 9 shows the response of version 2 of the pressure-differential WEC in 333 regular waves with K = 720 kN/m. The top left plot shows the motion response 334 amplitude operators (RAOs) of the top surfaces of the front and back air chambers. 335 It can be observed that the device is highly responsive to wave forcing, over a wide 336 range of wave frequencies. At peak, the motion of the top surfaces of the air chambers 337 is eight times the incident wave amplitude. For a typical incident wave with a 1-m 338 wave amplitude, such a large response is unrealistic, because it is much greater than 339 the height of the chamber (1 m). It is also very unlikely that it is possible to make 340 an air chamber with a bellow allowing a 16-m stroke. Moreover, the small amplitude 341 motion assumption would be violated. Nonlinear effects in the outer fluid structure 342 interaction would limit the motion response. However, for small amplitude waves on 343 the order of a few tens of centimeters, these limitations do not apply. Therefore, it 344 is expected that large motion RAO would be observed in practice for small waves. 345 The device would be highly efficient in these cases. 346

It is also worth noting that the response of the bottom and back chambers are superimposed, which indicates that when the top surface of the front chamber goes up, the surface of the back chamber goes down with the same amplitude. This response indicates that compressibility effects in the air chambers are small.

The top right plot in Figure 9 shows the dynamic internal pressure in the two chambers. The bottom left plot is the volume flow rate through the air turbine (red line). In the same graph, the product of the chambers' motion RAO, moving surface area, and wave frequency $(|\tilde{Z}_1|S\omega)$ has been plotted as well (dashed black line) and corresponds to the volume flow rate assuming air is incompressible. It can be observed that the results are superimposed. It shows that compressibility effects are negligible.

The bottom right plot in Figure 9 shows the absorbed power by the device (red 358 line). The theoretical maximum for a point absorber with a dipole-like wave radi-359 ation pattern was plotted in the same graph for the sake of comparison ($P_{\rm max}$ = 360 $\frac{\rho g^2}{4\omega} \left(\tanh(kh) + \frac{kh}{\cosh(kh)} \right) \frac{2}{k}$ [19]). Indeed, the pressure-differential WEC can be ap-361 proximated by two point sources separated by the distance S. As the two chambers 362 move in opposite directions (because compressibility effects are negligible), the wave 363 radiation pattern from the pressure-differential device is similar to the wave radi-364 ation pattern of a dipole in the far field. This outcome is confirmed in Figure 10 365 wherein the wave radiation patterns of the pressure-differential WEC and a dipole 366 are compared for a wave period of 10 s. In Figure 9, it can be observed that the 367 wave power absorption by the device is rather close to the theoretical maximum over 368 a wide range of frequencies. 369

³⁷⁰ Nevertheless, for moderate and strong sea states, the motion response predicted



Figure 9: Response of version 2 of the pressure-differential WEC in regular waves. The top left plot shows the motion RAOs of the top surfaces of the front and back air chambers. The top right plot shows the dynamic internal pressure in the two chambers. The bottom left plot is the actual volume flow rate through the air turbine and the volume flow rate for incompressible air. The bottom right plot shows the absorbed power by the device and the theoretical maximum for a point absorber with a dipole-like wave radiation pattern.

by the numerical model—and thus power absorption—is unrealistic if stroke limitation is not taken into account. In practice, stroke limitation may come from nonlinear stiffness or a moving surface reaching the end stops, which is a highly nonlinear effect. Thus, it cannot be taken into account directly in the linear frequency domain-based model. However, it can be considered indirectly.

The effect of stroke limitation is to limit the amplitude of motion. This limitation results in a reduction in power absorption that is related to the ratio of the predicted motion amplitude to the motion constraint Z_{mx} . If the ratio is smaller than 1 (motion amplitude is smaller than the motion constraint), there is no reduction in power absorption. Otherwise, the power loss is expected to increase quadratically with increasing ratio of motion amplitude to motion constraint. By using equations (11)



Figure 10: Left plot: amplitude of the free surface elevation for the wave radiated by the pressuredifferential WEC. Right plot: amplitude of the free surface elevation for the wave radiated by a dipole. The wave period is 10 s. The pattern is similar.

and (9), assuming the volume flow rate Q is approximately proportional to the chambers deformation velocities because the effect of compressibility appears to be negligible, and taking into account the motion constraint, the average absorbed power \bar{p}_c is on the order of:

$$\bar{p}_c \approx \frac{1}{2} B_{\rm PTO} \omega^2 \min(|\tilde{Z}_1|^2, Z_{\rm mx}^2) \tag{17}$$

Thus, if $|\tilde{Z}_1| > Z_{\text{mx}}$, the difference in absorbed power with and without consideration of the motion constraint is on the order of $\frac{1}{2}B_{\text{PTO}}\omega^2|\tilde{Z}_1|^2(|\tilde{Z}_1|^2 - Z_{\text{mx}}^2)$. It increases quadratically with $|\tilde{Z}_1|$.

The power loss can be mitigated by increasing the PTO damping coefficient $B_{\rm PTO}$ 389 in comparison with its optimal value without motion constraint. The direct effect 390 of increasing $B_{\rm PTO}$ is higher damping in the system, thus reduced motion amplitude 391 $|Z_1|$. But from equation (17), it can be seen that increasing $B_{\rm PTO}$ has no effect on the 392 term $\min(|\tilde{Z}_1|^2, Z_{\text{mx}}^2)$ in the constrained absorbed power \bar{p}_c while $|\tilde{Z}_1|$ is greater than 393 the motion constraint $Z_{\rm mx}$. Thus, while this condition is maintained, the constrained 394 absorbed power is expected to increase linearly with increasing $B_{\rm PTO}$. In conclusion, 395 it appears that the PTO damping coefficient should be optimized for each and every 396 sea state to maximize the power absorption while maintaining the motion amplitude 397 below or equal to the motion constraint. 398

Following this discussion, we now introduce the significant motion response $Z_{1/3}$,



Figure 11: Annual average of absorbed power for version 2 of the pressure-differential WEC as a function of the threshold on the significant motion response Z_{mx} . The air turbine coefficient B_{PTO} was optimized for each state to limit the air chamber response $Z_{1/3}$ below the threshold. The chamber stiffness is K = 720 kN/m.

400 which is similar to the significant height:

$$Z_{1/3}^2 = 4\max\left(\int_0^\infty S_h(\omega)|\tilde{Z}_1(\omega)|^2 d\omega, \int_0^\infty S_h(\omega)|\tilde{Z}_2(\omega)|^2 d\omega\right)$$
(18)

 $Z_{1/3}$ is equal to 2 times the standard deviation of the motion response of the device. It provides a measure for the air chamber motion in response to the sea state defined by the wave spectrum $S_h(\omega)$ as the significant height H_S does for the wave crests. Note that the significant height is a measure of the wave elevation stroke (distance from the crests to the troughs) whereas $Z_{1/3}$ is a measure for the amplitude of the motion (half of the stroke).

The air turbine coefficient $B_{\rm PTO}$ was reoptimized to limit the air chamber response 407 $Z_{1/3}$ below the threshold Z_{mx} . This optimization has been applied to different thresh-408 olds between 0.25 and 2 m. The air turbine coefficient $B_{\rm PTO}$ was optimized for each 409 sea state. Note that, because $Z_{1/3}$ is 2 times the variance of the motion, the motion 410 amplitude may be sometimes higher than the threshold $Z_{\rm mx}$. However, these events 411 are expected to be rather infrequent, thus, the effect on power absorption of stroke 412 limitation during these events is expected to be small. Figure 11 shows the annual 413 average of absorbed power as a function of the threshold $Z_{\rm mx}$. It can be observed 414 that the absorbed power increases with the increasing threshold $Z_{\rm mx}$. The increase 415 rate appears to be linear up to $Z_{\rm mx} = 0.75$ m. Then, the increase rate seems to de-416

Wave never received	$16.9 \mathrm{kW/m}$
wave power resource	10.0 KW/III
Annual average absorbed power	82 kW
Rated power	150 kW
Capacity factor	55%
Width	8 m
Characteristic width	$12.7 \mathrm{m}$
Capture width	4.9 m
Capture width ratio	38~%

Table 2: Summary of energy performance metrics for the optimized version of version 2 of the pressure-differential WEC.

⁴¹⁷ crease as $Z_{\rm mx}$ keeps increasing. It is clear that $Z_{\rm mx}$ should be as large as practically ⁴¹⁸ possible to maximize energy performance.

The threshold $Z_{\rm mx} = 1$ m is selected for further investigation as it corresponds 419 to the full utilization of the height of the chamber (H=1 m). The nameplate rated 420 power is set to $P_{rated} = 150$ kW, meaning that, for each sea state of the power 421 matrix, the average power is capped at 150 kW. Figure 12 shows the power matrix 422 of the device (in kW), the significant motion response matrix (in m), the optimal air 423 turbine coefficient matrix (in $Pa.s/m^{-3}$) and the matrix of the significant pressure 424 drop through the turbine (in kPa). It can be observed that the significant motion 425 response reaches the motion threshold much quicker than the absorbed power reaches 426 the power threshold (rated power). 427

To maintain the amplitude of the motion response below the motion threshold, 428 the top right plot in Figure 12 shows that the air turbine coefficient $B_{\rm PTO}$ must 429 increase by two orders of magnitude from the weaker to the stronger sea states. This 430 increase may be challenging to achieve in practice particularly while maintaining 431 a good conversion efficiency from kinetic energy in the air flow to electricity. A 432 technical solution may require using several connecting pipes and air turbines in 433 parallel. Depending on the sea states, some of the pipes may close or open to 434 maintain appropriate air flow velocities at the air turbines. 435

Assuming this issue can be overcome, the annual average absorbed power by the device is 82 kW. This corresponds to a capture width [20] of 4.9 m, the wave power resource at the site being 16.8 kW/m. As the device width is 8 m, it appears that the device is able to capture wave energy over a distance that is of the same order of magnitude as its width. Following [21], a characteristic active width B_C is defined as the diameter of a disk in which the surface area is equal to the area of the two moving surfaces: $B_C = 12.7$ m. Then, the maximum relative capture



Figure 12: Power matrix (top left, in kW), significant motion response matrix (bottom left, in m), optimal air turbine coefficient matrix (top right, in Pa.s/m⁻³) and matrix of the significant pressure drop through the turbine (bottom right, in kPa) for version 2 of the pressure-differential WEC. The chamber stiffness is K = 720 kN/m. The average power is capped at 150 kW. The motion threshold is $Z_{\text{mx}} = 1 \text{ m}$.

width $\eta_1 = \frac{C_W}{B_C}$ is 38%. Compared to other WECs (see Figure 16 in [21]), it seems that the pressure-differential WEC could be as efficient in absorbing waves as the most efficient WECs (i.e., fixed oscillating wave surge converters [OWSCs]). This possibility is not surprising as the wave radiation pattern of the pressure-differential WEC is similar to the wave radiation pattern of OWSCs (dipole-like pattern). A summary of energy performance metrics of this optimized version of the pressuredifferential WEC is shown in Table 2.

⁴⁵⁰ On a practical note, the pressure-differential WEC may have some advantages ⁴⁵¹ as compared to fixed OWSCs. Indeed, a challenge with fixed OWSCs is the large

horizontal force in the foundation [10], [22]. The horizontal force is much smaller 452 for the pressure-differential WEC because of the small vertical surface. The vertical 453 force in the foundation is expected to be closely related to the volume of air in the air 454 chambers when fully inflated (buoyancy force). When considering motion constraint, 455 the vertical force may be estimated approximately three times the buoyancy force 456 for the air chamber at rest. By using an inexpensive ballast, it should be relatively 457 easy to achieve sufficient system mass to avoid the device being lifted by the waves. 458 If the seabed allows, suction anchors may also be appropriate. 459

460 3.3. Comparison with other WEC technologies for economic performance measures

In [23], eight WEC technologies were studied and compared with respect to 461 economic performance measures. It is interesting to compare how the pressure-462 differential WEC performs in comparison with these other devices. Following the 463 specifications of the performance measures in [23], the characteristic mass of the 464 pressure-differential WEC is taken as being equal to three times the volume to ac-465 count for the foundations ($V_c = 384$ tons). The characteristic surface area is calculated 466 as being equal to the outer surface of the connecting pipe plus four times the outer 467 surface of the air chambers with the height increased to 2 m to include the founda-468 tions. This approach provides a characteristic surface area of $S_c = 414 \text{ m}^2$. Thus, 469 the ratio of annual absorbed energy E to characteristic mass is $\frac{E}{V_c} = 1.9$. This ratio 470 is 20% better than the best of the other WEC technologies in [23] $\left(\frac{E}{V_c}\right)$ =1.6 for the 471 fixed-bottom heave-buoy array). The ratio of annual absorbed energy to the char-472 acteristic surface area is $\frac{E}{S_c} = 1.8$, which is close to the best-performing fixed-bottom 473 oscillating flap $\left(\frac{E}{S_c}=2 \text{ in } [23]\right)$. 474

However, in $\begin{bmatrix} 2\\ 2\end{bmatrix}$ the near-shore wave resource was decreased by only 10% in 475 comparison with the offshore resource whereas in this study it was decreased by 476 30%. Thus, the annual average absorbed power by the pressure-differential WEC was 477 recalculated for a 10% decrease of the offshore resource. The nameplate rated power 478 was increased to 190 kW while the motion constraint was maintained at $Z_{\rm mx} = 1$ 479 m. The annual average absorbed power is equal to 99 kW and the ratio of annual 480 absorbed energy to the characteristic surface area is 2.1. Thus, the energy-to-surface 481 ratio is actually 5% greater for the pressure-differential WEC than for the fixed-482 bottom oscillating flap when considering the same level of wave resource. 483

Figure 13 shows the comparison of the economic performance measures for the eight WECs technologies studied in [23] and the pressure-differential WEC. It appears that the pressure-differential WEC is significantly better than the average of other technologies for both the energy-to-mass and energy-to-surface-area economic



Figure 13: Comparison of economic performance measures for the eight WECs technologies studied in [23] and the pressure-differential WEC. The top plot is the mean annual absorbed power, the middle plot is the ratio of absorbed energy to characteristic volume. The bottom plot is the ratio of absorbed energy to characteristic surface.

⁴⁸⁸ performance criteria; and that it performs slightly better than the best of other⁴⁸⁹ technologies with respect to these two particular critera.

Finally, it can be observed that the pressure-differential WEC appears to have 490 a high capacity factor (55%), suggesting a cost-efficient PTO design. In this study, 491 the power matrix was capped at 150 kW. In Figure 11, the uncapped annual average 492 absorbed power is 89 kW for $Z_{\rm mx} = 1$ m. Thus, capping the power at 150 kW 493 decreases power absorption by only 7%. The high capacity factor can be explained 494 by the wide bandwidth as shown in Figure 12 and the demanding motion constraint 495 $Z_{\rm mx} = 1$ m. Because of the motion constraint, the power increases slowly with 496 increasing significant height, thus explaining the high capacity factor. Note that 497 if the motion is not constrained and the power is not capped, the annual average 498 absorbed power is 340 kW (four times the power without constraints). Also, note 499 that a capacity factor of 55% is significantly greater than other renewable energy 500 technologies such as wind turbines and solar photovoltaics. 501

502 4. Conclusion

The motivation for this study was to investigate the energy performance of a new WEC concept that takes advantage of the spatially varying pressure differentials in the wave field to drive a fluid flow. Two versions of the concept were considered. Version 1 has the moving surfaces on the bottom of the air chambers whereas version 2 has the moving surfaces on the top.

Numerical models were developed to calculate power absorption for both regular and irregular waves. A fundamental difference between version 1 and version 2 for the hydrostatic force was highlighted. Because of this difference, it is much easier to tune the bandwidth of version 2 to match with the wave periods than for version 1. It appears preferable to have the moving surfaces on the top.

The most promising design for version 2 was further investigated. It was found necessary to take into account stroke limitations when optimizing the system to avoid unrealistic results for motion response. The significant motion response was limited to 1 m by increasing the air turbine coefficient with increasing energy in the sea conditions. The estimated annual average absorbed power of the device is 82 kW for a near-shore site with a 16.8 kW/m wave resource and a 150-kW rated power. The capacity factor is greater than 50%.

When comparing the energy performance and economic performance measures to other WEC technologies, it appears that the pressure-differential WEC is among the most efficient WECs with respect to energy performance. The device seems to perform slightly better than the best of other technologies with respect to energyto-mass and energy-to-surface-area economic performance measures.

Therefore, we believe that the pressure-differential WEC deserves further study. With respect to energy performance, the effect of the size of the air chambers may

be investigated as well as the effect of the separating distance between the chambers. 527 The significance of the energy losses in the internal flow should also be assessed. 528 This research may be achieved relatively easily with computational fluid dynamics 529 calculations. Further, the design of the air turbine(s) may have a strong impact on 530 the efficiency of the conversion of the absorbed wave power into electricity. There 531 are also practical challenges, such as the design of air chambers with bellows, the 532 integration of springs to achieve the appropriate air chamber stiffness, and the design 533 of the foundations. Convincing installation and maintenance scenarios need to be 534 developed, specifically for devices that are designed to be submerged in energetic 535 sites. 536

Finally, because the pressure-differential WEC design is near-shore and apparently rather efficient at absorbing waves, further research may be directed at assessing its potential for coastal erosion protection. On the other hand, sediment transport and scour around the device may raise further issues.

541 5. Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. 542 DE-AC36-08GO28308 with the National Renewable Energy Laboratory. Funding 543 for the work was provided by the DOE Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable 544 Energy, Wind and Water Power Technologies Office. It was carried out in collabora-545 tion between Ecole Centrale de Nantes (ECN) and NREL. Aurélien Babarit thanks 546 NREL for hosting him during this study. The authors are also grateful to the three 547 anonymous reviewers whose comments helped improve significantly the manuscript. 548 The U.S. Government retains and the publisher, by accepting the article for 549 publication, acknowledges that the U.S. Government retains a nonexclusive, paid-550 up, irrevocable, worldwide license to publish or reproduce the published form of this 551 work, or allow others to do so, for U.S. Government purposes. 552

553 6. References

- [1] K. Gunn, C. Stock-Williams (2012), Quantifying the global wave power resource.
 Renewable Energy, Vol. 44, pp. 296-304
- [2] J. Falnes (2007), A review of wave energy extraction. Marine Structures, Vol.
 20, pp. 185-201
- [3] A.F. de O. Falcão (2010), Wave energy utilization: a review of technologies.
 Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, Vol 14(3), pp. 889-918

- [4] N.I. Meyer, M. McDonald Arnskov, L.C.E. Vad Bennetzen, H.F. Burcharth, J. Bunger, V. Jacobsen, P. Maegaard, S. Vindelov, K. Nielsen,
 J.N. Sørensen (2002), Bølgekraftprogram: Afsluttende rapport fra Energistyrelsens Rådgivende Bølgekraftudval Bølgekraftudvalgets Sekretariat, Rambøll, Teknikerbyen 31, 2830 Virum, Denmark. In Danish
- [5] M. Previsic, R. Bedard, G. Hagerman (2004), E2I EPRI Assessment: Offshore
 Wave Energy Conversion Devices, E2I EPRI WP-004-US-Rev1, Electricity In novation Institute
- ⁵⁶⁸ [6] V. Neary, M. Previsic, R.A. Jepsen, M.J. Lawson, Y.-H. Yu, A.E. Copping,
 ⁵⁶⁹ A.A. Fontaine, K.C. Hallet, D.K. Murray (2014), Methodology for design and
 ⁵⁷⁰ economic analysis of marine energy conversion (MEC) technologies. Technical
 ⁵⁷¹ report from Sandia National Laboratories (USA), SAND2014-9040
- F.J.M. Farley, R.C.T. Rainey, J.R. Chaplin (2012), Rubber tubes in the sea.
 Philosophical transactions of the royal society A, Vol. 370, pp. 381-402
- [8] A. Babarit, B. Gendron, J. Singh, C. Mélis, P. Jean (2013), Hydro-elastic modelling of an electro-active wave energy converter. In Proc. of the 32nd International conference on ocean, offshore and artic engineering (OMAE2013), Nantes, France
- [9] J. Hals Todalshaug, G. Stein Asgeirsson, E. Hjalmarsson, J. Maillet, P. Moller,
 P. Pires, M. Guerinel, M. Lopes (2016), Tank testing of an inherently phasecontrolled wave energy converter. International Journal of Marine Energy, In
 Press
- [10] N.M. Tom, M.J. Lawson, Y.-H. Yu, A.D. Wright (2016), Development of a
 nearshore oscillating surge wave energy converter with variable geometry. Re newable Energy, Vol. 96, pp. 410-424
- [11] M. Morrow, M. Delos-Reyes (2013), Submerged wave energy converter. World
 patent WO 2013/019214A1
- [12] J.C. McNatt, H.T. Ozkan-Haller, M. Morrow, M. Delos-Reyes (2014), Preliminary modeling and analysis of a horizontal pressure differential wave energy converter. Journal of Offshore Mechanics and Artic Engineering, Vol. 136, pp. 011901-1-011901-8
- ⁵⁹¹ [13] candhis.cetmef.developpement-durable.gouv.fr Accessed July, 11, 2016.

- ⁵⁹² [14] M. Folley, T.J.T. Whittaker (2009), Analysis of the nearshore wave energy re-⁵⁹³ source. Renewable Energy, Vol. 34(7), pp. 1709-1715
- ⁵⁹⁴ [15] J.N. Newman (1994), Wave effects on deformable bodies. Applied Ocean Re-⁵⁹⁵ search, Vol. 16(1), pp. 47-59
- ⁵⁹⁶ [16] J. Kestin, A Course in Thermodynamics, Blaisdell, Waltham, MA, 1966.
- [17] A. Brito-Melo, L.M.C. Gato., A.J.N.A. Sarmento (2002), Analysis of Wells tur bine design parameters by numerical simulation of the OWC performance. Ocean
 Engineering, Vol. 29, pp. 1463-1477
- [18] R. Genest, F. Bonnefoy, A.H. Clément, A. Babarit (2014), Effect of non ideal
 power take off on the energy absorption of a reactively controlled one degree of
 freedom wave energy converter. Applied Ocean Research, Vol. 48, pp. 236-243
- [19] M. Wypych, L. Le-Ngoc, K. Alexander, A. Gardner (2012), On the application
 of circular-cylindrical waves to ocean power absorption. Ocean Engineering, Vol.
 40, pp. 69-75
- [20] J. Falnes (1975), A resonant point absorbed of ocean-wave power. Nature, Vol.
 256, pp. 478-479
- [21] A. Babarit (2015), A database of capture width ratio of wave energy converters.
 Renewable Energy, Vol. 80, pp. 610-628
- [22] A. Babarit, J. Hals, A. Kurniawan, M.J. Muliawan, T. Moan, J. Krokstad
 (2011), The NumWEC project: Numerical estimation of energy delivery from
 a selection of wave energy converters. Final report. Ecole centrale de Nantes,
 NTNU. 15 December 2011
- [23] A. Babarit, J. Hals, M.J. Muliawan, A. Kurniawan, T. Moan, J. Krokstad
 (2012), Numerical benchmarking study of a selection of wave energy converters. Renewable Energy, Vol. 43 pp. 44-63 [with Corrigendum in Renewable Energy, 2015, Vol. 74, pp. 955- 957]