

An Index to Distinguish Surface- and Subsurface-Intensified Vortices from Surface Observations

C. Assassi, Yves Morel, Frédéric Vandermeirsch, Alexis Chaigneau, C. Pegliasco, Rosemary Morrow, François Colas, S. Fleury, Xavier Carton, Patrice Klein, et al.

▶ To cite this version:

C. Assassi, Yves Morel, Frédéric Vandermeirsch, Alexis Chaigneau, C. Pegliasco, et al.. An Index to Distinguish Surface- and Subsurface-Intensified Vortices from Surface Observations. Journal of Physical Oceanography, 2016, 46 (8), pp.2529-2552. 10.1175/JPO-D-15-0122.1. hal-02349722

HAL Id: hal-02349722 https://hal.science/hal-02349722

Submitted on 5 Nov 2019

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.

1	An index to distinguish surface and subsurface intensified			
2	vortices from surface observations.			
3 4	C. Assassi ^{1,2} , Y. Morel ¹ ,F. Vandermeirsch ² , A. Chaigneau ¹ , C. Pegliasco ¹ , R. Morrow ¹ , F. Colas ⁴ , S. Fleury ¹ , X. Carton ³ , P. Klein ³ , R. Cambra ¹ ,			
5 6	1) LEGOS, University of Toulouse, CNES, CNRS, IRD, UPS, 14 av. Edouard Belin, 31400 Toulouse, FRANCE			
7	2) Ifremer, DYNECO/PHYSED, Centre de Brest, BP 70, 29280 Plouzané, France			
8	3) LPO (CNRS/Ifremer/IRD/UBO), BP 70, 29280 Plouzané, France			
9	4) LOCEAN (IRD/IPSL/UPMC), Paris, France.			
10				
11 12	Manuscript accepted in Journal of Physical Oceanography DOI: 10.1175/JPO-D-15-0122.1			
13	Corresponding author's email address: cassassi@ifremer.fr			
14				
15	ABSTRACT			
16 17 18 19	In this study, we first show that it is difficult to reconstruct the vertical structure of vortices using only surface observations. In particular we show that the recent SQG and ISQG methods systematically lead to surface intensified vortices and those subsurface intensified vortices are thus not correctly modelled.			
20 21 22 23 24	We then investigate the possibility to distinguish between surface and subsurface intensified eddies from surface data only, using the sea surface height and the sea surface temperature available from satellite observations. A simple index, based on the ratio of the sea surface temperature anomaly and the sea level anomaly, is proposed. While the index is expected to give perfect results for isolated vortices, we show that in a complex environment, errors can			
25 26 27	be expected, in particular when strong currents exist in the vicinity of the vortex. The validity of the index is then analysed using results from a realistic regional circulation model of the Peru-Chile upwelling system, where both surface and subsurface eddies coexist.			
28 29 30 31	We find that errors are mostly associated with double core eddies (aligned surface and subsurface cores) and that the index can be useful to determine the nature of mesoscale eddies (surface or subsurface- intensified) from surface (satellite) observations. The errors however reach 24% and some possible improvements of the index calculations are discussed.			

32 Keywords

33 Eddies, vortices, subsurface, sea surface height, sea surface density and sea surface temperature.

34 **1. Introduction**

35 Superimposed on the large-scale circulation, the ocean is filled with numerous 36 coherent mesoscale eddies whose size typically corresponds to the Rossby radius of 37 deformation between 10 and 300 km (e.g. Chelton et al., 2007; 2011; Morrow and Le Traon, 38 2012). Cyclonic and anticyclonic eddies can advect parcels of trapped fluid over time scales 39 from weeks to months, and hence play an important role for the large-scale transfer and 40 redistribution of heat, salt and momentum (e.g. Wunsch, 1999; Jayne and Marotzke, 2002; 41 Morrow and Le Traon, 2012; Treguier et al., 2012). At local scale, eddies have important implications on tracer dispersion, ocean stirring, and mixing processes (d'Ovidio et al., 2004; 42 43 Pasquero et al., 2005; Beron-Vera et al., 2008; 2010). Through horizontal and vertical 44 motions they also affect biogeochemical properties such as nutrients and phytoplankton 45 concentration and can thus impact biological resources and marine ecosystems (McGillicuddy and Robinson, 1997; Abraham, 1998; Martin and Richards, 2001; Lévy and Klein, 2004; 46 47 Pasquero et al., 2005; Bracco et al., 2009). Finally, ocean eddies can also influence the lower-48 atmosphere winds (Chelton and Xie, 2010; Chelton, 2013), cloud cover and rainfall (Frenger et al., 2013) and enhance the dissipation of energy introduced by the wind to the ocean (Munk 49 50 and Wunsch, 1998; Wunsch and Ferrari, 2004).

51 Satellite-based sensing provides sea-surface parameters at increasing precision, 52 resolution and frequencies that are crucial for studying the ocean mesoscale dynamics. Eddies 53 are associated with thermodynamical anomalies with relatively large amplitudes and can have 54 clear signatures on altimetry sea-level anomaly (SLA) maps and infrared sea-surface 55 temperature (SST) images. Mesoscale vortices can be simply classified into four distinct 56 categories depending on their rotation sense (cyclonic or anticyclonic) and the vertical 57 position of their potential vorticity (PV) core (surface or subsurface-intensified) depending whether their core -or area where their potential vorticity reaches its maximum- is located 58 59 inside the water column rather than in the surface layer. The rotation sense can be easily 60 retrieved from SLA satellite data considering the geostrophic approximation (Pedlosky, 1987; 61 Cushman-Roisin and Beckers, 2011). In contrast, surface satellite data do not allow, a priori, 62 determining whether an eddy is surface or subsurface-intensified. Using in-situ hydrographic data, subsurface eddies have been observed in various sites of the World Ocean such as the 63

Mediterranean water eddies (Meddies) and Slope Water Oceanic eddies(Swoddies) in the 64 North-East Atlantic (Pingree et al., 1992a, b; Paillet et al., 2002; Bashmachnikov et al., 2013), 65 the California Undercurrent eddies (Cuddies) in the North-East Pacific (Garfield et al., 1999), 66 or subsurface anticyclones in the South-East Pacific (Johnson and McTaggart, 2010; 67 68 Chaigneau et al., 2011; Morales et al., 2012; Stramma et al., 2013). Subsurface intensified 69 eddies, that are thus ubiquitous in the ocean, are typically centred between 200 and 1000 m 70 depth and exhibit, by nature, a completely distinct vertical structure than surface-intensified 71 vortices (e.g. Chaigneau et al., 2011; Colas et al., 2012).

72 Different mechanism of generation can explain the formation of surface or subsurface 73 cyclones and anticyclones. Barotropic and baroclinic instabilities of oceanic currents are 74 known to generate anticyclone and cyclone dipoles (see, Cushman-Roisin and Beckers, 2011; Morel and McWilliams, 2001). They can also be forced by the rough floor topography 75 76 (Pingree and Le Cann, 1992a; Chérubin et al., 2000; Thompson, 2008). Many remote sensing 77 observations have also revealed the formation of surface eddies in the lee of islands (Calil et 78 al., 2008). In the latter case, Kubryakov and Stanichny (2015) found a correlation between 79 wind curl and the type of eddy formed, they showed that a weakening of large-scale 80 circulation in response to the decrease of the wind curl leads to the formation of anticyclones 81 and that an increasing wind curl and circulation induce intensive formation of cyclones. A 82 constant wind blowing along a regular coast generates coastal upwelling or downwelling 83 currents, that are known to form surface and subsurface eddies (McGillicuddy, 2014). 84 Different mechanism have been proposed to explain the observed instabilities and eddy 85 generation for upwelling systems: adiabatic processes leading to the modification of the potential vorticity structure of the flow and barotropic/baroclinic instabilities, the effect of 86 87 capes or promontories or the planetary beta effect when the coast is oriented along a North-88 South direction (see Marchesiello et al., 2003, Morel et al., 2006; Meunier et al., 2010).

89 Although both surface and subsurface intensified eddies can have a signature on 90 satellite-surface data, in particular on SLA and SST anomaly maps, without additional in- situ 91 measurements, there exists a strong risk that the surface anomalies associated with subsurface 92 eddies are interpreted as signatures of surface eddies, in particular by data assimilation 93 systems or, as will be shown in this article, by vertical reconstruction methods based on sea 94 surface data, such as the surface quasigeostrophy (SQG, see Blumen, 1978; Held et al., 1995; 95 Isern-Fontanet et al., 2006), or the interior and surface quasigeostrophy (ISQG, see Wang et 96 al., 2013) methods. There exists other methods that could potentially be used to reconstruct 97 the vertical structures of subsurface vortices, for instance the effective surface

98 quasigeostrophic (ESQG) theory proposed by Lapeyre and Klein (2006; see also Ponte and 99 Klein, 2013), but they rely on some knowledge or hypothesis of the ocean interior which do 100 not distinguish surface/subsurface vortices. For instance the ESQG method relies on the 101 calculation of a single mean vertical profile $\alpha(z)$ which depends on interior characteristics 102 (the correlation between the interior potential vorticity anomaly and the stratification). As far 103 as observations are concerned, a few studies have analyzed the surface signature of subsurface 104 vortices observed in- situ (see for instance, Stammer et al., 1991; Sweeney et al., 2003; 105 Caballero et al., 2008) and recently Bashmachnikov et al. (2013) have shown that two 106 Meddies, detected at sea, were associated with positive SLA and negative SST anomalies and 107 suggested that this could be used as a proxy to identify Meddies. Despite these breakthroughs, 108 we still lack a general theory revealing the exact nature (surface or subsurface) of vortices 109 from satellite surface observations. The main goal of this study is to propose a simple index, 110 combining SLA and SST observations, that allows differentiating between surface and 111 subsurface intensified eddies.

112 The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we present the quasigeostrophic 113 framework used in our study and the general inversion problem to reconstruct the vortex 114 structure. In section 3, we underline the problematic case of distinguishing and inferring the 115 structure of subsurface vortices. We then define the index that may allow discriminating 116 between surface and subsurface-intensified eddies from surface observations only (section 4). The sensitivity of the index to parameters characterising the vortex and its environment is 117 118 discussed in section 5. The validation and efficiency of this index is finally tested in section 6 119 using a regional model simulation of the South Eastern Pacific where surface and subsurface 120 eddies are found (Chaigneau et al., 2011; Colas et al., 2012). Concluding remarks are 121 provided in section 7.

122 **2. The model**

123 **2.1 Quasigeostrophic framework**

In order to analyse the physical content of different observed fields, and the possibility to define some combination in order to infer information on the structure of oceanic eddies, it is necessary to define equations linking these physical fields. To deal with mesoscale dynamics and vortices, the simplest equations are the quasi-geostrophic ones which express the conservation of the quasi-geostrophic potential vorticity (QGPV, see Pedlosky, 1987, Cushman-Roisin and Beckers, 2011)

$$QGPV = \Delta \psi + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left(\frac{f^2}{N^2} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z} \right), \tag{1}$$

130 where $\Delta = \partial_{x^2} + \partial_{y^2}$ is the horizontal Laplace operator, f is the planetary vorticity or Coriolis 131 parameter (here we consider a constant Coriolis parameter f = 1. 10⁻⁴ s⁻¹), ψ is the 132 streamfunction (proportional to the pressure field $P = \rho_0 f \psi$). N is the Brunt-Vaisala 133 frequency, given by

$$N^{2} = \frac{-g\partial_{z}\overline{\rho}}{\rho_{0}}, \qquad (2)$$

134 where *g* is the gravitational acceleration, and $\overline{\rho}(z)$ is the mean density profile, depending only 135 on the vertical coordinate z and coming from the total stratification expressed as

$$\rho_{tot} = \rho_0 + \overline{\rho}(z) + \rho, \qquad (3)$$

136 where ρ_0 is a constant reference density and ρ is the departure from this reference profile and 137 is given by (hydrostatic approximation):

$$\rho = -\frac{1}{g} \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} = -\frac{f\rho_0}{g} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z}, \qquad (4)$$

138 In the following, we will also consider the sea surface elevation η , or SLA, and the relative 139 vorticity ζ (used to evaluate the strength of a vortex):

$$\eta = \frac{P(z=0)}{\rho_0 g} = \frac{f}{g} \psi, \tag{5}$$

$$\zeta = \frac{\partial V}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial U}{\partial y} = \nabla^2 \psi$$
(6)

Using the previous relationships, the knowledge of potential vorticity allows the calculation of all physical fields (see Hoskins *et al.*, 1985; Bishop and Thorpe, 1994) but the boundary conditions are strong constraints for this inversion as Eq. 1 is elliptic. Both lateral and vertical boundary conditions have thus to be specified to close this so-called Dirichlet-Laplace problem and to allow the calculation of the streamfunction and all fields from the knowledge of the QGPV. At the vertical boundaries the condition is generally to specify the density anomaly which leads to:

$$\left. \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z} \right|_{z=0} = -\frac{g}{\rho_0 f} \rho(z=0)$$
(7)

$$\left. \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z} \right|_{z=-H} = -\frac{g}{\rho_0 f} \rho(z=-H)$$
(8)

where H is the depth of the ocean. As far as horizontal boundaries are concerned, in the following, in order to invert potential vorticity and calculate the associated velocity, vorticity or stratification, we have assumed periodic horizontal boundary conditions (see Isern-Fontanet *et al.*, 2006; Wang *et al.*, 2013). Using Fourier transforms, the QGPV inversion then boils down to a 1D (vertical) partial differential equation and can be more easily solved using the vertical barotropic and baroclinic modes associated with the stratification (see Wang *et al.*, 2013).

155

156 **2.2 General configuration**

Г

We will consider vortices associated with localized QGPV and surface density anomalies.
A first important theoretical constraint exists on QGPV and surface/bottom density anomalies.
Indeed integrating vertically Eq. 1 yields (using 7, 8 and 2):

٦

$$\Delta \overline{\psi} = \overline{QGPV} - \frac{1}{H} \left[\frac{f\rho(z=0)}{\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial z}(z=0)} - \frac{f\rho(z=-H)}{\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial z}(z=-H)} \right], \tag{9}$$

Where $\overline{\psi}$ and \overline{QGPV} are the barotropic (vertical average) streamfunction and QGPV. As 160 shown in Morel and McWilliams (1997), the vortex is "isolated" if the net horizontal integral 161 162 of the right hand side (potential vorticity and vertical boundary density anomalies) vanishes. If this is not the case, the vortex is not isolated and its velocity field decreases as 1/r (where r 163 164 is the distance from its center). Such a slow decrease is not realistic (see Zhang *et al.*, 2013) 165 and causes some problems for the inversion in a finite domain. Also notice that its kinetic 166 energy would be infinite in an unbounded domain and its sea level anomaly would increase as 167 log r.

In order to avoid this and deal with isolated and stable vortices, we have chosen to determine a family of vortex structure satisfying the isolation constraint. The QGPV and surface density anomalies are thus chosen as follows (see Carton and McWilliams, 1989; Herbette et al, 2003):

$$QGPV = Q_0 \left(1 - \left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^2\right) e^{-\left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^2} e^{-\left(\frac{z-z_0}{H_v}\right)^2},$$
(10)

$$\rho(z=0) = \delta \rho_0 (1 - (\frac{r}{R})^2) e^{-(\frac{r}{R})^2}, \qquad (11)$$

where r is the distance from the vortex center, R is the vortex radius, z is the vertical coordinate (directed upward and with z=0 at the surface, so that z<0 within the water column) z_0 is the vertical position of the vortex core and H_v is its vertical extension. In the following, we consider R = 50 km, $H_v = 200m$, and the density anomaly at the bottom is considered null, but Q_0 , z_0 and $\delta \rho_0$ remain variable.

177 Notice the structures given by Eq. 10 and 11 ensure that Eq. 9 is verified, and the vortex is 178 thus isolated. As a result, the knowledge of the streamfunction at lateral boundaries becomes 179 trivial to invert Eq. 1, periodic boundary conditions and fast Fourier transforms can thus be 180 used. Notice in particular that the potential vorticity structure given by Eq. 10 ensures a 181 vanishing net QGPV and is constituted of a core surrounded by a crown of opposite sign 182 anomaly. Other choices are possible, in particular the vertical superimposition of opposite 183 sign PV cores. The latter structure is however baroclinically unstable (see Morel and 184 McWilliams, 1997) whereas the chosen family of QGPV structures is generally stable (see 185 Carton and McWilliams, 1989; Herbette et al., 2003).

Finally, Eq. 1, 7 and 8 are solved using horizontal and vertical discretizations of $\Delta x = 5km$ and $\Delta z = 10m$. The domain will thus be constituted of a square (biperiodic in the horizontal) basin of length 500 km and total depth H=2000 m. The background stratification $\overline{\rho}(z)$ and N^2/f are also fixed and given in Fig. 1a. It represents a seasonal thermocline located between 100 and 200m with a density jump $\delta \rho = 1$. $^0/_{00}$ which separates two weakly stratified surface and bottom layers. Figure 1b represents the first second and third baroclinic modes associated with this stratification. The first radius of deformation is R1=16 km.

193 **3.** The difficult case of subsurface intensified vortices

As surface fields are accessible from spatial observations, and interior fields are more difficult to obtain at high resolution, it is tempting to try to reconstruct the vertical structure of eddies from the knowledge of surface fields alone. But, if the Dirichlet-Laplace problem, determined by Eq. 1, 7,8 and additional lateral boundary conditions, is a well-posed mathematical problem, the determination of the streamfunction (and all other physical 3D field) from the knowledge of surface boundary fields alone is unfortunately ill-posed. Indeed, notice that, given a surface density field, an infinite number of solutions exists with drastically different 3D fields, provided different interior QGPV field are chosen. The knowledge of, or some
hypothesis on, the interior QGPV field are required to determine the 3D structure of a vortex.

The "surface quasigeostrophy" approach (SQG, see Blumen, 1978; Held *et al.*, 1995; Isern-Fontanet *et al.*, 2006), is based on the assumption of no potential vorticity anomaly inside the water column (QGPV =0), so that the dynamics is entirely determined by the knowledge of the sea surface density anomalies. As noted by Lapeyre and Klein (2006), this hypothesis is generally not well verified and interior PV has to be taken into account too. Indeed, as shown in appendix A, the vortex structure reconstructed by the SQG method is systematically surface intensified and it is not possible to reconstruct subsurface vortices.

RecentlyWang *et al.* (2013) proposed to use the knowledge of both the surface density and SLA to determine the 3D structure of a vortex. This over-determination of the surface boundary condition can indeed lead to some information on the interior QGPV structure and improve the calculation of the 3D structure. Their method, called ISQG (interior+surface QG method), relies on the combination of the SQG streamfunction ψ_{SQG} (associated with the surface density anomaly alone), and an interior streamfunction ψ_i (associated with the QGPV, see also Lapeyre and Klein, 2006):

$$\boldsymbol{\psi} = \boldsymbol{\psi}_{SQG}(x, y, z) + \boldsymbol{\psi}_i(x, y, z) \tag{12}$$

At the surface, $\psi(x, y, z=0) = SLA = \psi_{SQG}(x, y, 0) + \psi_i(x, y, 0)$. Thus, the difference between the observed SLA and the surface SQG streamfunction (calculated using the observed surface density only) is the signature of the interior QGPV. This proves that the surface boundary over-determination indeed allows inferring some information of the 3D structure.

222 Despite this promising result, the interior structure is only known at the surface and its 223 vertical variation remains unknown. To close the problem, some additional information has to 224 be specified and Wang et al. (2013) hypothesize that the vertical structure of the interior 225 streamfunction (and OGPV) projects on the barotropic and first baroclinic mode only. 226 Unfortunately, the latter hypothesis leads to the same problem as the SQG method and the 227 vortex structure reconstructed by the ISQG is systematically surface intensified and it is not 228 able to identify subsurface vortices (see appendix A). The ESQG theory, proposed by Lapeyre 229 and Klein (2006) and extended by Ponte and Klein (2013), can potentially associate surface 230 SSH with subsurface structures, but it relies on the knowledge of the interior ocean 231 characteristics and is thus not considered here.

To conclude, the reconstruction of the 3D structure of vortices from the knowledge of surface fields alone is ill-posed and relies on additional hypothesis that, to our knowledge and up to now, systematically leads to surface intensified structures. The improvement of the existing methods requires being able to reconstruct the structures of both surface and subsurface intensified vortices. An indication to determine if the observed surface anomalies are associated with a surface or a subsurface intensified structure would thus be an important step for such an improvement.

4. Definition of an index to identify surface and subsurface intensified eddies

241 If the complete 3D structure of a vortex seems difficult to calculate precisely from 242 surface fields alone, its nature, surface or subsurface, is simpler to determine. Indeed, for 243 instance anticyclonic vortices are always associated with a positive sea level anomaly (SLA), 244 but the sea surface density anomaly depends on the vertical position of the vortex core: it is 245 expected to be negative for surface intensified anticyclones (see Fig. 2a), but positive when the vortex core is subsurface, as shown by Bashmachnikov et al. (2013) for Meddies. Thus 246 247 the combination of SLA and sea surface density anomaly can lead to the identification of the 248 vortex nature.

249 The shape of isopycnal levels for subsurface and surface-intensified eddies is illustrated in 250 Fig. 2a. Surface intensified cyclones are associated with a negative SLA and outcropping of 251 isopycnals, leading to positive SSp anomalies. In contrast, surface-intensified anticyclones are 252 associated with a positive SLA and deepening of isopycnals, leading to a negative SSp. Thus, 253 the ratio SSp / SLA is expected to be negative for both surface-intensified cyclones and 254 anticyclones. Subsurface-intensified anticyclones still have positive SLA, however the typical 255 shape of isopycnal levels is lens-like, with isopycnic levels outcropping the surface 256 (McWilliams, 1985; Stammer et al., 1991; McGillicuddy et al., 1999; Sweeney et al., 2003; 257 Sánchez and Gil 2004). This results in opposite sign of SSp anomalies in comparison with 258 surface intensified vortices and the ratio SSp / SLA is thus positive for both anticyclonic and 259 cyclonic subsurface vortices.

We thus define:

$$\chi_{\rho} = \frac{SS\rho}{SLA} \tag{13}$$

261 whose sign can be used to discriminate between surface and subsurface-intensified eddies.

The use of χ_{ρ} could be problematic when there exists a homogeneous mixed layer topping a subsurface vortex (surface vortices are always characterized by density anomalies). However, as shown in Fig. 2b, we expect the signature to be the same for χ_{ρ} . Indeed, for an anticyclone, the thermocline will be deformed similarly to the isopycnic levels below. In addition, the density anomaly just below the thermocline is also higher above the vortex. When mixing occurs, both previous effects contribute to the creation of positive SSp anomalies above the vortex core (see Fig. 2b), leading to a positive χ_{ρ} .

269

Finally, as SSp is not directly measured from satellite observations, we also define:

$$\chi_T = \frac{SST}{SLA},\tag{14}$$

At first order, the variations of SS ρ are dominated by SST variations (except in specific regions where salinity can play a substantial role on the stratification: near estuaries, region of ice formation/melting, etc...), and SST can be observed remotely. Thus, χ_T can also be used as an index to distinguish between surface and subsurface-intensified eddies (this will be tested and confirmed in section 6.5) except that as temperature and density are anticorrelated, χ_{ρ} and χ_T are of opposite sign (see Table 1).

277 **5. Sensitivity and errors estimation**

278 Qualitative arguments show that the sign of χ_{ρ} can determine the nature of a vortex in 279 simple configurations, with monopolar, circular and isolated vortices (here meaning that there 280 is no background flow). The latter simplifications are generally not verified in nature and the 281 consequence on the validity of our criterion has to be evaluated.

We believe that the deformation of vortices (elliptic shapes or inclination of the vertical axis) is not problematic: tests have shown that, as long as the vortex remains coherent (horizontal deformation below two initial vortex radius), the nature of deformed vortices remain correctly detected by the index.

286 When there exists a background flow, the first problem is to identify and calculate the 287 part of the SSp and SLA signal associated with the vortex and the background flow. A filter 288 has to be designed and we have proposed to use a spatial average based on a Gaussian filter with a correlation radius R_f (see appendix B). This filter is used to calculate and remove the 289 290 background flow but is obviously a source of error: it alters the vortex structure and the 291 separation between vortex structures and background flow is not obvious if their scales are 292 comparable. To evaluate possible errors, we here propose to consider vortices for which the 293 streamfunction can be described by a Gaussian structure in the horizontal (Chelton et al., 294 2011) and we also assume a localized -again Gaussian-vertical extension:

$$\psi = \psi_{0v} e^{-(\frac{r}{R})^2} e^{-(\frac{z-z_0}{H_v})^2},$$
(15)

Where $\Psi_{0\nu}$ is the streamfunction maximum, R is the vortex radius, z_0 is the vertical position of 295 the vortex core and H_{ν} its vertical extent. Notice that, for the sake of simplicity, the vortex 296 297 streamfunction structure is here expressed directly. We could have used Eq. 10-11 but the 298 problem would have been more complicated as the background stratification would have 299 played a role. Our goal is simply to qualitatively illustrate the possible problems associated 300 with the index calculation, so we chose a less realistic but simpler way of specifying the 301 vortex. Note that the vortex is still subsurface for $z_0 < 0$. We then superimpose a jet-like surface 302 current with a streamfunction of the form:

$$\psi = \psi_{0j} \tanh(\frac{y - y_0}{L}) e^{-\frac{z}{H_j}}$$
(16)

303 where L is the width of the current, H_j is its vertical extension and y_0 is the distance between

the current and the vortex center. In the following, we consider, $H_j=200$ m, but Ψ_{0j} , y_0 , Lremain variable. We also consider a subsurface anticyclonic vortex, with fixed characteristics (Gaussian structure defined using Eq. 15): intensity $\psi_{0v} = 7500 \text{ m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$, vertical position $z_0 = -$ 200m, vertical extension $H_v = 400$ m and radius R=50km. We superimpose both flows and use the filter given in appendix B to isolate the vortex flow and calculate χ_{ρ} . The vortex is subsurface, so that we expect $\chi_{\rho} > 0$.

We evaluated the sensitivity of the index calculation to the filter correlation radius R_f and jet width *L*, the jet intensity and its width, the jet intensity and the position of the jet with respect to the eddy centery₀. The results are shown in Fig. 3. Figure3a represents the index values as a function of the filter correlation radius and jet width. We have chosen ψ_{0j} = $\psi_{0v} = 7500 \text{ m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ and $y_0 = +50 \text{ km}$ (this correspond to the most unfavourable distance as can been seen below in Fig. 3c). The $\chi_{\rho} = 0$ isoline is represented so that it is easy to determine filter and jet characteristics for which the index calculation is problematic, here associated

with a negative index which would identify the vortex as surface intensified. When R_f is 317 318 small, the filter is not active and both structures (jet and vortex SLA and SSp signatures) mix 319 so that the evaluation of the vortex nature is problematic, whatever the value of the jet width. 320 A minimum filter correlation radius is thus necessary to avoid this problem. Also, as can be 321 seen from Fig. 3a, wrong identification is possible when the filter radius is more than 3 time 322 the eddy radius and current width being comparable to or less than about 1.3 eddy radius. 323 Otherwise, the eddy is always correctly identified as subsurface. This shows that the correlation radius of the Gaussian filter has to be chosen so that $R_f < 3 R$. In addition, we can 324 observe that, when the current width and the vortex have the same size (L/R=1), the best 325 results are obtained when $R_f \sim R$. 326

Figure 3b represents the index values as a function of the jet width and jet intensity. We thus set the filter radius to 50 km and the distance eddy-jet y₀ to +50 km. As can be expected, background currents influence the calculation of the index and can lead to incorrect identification if their characteristics (width and intensity) become comparable to the eddy. Also notice that there is no symmetry between eastward ($\psi_{0j}/\psi_{0v}>0$) and westward current $(\psi_{0j}/\psi_{0v}<0)$, this is related to the clockwise rotation of the anticyclonic eddy that has accumulative effect on the eastward current and opposite effects when the current is westward. To conclude, close to strong and narrow currents, the detection of the nature ofeddies can be problematic.

336 Fig. 3c represents the index variations as a function of the jet intensity and vortexcurrent distance. We have here chosen $R_f = 50$ km and L= 50 km. Again, there is no detection 337 problem when the current is weak enough or when the current is far from the vortex. Notice 338 339 that, when the center of the eddy is exactly superimposed with the current ($y_0=0$), the 340 subsurface eddy is well detected too, because in this particular point the average of the sea 341 surface height and of the density fields associated with the current are weak. However, for 342 strong currents (intensity higher than 2.3 times the vortex intensity), and when the vortex 343 strongly interacts with the current $(y_0 \sim R)$, the index does not allow a correct detection of the 344 vortex nature.

To conclude, we have here illustrated that, in a complex environment, when the vortex is in the vicinity of strong currents, the χ_{ρ} index can lead to incorrect identification of the nature (surface or subsurface) of a vortex.

348 **6. Validation of** χ_{P} and χ_{T} using a realistic numerical simulation

349 **6.1. Model configuration**

In order to examine the general relevance of the proposed indices (χ_p and χ_T), we now 350 351 use a realistic simulation of the Peru-Chile Current System. In this region, the main 352 characteristics and dynamics of mesoscale eddies have been recently studied from satellite 353 data and *in- situ* observations (Chaigneau and Pizarro, 2005a, b; Chaigneau et al., 2008; 2009; 354 2011; Johnson and McTaggart, 2010; Morales et al., 2012; Stramma et al., 2013). These studies have revealed the presence of both surface and subsurface intensified eddies that are 355 356 preferentially formed near the coast and propagate toward the open ocean. The ROMS 357 (Regional Ocean Modeling System) is used to reproduce both the observed regional 358 circulation (Penven et al., 2005; Colas et al., 2008; Montes et al., 2010, 2011; Echevin et al., 359 2011) where surface and subsurface eddies exist (Colas et al., 2012).

ROMS is a free-surface, split-explicit model that solves the hydrostatic primitive equations based on the Boussinesq approximation (Shchepetkin and McWilliams, 2005; 2009). We used the configuration developed in Colas *et al.* (2012; 2013). The horizontal grid is isotropic and spans the region between 15°N and 41°S and from 100°W to the South American coast. The baroclinic Rossby radius of deformation is 50-150 km in the region (*e.g.*

Chelton et al., 1998; Chaigneau et al., 2009) and the spatial resolution is ~ 7.5 km, allowing 365 366 to resolve mesoscale structures (Colas et al. 2012). 32 stretched terrain-following curvilinear 367 vertical coordinates are used. Lateral boundaries are opened and forced by thermodynamical 368 fields from the SODA monthly climatology (Carton and Giese, 2008), constructed over the 369 1980-2000 period. The model is forced at the surface by heat fluxes from the COADS 370 monthly climatology (DaSilva et al., 1994) and by a QuikSCAT monthly climatology for the 371 wind-stress (SCOW, Risien and Chelton 2008). As in Colas et al. (2012), the simulation was 372 performed over a 13 years period, and outputs are 3-day average fields. The first 3 years are 373 considered as the spin-up phase and discarded from the stabilized equilibrium solution 374 analyzed in this study. The mean currents are realistic and major characteristics of the 375 Humboldt Current system are reproduced, but El-Niño events and intra-seasonal variability 376 associated with equatorial waves dynamics are not represented due to the climatological 377 forcing. In the present study, we first use the last year of the simulation for our analysis.

378 Figure 4 represents the sea surface height and temperature for a given model output 379 (1st of February of the fourth year of the simulation, that is to say one month after the spin up 380 phase), representative of the circulation in the area. Notice the presence of numerous eddies 381 but also the larger scale gradients associated with the large scale circulation, and the strong 382 coastal upwelling associated with permanent alongshore winds (Colas et al., 2012). Since 383 alongshore equatorward wind is the primary forcing of coastal upwelling along an Eastern 384 boundary, this upwelling is ubiquitous as indicated by the continuous strip of cold water and 385 negative SSH nearshore (Fig. 4). Interested readers are referred to Colas et al. (2012; 2013) 386 for a more detailed analysis of the simulation.

- 387 **6.2. Analysis of surface and subsurface eddies**
- 388

The determination of the vortex nature from surface fields is done in 5 steps:

389

1. Extract snapshots of the SSH and SS ρ (or SST) fields from the simulation.

- Apply a spatial filter to the latter fields to calculate "anomalies" : SLA, SSpA
 and SSTA. The horizontal averaging given in appendix A is used to calculate
 mean fields and the anomalies are the difference between the initial fields and
 the mean fields.
- 394 3. Calculate $\chi_{\rho} = SS\rho A /SLA$ (or $\chi_T = SSTA/SLA$). To avoid problems where 395 SLA=0, we calculate $\chi_{\rho} = SS\rho A * SLA / max(SLA^2, \epsilon)$, where $\epsilon = 10^{-4}$ cm².

396 4. Identify all vortices: we identify all local SLA extrema for which |SLA| ≥ 2cm.
397 The extrema are associated with the vortex centers.

- 398
- 399

400

5. Determine the expected nature of each vortex : we calculate the average value of the index near each vortex center (average over 1 grid point). The vortex is identified as subsurface intensified if $\chi_{\rho} > 0$ and surface intensified if $\chi_{\rho} < 0$.

401 Concerning the filtering step, we use a Gaussian filter (see appendix B), and as 402 described above the correlation radius R_f of the filter should be chosen close to the vortex 403 radius and smaller than three times the latter. As in this regions the eddy size ranges between 404 50 and about 150 km (Chaigneau *et al.*, 2008; 2009), we have thus chosen R_f = 150 km.

The anomaly maps (SLA, SSpA and SSTA) corresponding to Fig. 4are shown in Fig.5. 405 406 The SLA exhibit positive changes up to 8 cm for anticyclonic eddies and -10 cm for cyclonic 407 eddies. The structure of the vortices is well marked (Fig. 5a). The SSpA and SSTA exhibit 408 very similar structures, with SSTA variations reaching $\pm 1^{\circ}$ C in the open ocean but as low as -409 4°C near the coast where the upwelling signal is very strong. The vortex structures are more 410 clearly marked on SLA than on SSpA or SSTA maps (see Fig. 5 b and c). Vortex centres are 411 thus identified as local extremum on SLA maps. In order to avoid taking into account 412 relatively weak eddies, we discarded eddies having a |SLA|<2 cm.

Figure 6 shows a map of SSpA on which we have superimposed SLA contours. Note that both fields, which enter in the calculation of χ_p , generally exhibit coherent patterns. However, SSpA exhibits a more complex structure, with marked filaments sometimes penetrating vortex cores.

417 Figure 7 shows a map of χ_{p} , red areas are associated with positive values, 418 corresponding to expected subsurface vortices, blue areas are associated with negative values, 419 corresponding to expected surface vortices. We have also superimposed the filtered SLA 420 isolines (yellow contours).

The expected nature of the vortex, calculated using the index, is then compared to the exact nature of the identified vortex is established using the relative vorticity (calculated from the total 3D velocity field available from the numerical results). Based on the notion that rotation dominates within a vortex, the relative vorticity is indeed a good indicator and can be used to detect eddies and to characterize their intensity (McWilliams, 1990). For each detected vortex, the depth of maximum absolute relative vorticity $|Z_{\zeta max}|$ corresponds to the vertical position of the vortex core. Vortices will be considered surface intensified when 428 $|Z_{\zeta max}|$ is located within the mixed layer (whose thickness is about 30 to 50 m for the present 429 simulation), and subsurface when it is located below.

The four different vortex types were observed: surface anticyclones and cyclones (with respectively positive and negative relative vorticity reaching their maximum absolute value at the surface) and subsurface anticyclones and cyclones (with respectively positive and negative relative vorticity reaching their maximum absolute value inside the water column). Typical examples are given in Fig. 8 with structures representative of the four possible vortex types and different amplitudes. The positions of the chosen eddies are indicated on Fig. 7 (denoted 8a-d).

437 **6.3. Analysis**

For the particular SLA map shown in Fig. 5a, 77 eddies have been identified over the region. Figure 9 represents the position for all identified eddies superimposed on the SLA (Fig. 9a) and χ_{p} (Fig. 9b). Crosses (+) are associated with eddies those are correctly identified, stars (*) are associated with eddies those are not correctly identified: positive index but surface intensified core in reality or negative index but subsurface intensified core. Among the 77 eddies detected, 24 (30%) are not correctly identified. As we will see below, this error rate corresponds to a maximum in the simulation (summer season).

There exist two main types of vortices leading to incorrect identification: eddies with a clear main core and a well-defined structure and eddies having a multicore structure with superimposed surface and subsurface maxima of relative vorticity.

448 Figure 10 represents the relative vorticity structure of 4 eddies for which the index 449 yields wrong results. Their positions are indicated in Fig. 7 (denoted 10a, b, c and d) and Fig. 450 9 (indicated by stars: *). Vortex 10a is a subsurface anticyclonic vortex identified as a surface 451 intensified eddy by the index χ_0 (negative value). Vortex 10b is a surface intensified 452 anticyclone identified as a subsurface intensified eddy by the index. Notice that most of these 453 vortices have an index that varies from negative to positive in the vicinity of the center (see 454 Fig. 9 and 6). Vortices 10c and 10d are different and associated with a multicore structure 455 (Fig. 10c, d, vertical transects). The strength of both cores is similar so that is seems difficult 456 to identify the main core.

457 Multicore structures represent a bit more than half the problematic cases. It does not 458 seem possible to identify multicore vortices without complementary vertical profiles. In 459 practice any method based on surface observations can thus only reconstruct half the structure 460 (the surface or the subsurface part). Multicore eddies represent a significant fraction in the 461 present simulation, but many of them can be considered as eddies with a main core (one of the 462 core is much stronger than the others) and do not cause particular problems. Multicore 463 structures with cores of similar strength are more problematic. Even though they are rarely 464 observed in nature (see however Pingree et al., 1993, Tychensky et al., 1998), it is well 465 known that vortices of the same sign but whose cores are located at different depth tend to 466 align when they are close to each other (Polvani, 1991; Nof and Dewar, 1994; Correard and 467 Carton, 1998; Sutyrin et al., 1998; Perrot et al., 2010). It has also been shown that the 468 interaction of vortices with currents or topography can lead to the formation of secondary 469 aligned poles for the vortex (Vandermeirsch et al., 2002, Herbette et al., 2003; 2004). The 470 present results show that they could be more frequent than expected, at least in numerical 471 simulations, but their identification requires in situ observations.

To conclude, the use of the index χ_p allows us to adequately determine the nature of the eddy (surface or subsurface) for about 70% of them in this specific output, and among the incorrect detections about half are associated with vortices that are both surface and subsurface.

476 **6.4. Statistics over seven years**

477 To evaluate whether the previous results depend on the specific date chosen above, in 478 particular on seasonal characteristics of the mixed layer (depth, enhanced winter mixing or 479 summer restratification), the previous calculations have been tested for other dates over the seven years of simulation. One output corresponding to the 1st of each month, have been 480 481 selected and analysed. More frequent outputs can be used, but since the vortex evolution is of 482 the order of a few weeks, one month is an adequate time period to have considerable 483 evolution of the vortex distribution but still have a good representation of the seasonal 484 variability. For each selected date, we follow the methods presented in the previous section: 485 all vortices have been identified, the index χ_{ρ} and the vortex core depth $Z_{\zeta max}$ have been 486 calculated and visually compared with the vertical relative vorticity structure, and multi-core 487 structures have been identified.

The global statistics are presented in Fig. 12, which represents the total number of vortices detected and the number of wrong identification for the 12 months of the simulation (mean of seven years and the standard deviation).

491

This graphic shows that the total error varies between 15 to 30% and represents an

492 average of 24%, so that 76% of the vortices are correctly identified.

493 Multi-core eddies represent 58% of the wrong identification (explaining 14% of the 24% 494 errors). The error, associated with eddies having a main core, has an average of $\sim 10\%$, which 495 is considered good. Interestingly, this error exhibits a seasonal cycle with a minimum in 496 austral winter and a maximum in late austral summer. This is associated with mixed layer 497 dynamics. Indeed, during summer, when the mixed layer is shallower, SSTA can be more 498 influenced by atmospheric forcings than by oceanic processes. In addition, during summer, 499 the stratification increases and the mixed layer shrinks, reducing the surface signature of 500 subsurface intensified eddies.

501 To conclude, despite the observed seasonal variability, the errors remain reasonable 502 and the index is able to correctly identify surface and subsurface vortices during the whole 503 year.

504 6.5. Complementary tests with χ_T

As mentioned previously, the sea surface density is not currently observed from space and only SST is available at an adequate resolution and precision. We have thus evaluated the use of χ_T : Fig. 12 is the same as Fig. 9 but using χ_T instead of χ_p . The results show a very good general correspondence with χ_p . In fact, the nature of eddies, as evaluated from χ_T and χ_p , differs from 3 to 8% of the vortices and most of the eddies with different χ_T and χ_p identification are in fact multi-core vortices.

511 Also, the rate of success of using χ_T is 67% for the general case (and 65% for the 512 specific output) below but comparable to the rate associated with χ_{ρ} . This shows that in practice, in this region where salinity does not control the stratification, χ_T can be retained 513 without any drastic loss of –qualitative- information in comparison with χ_{ρ} . Indeed, the 514 515 differences between the SST and SSS fields are generally due to large scale variations 516 (characteristics of surface water masses, influence of precipitation, cloud cover, ...) which is 517 mostly filtered out within the reference state signal. Regions may however exist where vortices are constituted of waters with compensating temperature and salinity anomalies, or 518 519 region where the mesoscale signal is dominated by salinity variability, such as close to 520 estuaries. In such cases the use of χ_T instead of χ_p may be more problematic.

521 **7. Conclusions: summary, discussion and perspectives**

522

In this work, we have studied the possibility to reconstruct information on the vertical

523 structure of vortices from surface observations. We have first shown that the knowledge of the 524 interior potential vorticity is crucial to determine the exact 3D structure of a vortex in general. Theoretical models based on the pure knowledge of instantaneous surface fields yield good 525 526 results for surface vortices, but we have shown that subsurface eddies (with an interior 527 potential vorticity fields intensified in deep layers) cannot be reconstructed by the SQG or 528 ISQG theory. The ISQG theory improves the results obtained by SQG theory and can be used 529 for turbulence generated by winds (Rossby waves) where first baroclinic mode and barotropic 530 mode dominates. But it implicitly hypothesizes that the vortex is surface intensified. ESQG 531 relies on the knowledge of the ocean interior characteristics, which can be calculated from 532 ocean circulation models, but projects SSH on a single vertical profile (which can be surface, 533 subsurface or mixed) for a given area. SQG, ISQG and ESQG approaches have thus to be 534 handled with care in areas where both surface and subsurface vortices exist.

ISQG or ESQG can however be extended to take into account other vertical structures, determined from climatologies of specific coherent vortices present in oceanic regions for instance, in particular with subsurface maximum. To do so, a first step is to be able to determine the nature (surface or subsurface) of a vortex, from surface fields alone.

We have thus proposed an index to determine the nature (surface or subsurface) of vortices using surface anomalies: the ratio of the sea surface density to the sea level anomalies, χ_{ρ} . This was tested with data coming from a realistic ocean circulation model in the Peru-Chile upwelling system and an analysis of tens of vortices.

543 We have shown that there exist wrong identifications associated with different error sources. First, in realistic configurations, a filter must be applied to determine the part of the 544 545 physical fields associated with the vortex signal. We have then shown that the index 546 calculation can be more difficult in a complex environment: a strong current having 547 characteristics similar to the vortex can hide the signal of subsurface eddy when it is located 548 in its vicinity, and lead to errors. We have also shown that multi-core structures, with 549 subsurface and surface cores of comparable strength, the determination of the position of the 550 most intense core is difficult, which leads to errors too. This can be problematic in some 551 regions where deep coherent vortices exist but whose signature can be hidden by vertically 552 aligned surface eddies.

553 The general rate of success of the method reaches 76% in general, multi-core vortices 554 representing about half the errors. We have also shown that at first order, the variations of SSp are dominated by SST variations, except in specific regions where salinity can play a substantial role on the stratification (near estuaries, region of ice formation/melting, etc.). So that the use of the SST anomaly (a field currently available from satellite observations at high resolution) is a good proxy for the calculation of the index. We think that our results are satisfactory and can be applied to real observations.

560 A problem to be addressed is then the difference in resolution between satellite SST 561 and SSH data: the spatial and temporal resolutions of infrared SST observations are, for now, 562 far better. This is another potential source of error for the calculation of the index which has to 563 be assessed. In the future, wide swath altimetric observations will overcome this bias so that 564 the present results will greatly benefit from the breakthrough provided by the SWOT (surface 565 water ocean topography satellite, http://swot.jpl.nasa.gov/) mission, planned for 2020. Our 566 results are thus also contributions to prepare the exploitation of the future SWOT mission for 567 the analysis of the dynamics of meso and submesoscale vortices in the ocean. However, for 568 present observations, we expect that applications focussing on large scale structures or using 569 SST and SSH averaged over several days should limit the problems associated with 570 resolution. Testing the proposed method on different surface and subsurface eddies already 571 identified by authors or using in situ observations is thus an important perspective of this 572 work.

573 The calculation of the index remains very basic and can certainly be improved. 574 Different attempts have been made to do so. First, we have tried to use a more quantitative 575 approach to identify vortices. Indeed, for surface intensified vortices, calculations (using Eq. 4 576 and 5) show that the magnitude of SS_{ρ} and SLA are linked and should roughly verify:

 H_{ν} . SS_{ρ}/ρ_o SLA ~-1,

(17)

577 Where H_{ν} is the vertical scale of the surface vortex. For subsurface vortices, this ratio 578 should be positive, but weak. We could thus expect that there is a limit of $\chi_{\rho} < \chi_{\rho}^{lim}$ beyond 579 which the vortex is subsurface, instead of a change of sign. This has been applied with 580 success for the main model output analysed in the paper (associated with Fig. 4 to 11): using 581 $\chi_{\rho}^{lim} = 2$ lead to far better results (less than 10% errors). However applying this criterion to the 582 general case was disappointing and even lead to degraded general statistics.

583 We have also thought of replacing SLA by the surface relative vorticity, whose field 584 seems more closely correlated with SSTA (not shown). In the studied region (southern 585 hemisphere and negative f) relative vorticity has the same sign as SLA near the vortex center, 586 so that in order to detect surface and subsurface eddies we can use the same algorithms but we 587 replace SLA by relative vorticity to calculate a new index denoted χ^{ζ}_{ρ} . To identify eddies, the same method can be used but a new minimum ($\zeta_{min} = 0.5.10^{-5} \text{ s}^{-1}$) has to be defined to remove 588 589 weaker eddies. Again the general statistics were not improved in comparison with χ_{ρ} . In 590 addition, relative vorticity is more difficult to calculate using satellite observations, as gridded 591 altimetric SSH products have a coarse spatial resolution. The relative vorticity field, based on 592 a double derivative of SSH is then associated with large uncertainties that we believe would 593 be problematic.

594 Other improvements are possible, such as using an anisotropic filter to better define 595 the anomalies associated with vortices, or trying to better identify the SST anomaly when it is 596 not collocated with the vortex center defined by the SLA extrema. Figure 6 indeed shows that 597 SSpA can be highly variable over the vortex area (delimited by the closed contours of SLA for 598 instance) so that the calculation of the present index can have strong uncertainties given the 599 gap between SLA and SS_{ρ} . We believe an index based on an analysis of the latter fields within the vortex area could lead to a significant improvement. However, given its simplicity, we 600 601 think the present index derived in this first study is useful as a first step.

Finally, we have here seen that vortex structures are a complex result of their history. From their formation to their interaction with large scale background flow, jets or other eddies (such as alignment with other vortices, as mentioned in this paper), or diabatical transformations, many processes can modify their structure. Fundamental studies linking all aspects of vortex evolution to their structure and surface signature are thus of interest too to improve the proposed index or to determine alternative methods for the determination of the nature of vortices.

609 Concerning applications, we believe the index yields interesting information to 610 determine areas where the SQG approach can be used –or not- to calculate a surface velocity 611 field and where the ISQG method can be generalized to represent subsurface structure, 612 provided the interior PV structure is projected on new vertical profiles for instance calculated 613 from local vortex climatologies.

The index can also be applied as a proxy to analyze the details of the processes responsible for the generation and evolution of eddies in nature or in numerical model results, or to evaluate the contribution of eddies to the general circulation in the ocean, in particular in regions where water masses are known to subduct or to surface.

Finally, a straightforward and obvious application of the index is associated with the 618 619 assimilation of SLA or SST anomalies, which are for now, generally associated with surface 620 intensified eddies. Our work shows that both physical fields are strongly correlated and we 621 think our results offer the first step of a method to combine them to reconstruct the vertical 622 structure of a vortex and improve the representation of vortices in realistic models with data 623 assimilation. Estimating the exact vertical position of the vortex center remains a problem, as 624 we have shown that the index combines it with the vertical scale of the eddy core and is 625 probably sensitive to the details of the vortex structure. This has to be studied further but in 626 general a given oceanic region contains a limited number of coherent vortex types. It thus 627 seems possible to determine the index characteristics for each vortex type and to connect an 628 observed anomaly to a single one, then using an average three-dimensional structure of the 629 latter to project the observed anomalies vertically. This however requires important further 630 developments.

631 Acknowledgements

This study has benefited from the funding of different projects: EPIGRAM, funded by CNRS (LEFE/IMAGO) and ANR (grant ANR-08-BLAN-0330-01), "Merging of satellite and *in- situ* observations for the analysis of meso and submesoscale dynamics", funded by CNES (OSTST project), and COMODO, funded by Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR-11-MONU-005-03). We are grateful to Bernard Le Cann (UBO, LPO, Brest) for discussions on vortex studies and observations. We are also grateful to anonymous referees for their comments that drastically improved the quality of the manuscript and the calculation of the index.

639

640 Appendix A: evaluation of the SQG and ISQG methods for subsurface 641 vortices

As initially shown by Bretherton (1966), building on the idea that the surface density of the ocean plays the same role as the potential vorticity in the interior of the ocean, several studies have proposed to compute velocity fields from the knowledge of surface temperature alone (see Held *et al.*, 1995; Isern-Fontanet *et al.*, 2006), known as the surface quasigeostrophy (SQG) theory (Blumen, 1978). It boils down to inverting Eq. 1, 7 and 8, hypothesizing QGPV=0. It can be shown that in the Northern hemisphere a positive surface density anomaly –or a negative temperature anomaly- will in this case be associated via the

SQG theory with a surface intensified cyclone. Negative surface density anomaly –or a
positive temperature anomaly- will be associated by the SQG theory to a surface intensified
anticyclone (see Isern-Fontan et *et al.*, 2006).

However, for most oceanic eddies the assumption of no potential vorticity anomaly within the water column is not verified, so we can expect some discrepancies between reconstructed fields using the SQG method and realistic vortex structures. In particular, the difference between the observed sea surface elevation and obtained using SQG and the sea surface density anomaly is the signature of the interior QGPV.

Based on this idea, Wang *et al* (2013) have proposed an improved method, called ISQG (interior+surface QG method), which relies on the addition of an interior streamfunction Ψ_i to the SQG streamfunction Ψ_{SQG} associated with the surface density anomaly (Eq. 12, $\Psi = \Psi_{SQG} + \Psi_i$). The interior streamfunction Ψ_i is then calculated assuming that its vertical structure is a combination of the barotropic and first baroclinic modes whose horizontal structure is calculated so that the total streamfunction matches the sea surface elevation at the surface ($\Psi(z=0) = g\eta/f + \Psi_{surf}$) and vanishes at the bottom. The solution is given by

$$\psi_i(x, y, z) = \psi_h(x, y)F_1(z) - \psi_{SQG}(x, y, -H) - \psi_h(x, y)F_1(-H)$$
(A1)

664

$$\psi_{h}(x, y) = \frac{1}{F_{1}(0) - F_{1}(-H)} \left[\psi_{surf}(x, y) + \psi_{SQG}(x, y, -H) - \psi_{SQG}(x, y, 0) \right],$$
(A2)

665

666 With this, it can be easily verified that $\psi(z=0) = \psi_{surf}$ (the sea surface elevation is as 667 prescribed), $\psi(z=-H) = 0$ (the total streamfunction vanishes at the bottom) and $\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z} = 0$

 $\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial z}(z=0) = \frac{\partial \psi_{sQG}}{\partial z}(z=0)$ (the surface density field is as prescribed). Thus, the ISQG method leads to an estimation of interior fields from the sea surface elevation and density alone and matching these surface fields.

However, the vertical structure of the interior streamfunction, and thus QGPV, is empirically determined and only projects on the barotropic mode (which does not vary with depth) and first baroclinic mode. If the details of the shape of the first baroclinic mode depends on the stratification, it is always intensified at the surface, reaches zero at mid depth

or so and reaches another extremum (usually weaker) at the bottom (see Fig. 1b). As a result,
the vertical structure of the QGPV field associated with the ISQG approach is determined by
the first baroclinic mode and is always surface intensified.

678 Figure A.1 represents the vorticity, QGPV and density anomaly fields for a chosen surface intensified anticyclone with $\delta \rho_0 = -0.02^{-0} / _{00}$, R= 50 km, $H_v = 200m$, $z_0 = 0m$ and 679 $Q_0 = -0.5 f$ and its reconstruction using the ISQG and SQG approaches. As demonstrated by 680 Wang et al (2013) the improvement of the ISQG approach is obvious, in particular for the 681 682 vorticity and density anomaly fields. Notice however that there exist discrepancies in the 683 deepest layers for the QGPV field, which exhibits a vertical structure with opposite sign 684 anomalies for ISQG, a structure known to be baroclinically unstable. This modification does 685 not have a strong impact for the reconstructed fields (at least in the upper layers), but if it was 686 used in a predictive model, the evolution and propagation of the (real) QGPV and ISQG reconstructed vortices would be different (see Morel and McWilliams, 1997). 687

As the QGPV of the ISQG is surface intensified (and is null for SQG), the 688 689 reconstruction of subsurface eddies thus remains a problem for both SQG and ISQG methods. 690 This is illustrated in Fig. A.2 which represents the vorticity, QGPV and density anomaly fields for a subsurface vortex with $\delta \rho_0 = 0.$ $^0/_{00}$, R= 50 km, $H_v = 200m$, $z_0 = 300m$ and 691 $Q_0 = -0.5 f$. The surface vorticity field remains decently represented, but as expected, the 692 QGPV and density fields are this time very different as the structure reconstructed by the 693 694 ISQG method remains surface intensified. These differences get stronger as the vortex core vertical position (z_0) gets deeper. Also notice that, as the chosen vortex has no density 695 signature at the surface ($\delta \rho_0 = 0$. $^0/_{00}$) the SQG fields are null. 696

Finally, notice that this time the density field reconstructed by the ISQG method leads to opposite sign anomalies: in fact, an anticyclonic vortex with a negative QGPV core has a weakly stratified core. As a result, surface intensified anticyclones deflect isopycnic levels and the thermocline downward. This is also true for isopycnic levels located below the core of subsurface vortices, but the isopycnic levels located above their core are this time pushed upward (see for instance Bashmachnikov and Carton, 2012; Bashmachnikov *et al.*, 2014).

This has important consequences and accentuates the discrepancies for subsurface anticyclones. Indeed, as isopycnic levels located above the core are pushed upward, it is reasonable to associate this kind of structure with positive density anomalies at the surface. Figure A.3 represents the velocity, vorticity and potential vorticity fields for a subsurface vortex with, $\delta \rho_0 = 0$. $^0/_{00}$, R= 50 km, $H_v = 200m$, $z_0 = 300m$ and $Q_0 = -0.5f$.

The ISQG method leads to subsurface intensified vorticity, but the QGPV field still has the same problem and the intensity of the vorticity and density fields are this time much weaker than reality. SQG predicts a good thermocline position (density anomaly) but, as a positive surface density anomaly is associated with cyclonic vortices, the vorticity has an opposite sign.

To conclude, both SQG and ISQG have difficulties to represent subsurface eddies. Notice that as Eq. 1,7 and 8 are linear, we only considered anticyclonic vortices with a fixed QGPV strength ($Q_0 = -0.5f$), but the results are identical for cyclones or anticyclones with different strength.

The discrepancies associated with the reconstructed ISQG or SQG fields obviously depends on several parameters (vortex core depth, radius, shape, ...), but subsurface vortices represent a specific problematic category and, despite the recent improvement brought by the ISQG approach, the identification and calculation of the 3D fields for this kind of structures remains a challenge.

722 Appendix B

Using a low pass filter allows to retain the large scale information within an image while reducing the small scale information. Here, the low pass filter $\bar{\psi}$ of a physical field ψ is calculated using a smoother of the form:

$$\overline{\psi}(i,j) = \frac{\sum_{\Omega_{i,j}} w(i1,j1)\psi(i1,j1)}{\sum_{\Omega_{i,j}} w(i1,j1)},$$
(B1)

726 where the weights w are defined as:

$$w(i1, j1) = e^{-\frac{(x(i,j)-x(i1,j1))^2 + (y(i,j)-y(i1,j1))^2}{R_j^2}},$$
(B2)

And R_f is the correlation radius. The region over which the mean field is calculated is circular with a radius $2 \times R_f$.

730 **References**

- Abraham, E. R., 1998: The generation of plankton patchiness by turbulent stirring. Nature,
 391, 577–580.
- 733 Bashmachnikov, I., and X. Carton, 2012: Surface signature of Mediterranean Water eddies
- inthe North-East Atlantic: effects of upper layer stratification. Ocean. Sci., 8, 931–943.
 doi:10.5194/os-8-931-2012.
- Bashmachnikov, I., D. Boutov, and J. Dias, 2013: Manifestation of two meddies in altimetryand sea-surface Temperature. Ocean. Sci., 9, 249–259.
- Bashmachnikov, I., X. Carton, and T.V. Belonenko, 2014: Characteristics of surface signature
 of Mediterranean water eddies. J. Geophys. Res., 119, 10, 7245–7266,
 doi: 10.1002/2014JC010244.
- Beron-Vera, F. J., M. J. Olascoaga, and G. J. Goni, 2008: Oceanic mesoscale eddies as
 revealed by Lagrangian coherent structures. Geophys. Res. Lett., 35, L12603,
 doi:10.1029/2008GL033957.
- Beron-Vera, F. J., María J., Olascoaga, and G. J. Goni, 2010: Surface Ocean Mixing Inferred
 from Different Multisatellite Altimetry Measurements. J. Phys. Oceanogr., 40, 2466–2480.
- Bishop, C. H., and A. J. Thorpe, 1994: Potential vorticity and the electrostatics analogy:
 Quasi-geostrophic theory. Q. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc., 120, 713-731,
 doi: 10.1002/qj.49712051710.
- Blumen, W., 1978 : Uniform potential vorticity flow: Part I. Theory of wave interactions and
 two-dimensional turbulence. J. Atmos. Sci., 35, 774–783.
- Bracco, A., S. Clayton, and C. Pasquero, 2009: Horizontal advection, diffusion, and plankton
 spectra at the sea surface, J. Geophys. Res., 114, C02001, doi:10.1029/2007JC004671.
- Bretherton, F. P., 1966: Critical layer instability in baroclinic flows. Q. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.,92,325-334.
- Caballero, A., A. Pascual, G. Dibarboure, and M. Espino, 2008: Sea level and eddy kinetic
 energy variability in the Bay of Biscay inferred from satellite altimeter data. J. Marine. Syst.,
 72, 116-134.
- Calil, P. H. R., Y. L. Jia., R. R. Bidigare, 2008: Eddy activity in the lee of the Hawaiian
 Islands. Deep-Sea Res. Pt.II: Tropical Studies in Oceanography., 55, 10-13, 1179-1194,
 doi:10.1016/j.dsr2.2008.
- Carton, J. A., and B. S. Giese, 2008: A reanalysis of ocean climate using simple ocean data
 assimilation (SODA). Mon. Wea. Rev., 136, 2999-3017, doi:10.1175/2007MWR1978.1.
- 763 Carton, X., and J.C. McWilliams, 1989: Barotropic and baroclinic instabilities of
 764 axisymmetric vortices in a qg model. Mesoscale/Synoptic Coherent Structures in Geophysical
 765 Turbulence, Elsev. Oceanogr. ser., 225–244.
- Chaigneau, A., and O. Pizarro 2005a: Surface circulation and fronts of the South Pacific
 Ocean, east of 120°W, Geophys. Res. Lett., 32, L08605, doi:10.1029/2004GL022070.

- Chaigneau, A., and O. Pizarro, 2005b: Mean surface circulation and mesoscale turbulent flow
 characteristics in the eastern South Pacific from satellite tracked drifters, J. Geophys. Res.,
 110, C05014, doi:10.1029/2004JC002628.
- Chaigneau, A., A. Gizolme, and C. Grados, 2008: Mesoscale eddies off Peru in
 altimeterrecords: Identification algorithms and eddy spatiotemporal patterns, Prog. Oceanogr.,
 773 79, 106–119, doi:10.1016/j.pocean.2008.10.013.
- Chaigneau, A., G. Eldin, and B. Dewitte, 2009: Eddy activity in the four major upwelling
 Systems from satellite altimetry (1992–2007), Prog. Oceanogr., 83, 117–123,
 doi:10.1016/j.pocean.2009.07.012.
- Chaigneau, A., M. Le Texier, G. Eldin, C. Grados, and O. Pizarro, 2011: Vertical structure of
 mesoscale eddies in the eastern South Pacific Ocean: A composite analysis from altimetry and
 Agro profiling floats. J. Geophys. Res., 116, C11025, doi:10.1029/2011JC007134.
- 780 Chelton, D. B., R. A. deSzoeke, M. G. Schlax, K. El Naggar, and N. Siwertz, 1998:
- 781 Geophysical variability of the first baroclinic Rossby radius of deformation. J. Phys.
- 782 Oceanogr., 28, 433-460.
- Chelton, D. B., M. G. Schlax, R. M. Samelson, and R. A. Szoeke, 2007: Global observations
 of large oceanic eddies, Geophys. Res. Lett., 34, L15606, doi:10.1029/2007GL030812.
- Chelton, D. B., and S. P. Xie, 2010: Coupled ocean-atmosphere interaction at oceanicmesoscales. Oceanography Magazine., 23, 52-69.
- Chelton, D. B., M. G. Schlax, and R. M. Samelson, 2011: Global observations of non linearmesoscale eddies. Prog. Oceanogr., 91, 167-216.
- 789 Chelton D., 2013: Ocean–atmosphere coupling: Mesoscale eddy effects. Nature Geosci., 6,
 790 594–595 doi:10.1038/ngeo1906.
- Chérubin, L., X. Carton, J. Paillet, Y. Morel and A. Serpette, 2000: Instability of the
 Mediterranean Water undercurrents southwest of Portugal: effects of baroclinicity and of
 topography. Oceanol. Acta., 23, 551–573.
- Colas, F., X. Capet, J. C. McWilliams, and A. Shchepetkin, 2008: 1997–1998 El Niño off
 Peru: A numerical study. Prog. Oceanogr., 79 (2), 138-155.
- Colas, F., J. C. McWilliams, X. Capet, and J. Kurian, 2012: Heat balance and eddies in the
 Peru-Chile current system. Climate Dynamics., 39, 509-529.doi:10.1007/s00382-011-1170-6.
- Colas, F., X. Capet, J. C. McWilliams, and Z. Li, 2013: Mesoscale eddy buoyancy flux and
 eddy-induced circulation in Eastern Boundary Currents. J. Phys. Oceanogr., 43, 1073-1095.
- 800 Correard, S., and X. Carton, 1998: Vertical alignment of geostrophic vortices: on the influence
- 801 of the initial distribution of potential vorticity. Proceedings of the IUTAM Symposium on
- 802 Simulation and identification of organized structures in flows. Kluwer Acad. Publ., 52, 191-803 200.
- 804 Cushman-Roisin, B., and Beckers J-M, 2011: Introduction to Geophysical Fluid Dynamics.
- 805 2nd Edition. Academic Press, 875 pp.

- d'Ovidio, F., V. Fernandez, E. Hernandez-Garcia, and C. Lopez, 2004: Mixing structures in
 the Mediterranean sea from finite size Lyapunov exponents. Geophys. Res. Lett., 31, L17203.
- BO8 DaSilva, A., A. C. Young, and S. Levitus, 1994: "Atlas of surface marine data 1994, volume 1.
 BO9 Algorithms and procedures.," Tech. Rep. 6, U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA, NESDIS.
- 810 Echevin, V., F. Colas, A. Chaigneau, and P. Penven, 2011: Sensitivity of the Northern
- 811 Humboldt Current System nearshore modeled circulation to initial and boundary conditions.
- 812 J. Geophys. Res., 116, C07002, doi:10.1029/2010JC006684.
- Frenger, I., N. Gruber, R. Knutti, and M. Münnich, 2013: Imprint of Southern Ocean eddies
 on winds clouds and rainfall. Nature Geosci. ., 6, 608-612, doi:10.1038/ngeo1863.
- Garfield, N., C. A. Collins, R. G. Paquette, and E. Carter, 1999: Lagrangian exploration of the
 California Undercurrent. J. Phys. Oceanogr., 29, 560–583.
- Held, I. M., R. T. Pierrehumbert, S. T. Garner, and K. L. Swanson, 1995: Surface quasigeostrophic dynamics. J. Fluid. Mech., 282, 1-20.
- Herbette, S., Y. Morel, and M. Arhan, 2003: Erosion of a surface vortex by a seamount. J.
 Phys. Oceanogr., 33, 1664–1679.
- Herbette, S., Y. Morel, and M.Arhan, 2004: Subduction of a surface vortex under an
 outcropping front. J. Phys. Oceanogr. ,34, 1610–1627. doi:10.1175/15200485(2004)034<1610:SOASVU>2.0.CO;2.
- Hoskins, B. J., M. E. McIntyre, and A. W. Robertson, 1985: On the use and significance of isentropic potential vorticity maps. Q. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc., 111, 877-946.
- Isern-Fontanet, J., B. Chapron, G. Lapeyre, and P. Klein, 2006: Potential use of microwave
 sea surface temperatures for the estimation of ocean currents. Geophys. Res. Lett., 33, 1-5,
 L24608, doi:10.1029/2006GL027801.
- Jayne, S. R., and J. Marotzke, 2002:The oceanic eddy heat transport. J. Phys. Oceanogr., 32,
 3328–3345.
- Johnson, G. C., and K. E. McTaggart, 2010: Equatorial Pacific 13°c water eddies in the
 eastern subtropical South Pacific Ocean. J. Phys. Oceanogr., 40, 226-236,
 doi:10.1175/2009JPO42871.
- Kubryakov, A. A., and S. V. Stanichny, 2015: Seasonal and interannual variability of theBlack
- 835 Sea eddies and its dependence on characteristics of the large-scale circulation. Deep-Sea. Res.
- 836 Pt. I., 97, 80-91, doi:10.1016/j.dsr.2014.12.002
- Lapeyre, G., and P. Klein, 2006: Dynamics of the upper oceanic layers in terms of surface
 quasigeostrophy theory. J. Phys. Oceanogr., 36, 165-176.Lévy, M., and P. Klein, 2004: Does
- the low frequency variability of mesoscale dynamics explain a part of the phytoplankton and
- 840 zooplankton spectral variability? P. Roy. Irish. ACAD. A., 460, 1673-1683, doi:
- 841 10.1098/rspa.2003.1219.
- 842 Marchesiello, P., J.C. McWilliams, and A. Shchepetkin, 2003: Equilibrium structure and
- 843 dynamics of the California current system. J. Phys. Oceanogr., 33, 753–783.

- Martin, A. P., and K. J. Richards, 2001: Mechanisms for vertical transport within a North Atlantic mesoscale eddy. Deep-Sea. Res. Pt. II., 48, 757–773.
- McGillicuddy, D. J., and A.R. Robinson, 1997: Eddy induced nutrient supply and new
 production in the Sargasso Sea. Deep-Sea. Res. Pt. I., 44(8), 1427-1450.
- McGillicuddy, D. J., R. Johnson, D. A. Siege, A. F. Michaels, N. R. Bates, and A. H. Knap,1999: Mesoscale variations in biogeochemical properties in the Sargasse Sea. J.
- 850 Geophys. Res., 104(C6), c13381-13394.
- McGillicuddy, D. J, 2014: Formation of Intrathermocline Lenses by Eddy–Wind Interaction.
 J. Phys. Oceanogr., 45, 606-612, doi: 10.1175/JPO-D-14-0221.1.
- McWilliams, J.C., 1985: Submesoscale, coherent vortices in the ocean.
 Rev. Geophys., 23, 165-182.
- McWilliams, J.C., 1990: The vortices of two-dimensional turbulence. J. Fluid Mech., 219,
 361–385.
- Meunier, T., V. Rossi, Y. Morel, and X. Carton, 2010: Influence of bottom topography on an
 upwelling current: Generation of long trapped filaments. Ocean. Model., 35, 277–303,
 doi:10.1016/j.ocemod.2010.08.004
- Montes, I., F. Colas, X. Capet, and W. Schneider, 2010: On the pathways of the equatorial subsurface currents in the eastern equatorial Pacific and their contributions to the Peru-Chile undercurrent. J. Geophys. Res., 115, C09003, doi:10.1029/2009JC005710.
- Montes, I., W. Schneider, F. Colas, B. Blanke, and V. Echevin, 2011: Subsurface connections
 in the eastern tropical Pacific during La Niña 1999–2001 and El Niño 2002–2003.J. Geophys.
 Res., 116, C12022, doi:10.1029/2011JC007624.
- Morales, C. E., S. Hormazabel, M. Correa-Ramirez, O. Pizarro, N. Silva, C. Fernandez, V.
 Anabalon, and M. L. Torreblanco, 2012: Mesoscale variability and nutrient-phytoplankton
 distribution off central-southern Chile during the upwelling season: the influence of
 mesoscale eddies. Prog. Oceanogr., 104, 17–29.
- Morel, Y., and J.C. McWilliams, 1997: Evolution of isolated interior vortices in the ocean. J.
 Phys. Oceanogr., 27, 727-748.
- Morel, Y., and J.C. McWilliams, 2001: Effects of isopycnal and diapycnal mixing on
 thestability of oceanic currents. J. Phys. Oceanogr., 31, 2280-2296.
- Morrow, R., and P. Y. LeTraon, 2012: Recent advances in observing mesoscale oceandynamics with satellite altimetry. Adv. Space. Res., 50, 1062–1076.
- Munk, W. H., and C., Wunsch, 1998: Abyssal recipes II: Energetics of tidal and wind mixing.
 Deep-Sea. Res. Pt. I., 45, 1977–2010.
- 878 Nof, D., and W. K, Dewar, 1994: Alignment of lenses: laboratory and numerical experiments.
- 879 Deep-Sea. Res. Pt. I., 41, 1207-1229.
- 880 Paillet, J., B. Le Cann, A. Serpette, Y. Morel, and X. Carton, 2002: Dynamics and evolution
- of a Northen Meddy. J. Phys. Oceanogr., 32, 55-79.

- Pasquero, C., A. Bracco, and A. Provenzale, 2005: Impact of the spatiotemporal variability of
 the nutrient flux on primary productivity in the ocean. J. Geophys. Res., 110, C07005 doi:
- 884 10.1029/2004JC002738.
- Pedlosky, J., 1987: Geophysical Fluid Dynamics., New York, Springer-Verlag, 710 pp.

Penven, P., V. Echevin, J. Pasapera, F. Colas, and J. Tam, 2005: Average circulation, seasonal
cycle, and mesoscale dynamics of the Peru Current System: A modeling approach. J.
Geophys. Res., 110, C10021, doi:10.1029/2005JC002945

- 889 Perrot, X., X. Carton, and A. Guillou, 2010: Geostrophic vortex alignment in external shear or
- 890 strain. Proceedings of the Symposium on Turbulence in the Atmosphere and Oceans, IUTAM
- book series 28, Springer, 217-224.
- Pingree, R.D., and B. Le Cann, 1992a: Three anticyclonic Slope Water Oceanic eDDIES
 (SWODDIES) in the southern Bay of Biscay in 1990. Deep-Sea. Res., 39 (7/8), 1147–1175.
- Pingree, R. D., and B. Le Cann, 1992b: Anticyclonic eddy X91 in the southern Bay of
 Biscay,may 1991 to February 1992. J. Geophys. Res., 97, doi:10.1029/92JC01181.
- Pingree, R. D., and B. Le Cann, 1993: Structure of a Meddy (Bobby 92) southeast of the
 Azores. Deep Sea Research 40(10), 2077-2103, doi:10.1016/0967-0637(93)90046-6.
- Polvani, L. M., 1991: Two-layer geostrophic vortex dynamics. Part 2. Alignment and twolayer V-states. J. Fluid. Mech., 225, 241–270.
- Ponte, A.L. and P. Klein, 2013: Reconstruction of the upper ocean 3D dynamics from highresolution sea surface height. Ocean Dynamics, 63, 777-791.
- Risien, C. M., and D.B. Chelton, 2008: A global climatology of surface wind and wind stress
 fields from eight years of QuikSCAT scatter-ometer data. J. Phys. Oceanogr., 38, 2379–
 2413. doi:10.1175/2008.JPO3881.1.
- Sánchez, R., and J. Gil, 2004: 3D structure, mesoscale interactions and potential vorticity
 conservation in a swoddy in the Bay of Biscay. J. Marine. Syst., 46, 47–68.
- 907 Shchepetkin, A. F., and J. C. McWilliams, 2005: The regional ocean modeling 908 system (ROMS): a split-explicit, free surface, topography following coordinates ocean 909 model. Ocean. Model., 9, 347-404.
- 910 Shchepetkin, A. F., and J. C. McWilliams, 2009: Correction and Commentary for "Ocean
- 911 forecasting in terrain-following coordinates: formulation and skill assessment of the Regional
- 912 Ocean Modeling System" by Haidvogel et al.. J. Computat. Phys., 227, 3595-3624.
- 913 Stammer, D., H.-H. Hinrichsen, and R. H. Käse, 1991: Can meddies be detected by satellite
- 914 altimetry? J. Geophys. Res., 96(C4), 7005–7014, doi:10.1029/90JC02740.
- 915 Stramma, L. H., W. Bange, R. Czeschel, A. Lorenzo, and M. Frank, 2013: On the role of
- 916 mesoscale eddies for the biological productivity and biogeochemistry in the eastern tropical
- 917 Pacific Ocean off Peru. Biogeosci. Discuss., 10, 9179-9211, doi:10.5194/bgd-10-9179-2013.
- 918 Sutyrin G. G., J. C. McWilliams, R. Saravanan, 1998: Co-rotating stationary states andvertical
- alignment of geostrophic vortices with thin cores. J. Fluid. Mech., 357, 321-349.

- 920 Sweeney, E. N., D. J. McGillicuddy, K. O. Buesseler, 2003: Biogeochemical impacts due to 921 mesoscale eddy activity in the Sargasso Sea as measured at the Bermuda Atlantic Time-series.
- 922 Deep-Sea. Res. Pt. II., 50, 3017-3039.
- Thompson, A. F., 2008: The atmospheric ocean: eddies and jets in the Antartic Circumpolar
 Current. Philos. T. Roy. Soc. A., 366, 4529–4541.
- Treguier, A. M., J. Deshayes, C. Lique, R. Dussin, and J. M. Molines., 2012: Eddy
 contributions to the meridional transport of salt in the North Atlantic.J. Geophys. Res., 117,
 C05010, doi:10.1029/2012JC007927.
- Tychensky, A., and X. Carton, 1998: Hydrological and dynamical characterization of meddies
 in the Azores region: A paradigm for baroclinic vortex dynamics. J. Geophys.
 Res., 103, 25061–25079.
- Vandermeirsch, F., Y. Morel, and G. Sutyrin, 2002: Resistance of a coherent vortex to avertical shear. J. Phys. Oceanogr., 32, 3089-3100.
- Wang, J., G.R. Flierl, J.H. LaCasce, J.L. McClean, A. Mahadevan, 2013: Reconstructing the
 Ocean's Interior from Surface Data. J. Phys. Oceanogr., 43, 1611–1626.
- Wunsch, C., 1999: Where do ocean eddy heat fluxes matter? J. Geophys. Res., 104, 13,235–13,249.
- Wunsch, C., and R. Ferrari, 2004: Vertical mixing, energy, and the general circulation of theoceans. Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech., 36, 281-314.
- 941

942 Tables

$\chi_{\rho} = \frac{SS\rho}{SLA}$	$\chi_T = \frac{SST}{SLA}$	SLA	Nature of the vortex
> 0	< 0	>0	Subsurface and anticyclonic
> 0	< 0	< 0	Subsurface and cyclonic
< 0	>0	> 0	Surface and anticyclonic
< 0	>0	< 0	Surface and cyclonic

943 Table 1: Sign of indices and SLA for the different vortex types.

944

945 **Figures captions**

946 Fig. 1: Chosen density profile $\overline{\rho}(z)$ and stratification (panel a) and vertical structure of the 947 first three baroclinic modes (panel b).

Fig. 2: Isopycnal displacements, SLA and SST anomaly for: a) the four different eddies types.b) a subsurface eddy with a mixed layer.

Fig. 3: Sensitivity study of the index to: a) the filter radius and the current width, b) the jetintensity and its width, c) the jet intensity and the distance jet-eddy.

Fig. 4: SSH in m (a) and SST in $^{\circ}$ C (b) over the Peru-Chile domain on February (1st) of the last year (7th) of the climatological simulation.

Fig. 5: SLA in m (a), SSTA in $^{\circ}$ C (b) and SSpA in kg.m⁻³ (c), where the "anomalies" are calculated from the total fields presented in Fig. 4.

956 Fig. 6: SSpA in kg.m⁻³superimposed on the SLA (black lines).

Fig. 7: Map of the index χ_p (red for positive index and subsurface vortices, blue for negative index and surface vortices) superimposed on the SLA (red lines) in the Peru-Chile area calculated from the fields presented in Fig. 5 (the position of specific eddies analysed in this study is indicated by numbers).

Fig. 8: Relative vorticity (East-West and North-South transects, vertical profile) of eddies correctly identified : a- cyclonic surface eddy, b-anticyclonic surface eddy, c- cyclonic subsurface eddy, d-anticyclonic subsurface eddy. The position of each vortex (denoted 8a, b, c and d) is indicated in Fig. 7. Fig. 9: SLA (left panel, same as Fig. 5a but with fewer contours) and Index χ_{ρ} (right panel, same as Fig. 7). Eddies that are correctly identified by the index are labelled with crosses (+). Eddies that are not correctly identified by the index are labelled with stars (*).

968 Fig.10: Vorticity structure of the 4 eddies which the index yields wrong results. For each 969 vortex, we have represented the East-West and North-South transects of relative vorticity, and 970 a mean vertical profile near the center. The positions of each vortex (denoted 10a, b, c and d) 971 are also given on Fig.7.

- Fig. 11: Diagram representing the monthly statistics of vortices identification for the
 numerical simulation used in the study (the black intervals represent the standard deviation
 for each month over the seven years of simulation).
- 975 Fig. 12: Same as Fig. 9 but using χ_T instead of χ_p . Eddies that are correctly identified by the 976 index are labelled with crosses (+). Eddies that are not correctly identified by the index are 977 labelled with stars (*).
- 978 Fig.A.1: Vertical section of vorticity, QGPV and density fields for a surface anticyclone with 979 $\delta \rho_0 = -0.02^{-0}/_{00}$, R= 50 km, $H_v = 200m$, $z_0 = 0m$ and $Q_0 = -0.5f$ (left column) and 980 reconstructed fields for ISQG (middle column) and SQG (right column).
- Fig. A.2: Vorticity, QGPV and density fields for a surface anticyclone with $\delta \rho_0 = 0$. $^0/_{00}$, R= 50 km, $H_v = 200m$, $z_0 = 300m$ and $Q_0 = -0.5f$ (left column) and reconstructed fields for ISQG (middle column) and SQG (right column).
- Fig. A.3: Vorticity, QGPV and density fields for a surface anticyclone with $\delta \rho_0 = 0.02^{-0}/_{00}$, R= 50 km, $H_v = 200m$, $z_0 = 300m$ and $Q_0 = -0.5f$ (left column) and reconstructed fields for ISQG (middle column) and SQG (right column).
- 987





Fig. 1: Chosen density profile $\overline{\rho}(z)$ and stratification (panel a) and vertical structure of the first three baroclinic modes (panel b).



Fig. 2: Isopycnal displacements, SLA and SST anomaly for: a) the four different eddies types.b) a subsurface eddy with a mixed layer.





Fig. 3: Sensitivity study of the index to: a) the filter radius and the current width, b) the jet intensity and its width, c) the jet intensity and the distance jet-eddy.



Fig. 4: SSH in m (a) and SST in $^{\circ}$ C (b) over the Peru-Chile domain on February (1st) of the last year (7th) of the climatological simulation.



Fig. 5: SLA in m (a), SSTA in $^{\circ}$ C (b) and SSpA in kg.m⁻³ (c), where the "anomalies" are calculated from the total fields presented in Fig. 4.



Fig. 6: SSpA in kg.m⁻³superimposed on the SLA (black lines)



Fig. 7: Map of the index χ_p (red for positive index and subsurface vortices, blue for negative index and surface vortices) superimposed on the SLA (red lines) in the Peru-Chile area calculated from the fields presented in Fig. 5 (the position of specific eddies analysed in this study is indicated by numbers).









Fig. 8: Relative vorticity (East-West and North-South transects, vertical profile) of eddies correctly identified: a- cyclonic surface eddy, b-anticyclonic surface eddy, c- cyclonic subsurface eddy, d-anticyclonic subsurface eddy. The position of each vortex (denoted 8a, b, c and d) is indicated in Fig. 7.



Fig. 9: SLA (left panel, same as Fig. 5a but with fewer contours) and Index χ_{ρ} (right panel, same as Fig. 7). Eddies that are correctly identified by the index are labelled with crosses (+). Eddies that are not correctly identified by the index are labelled with stars (*).









Fig.10: Vorticity structure of the 4 eddies which the index yields wrong results. For each vortex, we have represented the East-West and North-South transects of relative vorticity, and a mean vertical profile near the center. The positions of each vortex (denoted 10a, b, c and d) are also given on Fig.7.



Fig. 11: Diagram representing the monthly statistics of vortices identification for the

numerical simulation used in the study (the black intervals represent the standard deviation for each month over the seven years of simulation).



Fig. 12: Same as Fig. 9 but using χ_T instead of χ_ρ . Eddies that are correctly identified by the index are labelled with crosses (+). Eddies that are not correctly identified by the index are labelled with stars (*).



Fig. A.1: Vertical section of vorticity, QGPV and density fields for a surface anticyclone with $\delta \rho_0 = -0.02^{-0}/_{00}$, R= 50 km, $H_v = 200m$, $z_0 = 0m$ and $Q_0 = -0.5f$ (left column) and reconstructed fields for ISQG (middle column) and SQG (right column).



Fig. A.2: Vorticity, QGPV and density fields for a surface anticyclone with $\delta \rho_0 = 0$. $^0/_{00}$, R= 50 km, $H_v = 200m$, $z_0 = 300m$ and $Q_0 = -0.5f$ (left column) and reconstructed fields for ISQG (middle column) and SQG (right column).



Fig. A.3: Vorticity, QGPV and density fields for a surface anticyclone with $\delta \rho_0 = 0.02^{-0}/_{00}$, R= 50 km, $H_v = 200m$, $z_0 = 300m$ and $Q_0 = -0.5f$ (left column) and reconstructed fields for ISQG (middle column) and SQG (right column).