Mesoscale eddy characteristics in the interior subtropical southeast Indian Ocean, tracked from the Leeuwin Current system
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Abstract: Two oppositely rotating mesoscale eddies, originating from the Leeuwin Current, were captured during a research cruise in the interior southeast Indian Ocean in August 2012, a few hundred kilometers off the west coast of Australia. The two eddies had different vertical structures: the anticyclonic eddy had stronger vertical shear above 200m and a less stratified thermocline below the mixed layer, while the cyclonic eddy had a more barotropic structure in the upper 500 m. Compared with the same types of eddies sampled in 2003 close to the Australian coast, the 2012 anticyclonic eddy had a larger radius, deeper isothermal depths, and higher peak velocity; whereas the 2012 cyclonic eddy had a similar structure with the 2003 survey. We use an Argo float and three surface drifters deployed and trapped in the anticyclonic eddy to track its evolution over a 4-month period. The eddy was observed to propagate 1000 km further to the west, indicating that the Leeuwin Current properties of the eddy may be preserved for over 2000 km off the west coast of Australia. The eddy appeared to have experienced radial excursions relative to the eddy center, with periodicity of 4-6 days and 15 days, during their anticlockwise motions. The radial movements of the drifters appeared to be constrained by the radial momentum balance within the eddy. The importance of eddy distortions to ocean primary production in anticyclonic eddies in the southeast Indian Ocean warrants further studies.
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1. Introduction

Mesoscale eddies are important in transporting heat and water properties in the ocean and play a leading role in the global ocean energy distributions (Qiu and Chen, 2010). Eddies also play an important role in pumping nutrients into the euphotic zone to drive primary production in the ocean (McGillivray et al. 2008). The Leeuwin Current in the southeast Indian Ocean possesses stronger mesoscale eddy energy than other mid-latitude eastern boundary current systems (Feng et al. 2005; Zheng et al. 2018). Eddy activities in the Leeuwin Current are important in the heat and momentum balances of the boundary current (Feng et al. 2005; Domingues et al. 2006) and regional biogeochemical processes (Moore et al. 2007; Paterson et al. 2008; Waite et al. 2016).

Anticyclonic eddies from the Leeuwin Current are found to propagate long distances offshore (Morrow et al. 2003), potentially affecting water properties in the interior Indian Ocean. Anticyclonic eddies trap high chlorophyll shelf waters as they are formed by instability of the poleward Leeuwin Current (Rennie et al. 2007). These eddies are found to maintain their high chlorophyll concentration signatures for long periods of time after they propagate into the interior southern Indian Ocean (Feng et al., 2007; Greenwood et al., 2007). Cold-core cyclonic eddies also form through instability of the Leeuwin Current, although they capture less productive offshore waters (Rennie et al. 2007). In the southern Indian Ocean, warm-core anticyclonic eddies tend to be more productive compared to cyclonic eddies (Gaube et al., 2013; Dufois et al., 2014). In addition to the offshore nutrient/biomass transport, high chlorophyll concentrations in warm-core anticyclonic eddies in the southern Indian Ocean have also been attributed to eddy Ekman pumping (Gaube et al., 2013), and wintertime entrainment mixing (Dufois et al., 2014).

Satellite altimeter data are the main tool to identify and define mesoscale eddies in the open ocean (Chelton et al. 2007). Altimeter sea level anomaly (SLA) data has been widely used in tracking mesoscale eddies, and the methods of identifying
mesoscale eddies are evolving (Qiu and Chen, 2010; Dong et al., 2011, Faghmous et al. 2017). One of the most commonly used methods is based on the properties of the Okubo–Weiss parameter (Okubo, 1970; Weiss, 1991), which is frequently used to detect eddies from SLA data (Isern-Fontanet et al. 2003; Morrow et al. 2004; Chelton et al. 2007; 2011). Another method can be classified as a hybrid: a physical quantity (SLA) is used to identify eddies, and the streamlines of the flow field are used to define eddy boundaries (Chaigneau et al. 2008). Nencioli et al. (2010) developed an algorithm in which eddy detection is based on velocity derivatives as well as from the SLA field. Oceanic surface drifter trajectories have also been used to identify eddies based on looping segments within a drifter trajectory (Li et al. 2011; Peng et al., 2015a; Peng et al., 2015b). The accuracy of these eddy definitions needs to be evaluated using in situ observations (Isern-Fontanet, et al. 2003; Peliz, et al. 2005; Feng et al. 2007; Dickey et al.2008; Nencioli et al. 2008; Paterson, et al. 2008; Kersale, et al. 2013).

In August-September 2012, research vessel (R/V) Southern Surveyor sampled an anticyclonic eddy and a cyclonic eddy in the interior subtropical southeast Indian Ocean, with the aim to better characterise the 3-dimensional physical and biogeochemical structure of the Leeuwin Current eddies. These observations provided a unique opportunity to examine the physical dynamics of these eddies which were likely sourced from the Leeuwin Current system. This would allow us to understand the relative roles of the deep nutrient pump due to eddy dynamics, and mixing and nitrogen fixation in maintaining the high chlorophyll concentrations in the anticyclonic eddies, in contrast with the physical processes at work in the cyclonic eddy.

In this paper, we examine data from one bio-Argo float and three surface drifters deployed in one anticyclonic (anti-clockwise rotating, warm-core) eddy, and one bio-Argo float in a cyclonic (clockwise rotating, cold-core) eddy. Both eddies were surveyed in the subtropical southeast Indian Ocean during the R/V Southern Surveyor voyage in late 2012. Our focus is determining the physical characteristics of each eddy based on the looping trajectories of the floats and drifters, as well as the shipboard
survey. Section 2 of this paper describes the methods used for eddy detection and
tracking. Section 3 shows results from the eddy structure and eddy tracking; in Section
4, we summarize the results, and discuss the comparisons with a Leeuwin Current eddy
pair surveyed in 2003 as well as examine an oscillatory feature identified in the
anticyclonic eddy. A companion paper will examine the changing biomass properties
within the eddies based on the biogeochemical data “Biogeochemical Argo floats reveal
the vertical structure of Indian Ocean eddies”, Strutton et al., In prep.)

2. Data and Methods

2.1 Data

The primary data used in this study are trajectories from two bio-Argo floats and
three surface drifters that were deployed from R.V. Southern Surveyor V04 (11 August
– 6 September 2012) in the subtropical southeast Indian Ocean. We named the sea
surface drifters S1, S2, and S3, and named the bio-Argo floats A1 and A2 (Table 1).
The three drifters and A1 were used to study an anticyclonic eddy, and A2 was used to
study a cyclonic eddy. The instruments were trapped in the two eddies for 3-4 months
(Figs. 1).

The Argo floats were Teledyne Webb Research APEX floats equipped with
SBE41 CTD, Iridium telemetry, Aanderaa Oxygen Optode 3830 and WetLabs
FLBBCD-AP2 bio-optical sensors. The floats were programmed to cycle continuously
between the surface and 300 dbar, descending to 2000 dbar every 3 days to allow
calibration of the salinity sensor. The CTD data was binned into 2 dbar depth.

The surface drifters were provided by the Global Surface Drifter Program
(http://www.aoml.noaa.gov/phod/dac/index.php). They were fitted with a holey-sock
drogue centered at 15 m depth to measure mixed layer currents and near-surface
temperature. Data was transmitted every 6 hours to the Argos satellites and was
available on the GTS in near-real time.
Shipboard observations included underway acoustic Doppler current profiling (ADCP), and thirty CTD and lowered ADCP (LADCP) profiles to 2000 dbar. The Teledyne RDI 75kHz ADCP measured the ocean currents from 29 m to about 500 m depth in 8 m bins. The CTD unit was a Seabird SBE 911plus CTD. Bottle samples were taken at 12 depths on each station to calibrate the salinity and oxygen sensors, and to measure nutrients. The LADCP is not discussed in this paper because the shipboard ADCP data provided continuous sampling across the eddy and was consistent with the LADCP data at the CTD/LADCP stations. Bad weather during the sampling of the cyclonic eddy resulted in some data gaps in the shipboard ADCP record.

Satellite altimeter SLA data from 1 January 2012 to 31 December 2015 were used to track the lifetime of the eddy. We obtained the data from Archiving Validation and Interpretation of Satellite Oceanographic data (AVISO) (ftp://ftp.aviso.altimetry.fr/). Merged sea level anomaly (SLA) data came from two satellite missions, TOPEX/Poseidon and ERS, followed by Jason-1 and Envisat (AVISO, 2006). The mapped altimetry dataset included one map every day with a 0.25° spatial resolution on a Mercator grid (Ducet et al. 2000). The sea level anomalies - which by definition provide the differences of the sea level with respect to a reference mean - may display a much weaker signal than the sea level with respect to the geoid for slowly evolving eddies, because part of the quasi-permanent signal of the eddy is absorbed in the reference mean. The two eddies studied in the manuscript seem to be quite dynamical, so that their signal is not attenuated in the sea level anomalies.

World Ocean Atlas 2013 data are obtained from NOAA National Oceanographic Data Center (Boyer et al. 2013).

2.2 Methods

Statistical census of eddies from Lagrangian drifter trajectory data has been conducted in many studies (e.g., Richardson, 1993; Chaigneau and Pizarro, 2005; Shoosmith et al. 2005; Fratantoni and Richardson, 2006; Hamilton, 2007; Berti et al.,
2011; Li et al., 2011; Schroeder et al., 2012; Zu et al., 2012). Similarly, satellite altimeter data has been used extensively to investigate the global characteristics of mesoscale variability (e.g. Ducet et al. 2000; Morrow et al. 2003, 2004; Chelton et al. 2007; Gaube et al. 2013). Here we focus on two methods to track the eddies in which our instruments were trapped. The first method is based on the drifter and Argo trajectory data, following Li et al. (2011). The second uses satellite SLA data following Nencioli et al. (2010).

Li et al. (2011) developed a method that uses discrete loops in the trajectories of surface drifters to determine the changing position and radius of eddies. When a loop is a closed and continuous curve, with its starting point overlapped by its ending point, an eddy is identified. Following their method, we identify the eddy center as follows: 1) find overlapping points along surface drifter trajectories; 2) quality-control the overlapping points to eliminate false points and avoid losing internal overlapping points; 3) determine the polarity of loops; 4) cluster loop trajectories into individual eddies (Fig. 3). The loop center is estimated by geometrically averaging all the sample points along the looping trajectory.

We compared three ways to define the loop (eddy) radius $R$ from the trajectory data: 1) $R$ is the mean distance between all loop points to the loop center (Li et al., 2011; Zheng et al., 2015); 2) $R$ is estimated from the mean looping period ($T$) and mean swirl speed ($V_s$) using the relation $R = V_s * T / 2 \pi$ (Shoosmith et al., 2005); 3) $R = (ab)^{1/2}$, where $a$ is the minimum distance between loop points and the loop center, $b$ is the maximum distance between loop points and the center (Hamilton et al. 1999).

We also used satellite SLA data to track the eddies followed by the instruments. The algorithm is based exclusively on the geometry of geostrophic velocities determined from satellite SLA (Nencioli et al. 2010). The track of a given eddy at time step $t$ is updated by searching for eddy centers of the same type (e.g. anticyclonic) at time $t+1$ within a searching area of 50 $\times$ 50 km centered around the eddy location.
time $t$. Eddy boundaries were defined as the outermost closed streamline around the eddy center. From the altimeter data, the eddy radius is simply the mean distance from the eddy center to the eddy boundary.

For the anticyclonic eddy, we average the eddy centers determined from the 3 drifters and the altimeter data and then smooth in time to define the eddy centers that are used to reference the various datasets. For the cyclonic eddy, the eddy centres are only available from the altimeter data. The tangential velocity of the eddies were calculated as a function of distance from the identified eddy centers. The shipboard ADCP velocities at 29m were projected to the tangential direction relative to the eddy center on the day of the ADCP transect across each eddy. The radius was determined using the distance from the center to where the ADCP tangential velocity reached a maximum value. The drifter velocities were projected to the tangential direction relative to the 6-hourly moving eddy center.

We calculate the power spectrum of the drifter positions relative to the eddy centre using the method of Papadakis and Lawrence (1993), which is available in the Matlab function rednoise.m. We calculated the red noise spectrum over 100 realizations.

Mixed layer depth (MLD) was defined as the depth at which there was a $0.125 \sigma_o$ increment from the density at 10 m depth in individual CTD profiles from the shipboard and bio-Argo data.

3. Results

3.1 Eddy structures from shipboard observations

The two mesoscale eddies sampled during the August 2012 cruise period were an anticyclonic warm-core eddy located at 105°E, 26.5°S, and a cyclonic cold-core eddy located at 109.5°E, 32.6°S (Fig. 1). The two eddies were identified by their sea level
anomaly signatures and the cruise track crossed the centers of both eddies. From the shipboard ADCP current measurements, the eddy centers were identified as the locations of minimum velocities along the cruise track. The tangential velocities of the eddies increased approximately linearly with distance from the center before reaching maximum values at about 80 km (anticyclonic) and 50 km (cyclonic).

The anticyclonic eddy had a bowl shape with isotherms depressed by around 100 m at the centre of the eddy relative to the edges (Fig. 2a). The core of the eddy was warm and fresh, with isohalines displaying the same bowl shape. The low salinity signature (~35 psu) in the surface layer is likely derived from its Leeuwin Current source (Feng et al. 2007). High salinity subtropical water (STW) forms a subsurface salinity maximum at 100-300 m depth above a low salinity layer below 400 m depth. The eddy structure extended to the 2000 m limit of the CTD observations.

Within the cyclonic eddy, the isotherms displayed a significant dome shape only below 300m (Fig. 2d, e), which is consistent with weak vertical shear in the eddy (Fig. 2f). There was strong stratification and weak current shear (high Richardson number) below the mixed layer of the cyclonic eddy and the mixing across the base of the mixed layer may not be strong (not shown). Although vertical shear was weak in the cyclonic eddy, the rotational velocities were as strong as those encountered in the surface of the high shear anticyclonic eddy. High salinity subtropical water in the mixed layer of the cyclonic eddy capped the low salinity Antarctic Intermediate Water in the subsurface. (Fig.2e).

We investigated the likely Leeuwin Current origin of the warm core eddy by comparing its T-S structure with profiles from the World Ocean Atlas. Figure 3 compares the T-S profile from shipboard data at the centre of the anticyclonic eddy, and a WOA profile at the location where the eddy was first seen in the altimeter record (Section 3.2). We also show the profile at the centre of the cyclonic eddy for contrast. It is clear from the features in T-S profiles that the watermass properties of the
anticyclonic eddy are consistent with it forming within the Leeuwin Current. The warmer and fresher signature of the anticyclonic eddy mixed layer salinity in the CTD observations relative to WOA may be related to the warming and freshening of the Indonesian Throughflow and the Leeuwin Current prior to the survey period associated with the Pacific climate variability (Feng et al. 2015a, b).

In summary, the anticyclonic eddy was larger and stronger than the cyclonic eddy in the surface layer. The two eddies had different vertical structures; the anticyclonic eddy had stronger vertical shear above 200 m and a less stratified thermocline below the mixed layer, while the cyclonic eddy had a more barotropic structure in the upper 500 m and the isothermal doming did not reach the surface layer.

3.2 Eddy tracking

We follow the observed anticyclonic and cyclonic eddy using sea level anomaly, sea surface temperature and surface chlorophyll. Figure 4 shows monthly maps of these fields, from September 2012 to February 2013 while the instruments were within the eddies. The tracks of drifters and Argo floats during each month are overlaid, clearly showing the floats stayed within the eddies. Examining the SLA data prior to the voyage, we saw that the anticyclonic eddy spun off the Leeuwin Current in May 2012 (Fig. 5), whereas the cyclonic eddy developed away from the coast in July 2012. The anticyclonic eddy could be tracked from 28 April 2012 to 19 February 2013, with its radius ranging from 34 km to 180 km with an average of 100 km, and its amplitude ranging from 36 to 49 cm. The cyclonic eddy could be tracked from 16 July 2012 to 25 July 2014. Its radius ranged from 36 km to 106 km with an average of 66 km. Both eddies moved westward. The anticyclonic eddy moved at an average of 13.7 km/day and the cyclonic eddy at 2.7 km/day, based on the speed of translation of the eddy centers.

We next examine the eddy characteristics determined directly from the drifter and float trajectories. All instruments experienced looping trajectories and we identified
between 6 and 17 closed loops within each trajectory (Figure 6, Table 1). The loops within the anticyclonic eddy were large and clear over the 1000 km distance it travelled during the 4 month period. The loops from the Argo float in the cyclonic eddy were large and clear at the start of the record but the radius reduced dramatically in the middle of the record to the point where the looping appeared to be more like inertial circles. We examined the position of the Argo float relative to the eddy, stepping through the altimeter record in increments of 14 days (Figure 7). It is clear that the float stayed within the core of the eddy over its lifetime. The shrinking of the loops suggests that there was convergent flow within the eddy that caused the float to be drawn towards the centre of the eddy, dramatically shrinking the loop radii toward the end of the record.

### 3.3 Rotation of the anticyclonic eddy

The tangential velocities of the anticyclonic eddy derived from drifter tracks (Section 2.2) are compared with ADCP measured velocities in Figure 8, which shows the relationship between the near surface (29 m) tangential velocity and distance to eddy center in the anticyclonic eddy. The black line is the second order polynomial fit of the zonal (tangential) velocity from the meridional ADCP section across the anticyclonic eddy. Maximum velocities of about 50 cm/s were found at a radius of 90 km, while velocities at larger distances from the center tended to decrease. Linear fits to the drifter velocities were close to the polynomial fit to the ADCP data out to about 60 km. Beyond 60 km, the polynomial fit to the ADCP data showed a further increase in velocity to a maximum at a radius of about 90 km. At 90 km, the relative vorticity was about 1.1% of the Coriolis parameter, $f$, suggesting that the edges of this eddy are in geostrophic balance. Thus, the geostrophic relationship is suitable to be used to determine the tangential velocity at the eddy edges from altimetry measurements.

### 3.3 Distortions of the anticyclonic eddy

When tracked relative to the center of the anticyclonic eddy, all 3 drifters followed
close to circular paths around the eddy centers (Fig. 9 a-c), however, the time series of
the distance of each drifter from the eddy center contained periodic fluctuations (Fig. 9
d). In the power spectrum calculated from the distance between each drifter and the
eddy center, there was a significant peak at 0.23 cpd, corresponding to a 4.4 day period
for S1, and a 0.25 cpd peak, or 4.0 days period for S3. The S2 spectrum had two peaks
at 0.16 cpd and 0.22 cpd, or 6.4 days and 4.5 days period, respectively (Fig. 9). Thus,
all of the 3 drifters showed short period oscillations of 4-6 days relative to the
anticyclonic eddy center.

To quantify the relationship between horizontal distance and the vertical movement
of isopycnals at the center of the anticyclonic eddy, we adopted a universal structure in
normalized stretched coordinates, following Zhang et al. (2013). Horizontally, the
isopycnal depth anomaly is described by a function of the normalized radial distance
from the eddy center \( R(r_n) = (1 - r_n^2/2) \cdot \exp(-r_n^2/2) \), where \( r_n \) is the radial distance
from the eddy center. We define \( H_n \) as the depth of the 25.5 kg/m³ isopycnal at the
eddy center, \( H_{rn} \) means the depth of the 25.5 kg/m³ isopycnal at the radial distance
\( r_n \). Therefore, the standardized isopycnal depth anomaly at the eddy center is,

\[
H_0 = H_{rn} / R(r_n) = H_{rn} / \left( (1 - r_n^2/2) \cdot \exp(-r_n^2/2) \right)
\]

The variations of mixed layer depth
derived from the A1 Argo data agreed well with variations in isopycnal depths, and
when the Argo float moved away from the eddy center, both the mixed layer depth and
isopycnal depth became shallower (Fig. 10). There appeared to be a periodicity of ~15
days of the position of the A1 Argo float relative to the anticyclonic eddy center (not
shown). It is not surprising that the periodicity of the Argo float is quite different to that
of the drifters given that it profiles to 300 dbar continuously whereas the drifters stay at
the sea surface.

4. Summary and Discussion
In this study, we used satellite data, sea surface drifters, Argo and shipboard data to track two mesoscale eddies and their evolving characteristics in the southeast Indian Ocean during 2012. The anticyclonic eddy formed in the Leeuwin Current off the west coast of Australia; whereas the cyclonic eddy was first detected offshore of the Leeuwin Current. Three surface drifters and one Argo float tracked the anticyclonic eddy for four months, and one Argo float tracked the cyclonic eddy for the same period. The anticyclonic eddy had larger amplitude and faster tangential velocity than the cyclonic eddy in the surface layer. The two eddies had different vertical structures: anticyclonic eddy had stronger vertical shear above 200m and a less stratified thermocline below the mixed layer, while the cyclonic eddy had a more barotropic structure in the upper 500 m. Compared with the same types of eddies sampled in 2003, as described by Feng et al. (2007), the anticyclonic eddy was farther away from the coast, had a larger radius, deeper isothermal depths, and higher peak velocity; whereas the cyclonic eddy had a similar structure to that sampled in 2003 (Table 2). The peak velocity of the anticyclonic eddy decreased from 73 cm s\(^{-1}\) at 30 m to about 40 cm s\(^{-1}\) at 300 m, while the peak velocity of the cyclonic eddy was almost constant with depth at around 60-70 cm s\(^{-1}\) in the upper 400 m. The radius of the anticyclonic eddy was about 80 km and the radius of the cyclonic eddy was about 50 km.

Eddy characteristics derived from drifters are compared with those from satellite and shipboard data. Table 3 shows the mean period of the drifter track loops, and mean radii of the loops estimated using the 3 methods for the anticyclonic eddy described in Section 2.2. The mean periods determined for the 3 drifters were similar, while the mean radius varied by up to a factor of 2 between drifters, and between methods, especially for S1 and S3. The mean radius and range of radii, derived from satellite data (Nencioli et al. 2010), are also shown in Table 3. The satellite-derived radius was 2-5 times larger than that observed by the drifters. The mean radius estimated from shipboard data (80 km, Fig.3) was also two times larger than observed by the drifters. This suggests that the drifters were following interior streamlines of the eddy and that
the radii of closed-loop trajectories were not indicative of the size of the eddy.

Based on three drifters and one Argo float, the anticyclonic eddy appeared to have experienced 4-6 day and 15-day oscillations of the eddy. The oscillatory nature of the drifter movements denotes strong alternating divergent and convergent motions in the interior of the eddy, which warrants further study. Earlier studies noticed that eddy pumping leads to rich plankton within eddies (Jyothibabu et al. 2015; Weller et al. 2013). The oscillatory feature of eddy may suggest upwelling and downwelling motion within the eddy, providing new insight into the vertical exchanges in the eddy, which may induce mixing and bring nutrients up toward the sea surface.

The physical description of the present study will aid the interpretation of the biogeochemical processes in the two eddies using shipboard survey and bio-Argo data in future studies. The contrast of the two types of eddy structures are consistent with the census of eddies based on satellite altimeter data in the southern Indian Ocean (Gaube et al. 2013; Dufois et al. 2014), with the anticyclonic eddy being more dynamic and potentially more prone for vertical nutrient fluxes whereas the cyclonic eddy having a weaker upwelling and vertical mixing in the near-surface layer. The oscillatory feature of the anticyclonic eddy may also contribute to the nutrient fluxes, which is explained by the momentum balance within the eddy in the following section.

Momentum balance of the anticyclonic eddy

Following Zhang et al. (2015), the standardized radial distance ($\gamma$) of a given point inside an eddy relative to the eddy center is defined as $\gamma = \frac{A - a}{A}$, where $A$ is the amplitude of the eddy and $a$ is the SLA difference between the point and the eddy edge. The eddy edge was determined by the maximum tangential geostrophic velocity. The geostrophic current velocities from altimeter SLA data were used to derive the relative
vorticity within the eddy. The area-averaged Rossby number \( \varepsilon \) of the eddy is given by,

\[
\varepsilon = \frac{\left| \nabla g \right|}{f},
\]

where \( \left| \nabla g \right| \) is the absolute area-averaged geostrophic vorticity within the eddy edge and \( f \) is the Coriolis parameter (Zhang et al., 2015).

The momentum balance equation is

\[
-g \frac{\partial h}{\partial r} + f v + \frac{v^2}{r} = 0
\]  

(1)

where \( h \) is the SLA, \( r \) the radial distance outward from the eddy center, \( v \) the tangential velocity, and \( g \) the gravitational acceleration. Assuming that the rotational velocity is the sum of geostrophic and ageostrophic currents \( (v = v_g + v_{ag}) \) and sea level slope is balanced by Coriolis acceleration due to geostrophic current, the above equation can be rewritten as

\[
v_{ag}^2 + (2v_g + rf)v_{ag} + v_g^2 = 0
\]  

(2)

The solution of \( v_{ag} \) in this equation is possible if \( -\frac{v_g}{r} \leq 0.25f \), i.e., \( \varepsilon \leq 0.25 \). That is to say, a water parcel can be stable if the Rossby number \( \varepsilon \leq 0.25 \), otherwise it is unstable because of the imbalance of radial momentum. When \( \varepsilon > 0.25 \), the sum of pressure gradient, Coriolis, and centrifugal forces is inward and a parcel tends to move toward the eddy center. When \( \varepsilon > 0.25 \), the balance of forces is outward, driving a parcel toward the eddy edge until a new balance is set up.

Figure 11a shows the time series of distance from the anticyclonic eddy center. The black line is the eddy radius from SLA, and the colored lines are the distance from the eddy center of the three drifters. After 25 Sep. 2012, the eddy became stabilized and the floats were trapped within about 60 km from the eddy center. The eddy radius increased from 60 km to 120 km during 25 September to 30 December, denoting the decay phase of the eddy.
The drifters in the anticyclonic eddy experienced large radial excursions during the 18-30 September period, with radial oscillations of about 20-60 km and periodicity of about 5 days. We have chosen three time slices, T1 on 30 Sep. 2012, T2 on 10 Oct. 2012, and T3 on 20 Oct. 2012, to analyze the relationship between the local Rossby number and the radial movement of the drifters.

Overall, the local Rossby numbers decreased with standardized radial distance, $\gamma$: at T1 it decreased from 0.33 at the eddy center to 0.06 at the eddy edge; at T2 it decreased from 0.36 to 0.08; at T3 it decreased from 0.35 to 0.14. At T1 (Fig. 11b), the local Rossby number values at the three drifter locations were mostly under 0.25, indicating that all the drifters were forced by surface convergence to move inward toward the eddy center, as indicated in Figure 11a. At T2 (Fig. 11c), the Rossby number values of S1 and S3 within the inner area $\gamma \leq 0.3$ were above 0.25, indicating that water parcels in this inner area were forced to move outward; the Rossby number values of S2 within the area $\gamma \geq 0.5$ were under 0.25, indicating that the parcels in this inner area were forced to move inward. At T3 (Fig. 11d), the Rossby number values of most points within the eddy were above 0.25, indicating that the parcels in the eddy were forced to move outward.

Overall, the oscillatory feature of the anticyclonic eddy suggests a dynamic distortion of the eddy, alternating between convergence and divergence of volume at the eddy centre, which may be important for biogeochemical processes within the eddy. A more detailed evaluation of the relationship between the dynamics of the oscillatory feature and the variability in biogeochemical properties of the eddy needs to be undertaken to better understand their roles in vertical nutrient fluxes in the anticyclonic eddies in the subtropical oceans. Future work is needed to address the question of whether the productivity of warm core Leeuwin Current eddies gradually decays from the level present at formation of the eddy, or whether processes such as dynamic distortion can stimulate productivity through vertical nutrient fluxes to sustain phytoplankton biomass.
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Table 1. Deployment information for the three drifters and two Argo floats, and the numbers of loops observed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WMO ID</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Eddy</th>
<th>Start Position (lat, lon)</th>
<th>First obs.</th>
<th>Last obs.</th>
<th>Loops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>109245</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Anticyclonic</td>
<td>27.00°S, 105.00°E</td>
<td>22 Sep 2012</td>
<td>26 Jan 2013</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109251</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Anticyclonic</td>
<td>26.51°S, 105.02°E</td>
<td>25 Sep 2012</td>
<td>26 Dec 2012</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109543</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Anticyclonic</td>
<td>26.51°S, 105.02°E</td>
<td>17 Sep 2012</td>
<td>13 Feb 2013</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5904218</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Anticyclonic</td>
<td>26.00°S, 105.00°E</td>
<td>22 Sep 2012</td>
<td>10 Dec 2012</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5903955</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Cyclonic</td>
<td>32.60°S, 109.50°E</td>
<td>3 Sep 2012</td>
<td>27 Dec 2012</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Selected eddy properties determined from the 2012 shipboard data compared with eddies observed in 2003. Eddy properties for the 2003 eddies are from Feng et al. (2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anticyclonic eddy</th>
<th>Cyclonic eddy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center longitude</td>
<td>105°E</td>
<td>111°46.10'E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center latitude</td>
<td>26°30'S</td>
<td>31°8.10'S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average radius (km)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak velocity (cm s⁻¹)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height amplitude (cm)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.5 °C isotherm D (m)</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential vorticity (ζ+f)/D (m⁻¹ s⁻¹)</td>
<td>-2.77×10⁻⁶</td>
<td>-2.1×10⁻⁷</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Rotation period and the mean and range of loop radius for 3 surface drifters in an anticyclonic eddy, determined by the 3 methods as described in Section 2.2. Loop radius derived from the satellite SLA data is also included for comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Period(day)</th>
<th>Drifters Radius (km)</th>
<th>SLA Radius (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Method 1</td>
<td>Method 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>7.96 (4.25-16.75)</td>
<td>40 (22-69)</td>
<td>22 (9-45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>7.11 (4.25-10.50)</td>
<td>42 (31-61)</td>
<td>40 (32-46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>6.65 (4.00-15.00)</td>
<td>22 (12-33)</td>
<td>40 (30-46)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure captions

Figure 1. Voyage tracks in 2012 with thirty-minute averaged shipboard ADCP velocities, averaged over the top 200m (vectors). CTD station positions (with station numbers) and trajectories of the 2 bio-optical Argo floats, and 3 surface drifters are shown. Dates are marked along the trajectories at 1 month intervals.

Figure 2. Vertical sections crossing the anticyclonic eddy along 105°E (left panels) and crossing the cyclonic eddy (right panels). Potential temperature (a, d), practical salinity, PSS-78 (b, e) and ADCP velocity normal to the sections: eastward velocity (c) and northward velocity (f).

Figure 3: Temperature-salinity profiles from the CTD stations at the centre of the anticyclonic eddy (105.0027°E, 26.4982°S) and cyclonic eddy (109.4986°E, 32.6201°S), and those from September World Ocean Atlas climatology at the formation location of the eddies, that is, 104.75°E-105.25°E, 26.25°S-26.75°S and 109.75°E-109.25°E, 32.25°S-32.75°S; the LC-WOA was from the area 113°E-115°E, 29°S-31°S in July 2012.

Figure 4: Monthly Argo float and drifter tracks in the anticyclonic eddy with monthly sea level anomalies (a-f), sea surface temperature anomalies (g-l), and surface chlorophyll concentrations (log-scale, m-r) during September 2012 to February 2013.

Figure 5. Sea surface height anomaly fields prior to the voyage in the southeast Indian Ocean on 28 May (a), 28 June (b), 28 July (c) and 28 August (d) of 2012. The dashed square follows the anticyclonic eddy in each panel, and the solid square follows the cyclonic eddy. The cyclonic eddy could not be identified in May and June. The solid lines denote the center locations of the cyclonic during its evolution.

Figure 6. Examples of loops detected using data from three drifters (a, b, c) and one Argo (d). The bold lines denote closed loops of drifter trajectories that are used to derive the eddy properties. The mean eddy drifting velocities are calculated from the
translation of the eddy centers derived from the closed loops of drifter trajectories. The WMO ID numbers of the drifters are labeled at the bottom left corner of each panel.

Figure 7. SLA map and Argo track (red line) from September 1st to December 21st. The magenta portion of the Argo track identifies the positions recorded on the day of the SLA image.

Figure 8. The relationship between tangential velocity of the anticyclonic eddy and distance from the eddy center. The gray dots are derived from the ADCP data at 29m level, fitted with a second order polynomial curve (black line). Colored dots are from 6-hourly drifter data. Blue, red and green lines are linear fits to the data points for the three drifters in the range of 0 to 60km from the eddy center.

Figure 9. Drifter position relative to the anticyclonic eddy center as calculated by subtracting the mean eddy position from the 6-hourly drifter positions (top); time-series of distance between the drifter position and eddy center (middle); the power spectrum of distance between the drifter position and eddy center (bottom). In the top panels, the black triangle means the start and the black square means the end of the trajectory. In the lower panels, the black lines are the red noise power spectrum of the distance to eddy centre, averaged over 100 realizations.

Figure 10. (a) Time series of distance to the anticyclonic eddy center for the Argo float (red curve) and mixed layer depth (blue curve) observed by Argo float A1 (ID: 5903955), and (b) evolution of upper ocean potential density measured from the Argo float. The mixed layer depth is defined as the depth where the density is 0.125 higher than that at 10 m depth. The red line in (b) highlights the 25.5 potential density contour.

Figure 11. Time series of distance from anticyclonic eddy center (a), the relationship between standardized radial distance and local Rossby number during time period T1 (b), T2 (c), and T3 (d). Black dashed line in (a) is the eddy radius from SLA data and the color lines show the distance of the three drifters. T1, T2, and T3 are three
representative one-day time periods. T1 is 30 Sep. 2012, T2 is 10 Oct. 2012, and T3 is 20 Oct. 2012. The local Rossby number values in (b), (c), and (d) of the drifters are calculated from local velocity gradients at the drifter locations. Solid lines are linearly fits to the data points.