

# Velocity gradients along particles trajectories in turbulent flows

Roberto Benzi,<sup>1</sup> Luca Biferale,<sup>1</sup> Enrico Calzavarini,<sup>2,3</sup> Detlef Lohse,<sup>2</sup> and Federico Toschi<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Dept Physics and INFN, University of Tor Vergata,  
Via della Ricerca Scientifica 1, 00133 Rome, Italy*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Applied Physics, University of Twente, 7500 AE Enschede, The Netherlands.*

<sup>3</sup>*Lab. de Physique, École Normale Supérieure de Lyon,  
CNRS UMR5672, 46 Allée d' Italie, 69007 Lyon, France.*

<sup>4</sup>*CNR-IAC, Viale del Policlinico 137, 00161 Roma, Italy, and  
INFN, Sezione di Ferrara, Via G. Saragat 1, 44100 Ferrara, Italy.*

(Dated: May 29, 2019)

We present an investigation of the statistics of velocity gradients along the trajectories of neutral tracers and of heavy/light particles advected by an homogeneous and isotropic turbulent flow. We propose a Lagrangian rephrasing of the Refined Kolmogorov Similarity Hypothesis (RKSH) and test its validity along the particle trajectories. We perform our study on state-of-the-art numerical data coming from numerical simulations up to  $Re_\lambda \sim 400$  with  $2048^3$  collocation points. We show that the Lagrangian RKSH is well verified for time lags larger than the typical response time of the particle,  $\tau_p$ . Implication of these findings for modeling of particle transport in many applied problems are also discussed.

PACS numbers: 47.27.-i, 47.10.-g

One of the most prominent feature of turbulent flows are the strong variations in the energy dissipation field, a phenomenon called intermittency [1]. In an attempt to describe quantitatively intermittent fluctuations, Kolmogorov and Oboukhov in 1962 [2] proposed a general relation linking velocity fluctuations, measured at a given spatial increment  $\delta_r u = u(x+r, t) - u(x, t)$ , with the statistical properties of the coarse grained energy dissipation,  $\varepsilon_r = r^{-3} \int_{\Lambda(r)} \varepsilon(\mathbf{x}) d^3x$  averaged over a volume,  $\Lambda(r)$ , of typical linear size  $r$ :

$$\delta_r u \sim r^{1/3} \varepsilon_r^{1/3}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\sim$  means "scales as". Equation (1) is known as the Refined Kolmogorov Similarity Hypothesis (RKSH) and it is considered to be one of the most remarkable relations between turbulent velocity fluctuations: many efforts has been devoted in the last decades to its validation [3, 4, 5]. The importance of RKSH cannot be underestimated: it bridges inertial range properties with small-scale properties, supporting the existence of an energy cascade mechanisms, statistically local in space. So far, a rather strong evidence supports the validity of the RKSH in the Eulerian frame (i.e. the laboratory frame). On the other hand, no investigation has been reported in the literature on the validity of RKSH in the Lagrangian frame. The main difficulty in studying RKSH in a moving reference frame stem from the necessity to make multi-point measurements along particle trajectories, in order to calculate the stress tensor. As a result, no experimental measurements along particle trajectories of velocity gradients exists for time long enough to be able to asses temporal correlations. Also numerical experiments are very demanding, requiring refined computation of velocity differences along particle trajectories, something usually implemented by a heavy use of Fast Fourier Trans-

form combined with off-grid interpolation. Here we report the first of such measurements using state-of-the-art DNS investigations.

When particles are transported in a turbulent environment, their trajectories are strongly sensitive to the statistical and topological properties of the advecting flow [6]; the possible validity of a RKSH in this context is far from being trivial and may shed new light on the physics of the transport of particulate by turbulent flows: an ubiquitous phenomena in nature and in industrial applications alike.

In the present manuscript we will extend the RKSH relation to the temporal domain and test its validity along the trajectories of fluid tracers and of heavy/light inertial particles. Together with the Eulerian field we integrated the Lagrangian evolution of point-particles by mean of a model of dilute suspensions of small passively advected spherical particles, as derived in Refs. [7, 8]:

$$\frac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt} = \mathbf{v}, \quad \frac{d\mathbf{v}}{dt} = \beta \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{Dt} + \frac{1}{\tau_p}(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}), \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$  denote the particle position and velocity, respectively. In Eq. (2)  $\tau_p = a^2/(3\beta\nu)$  is the particle response time and the Stokes number of the particle is defined as  $St = \tau_p/\tau_\eta$ ;  $\beta = 3\rho_f/(\rho_f+2\rho_p)$  is related to the ratio between the density of the particle and of the fluid. The incompressible fluid velocity  $\mathbf{u}$  evolves according to the Navier-Stokes equations :

$$D_t \mathbf{u} \equiv \partial_t \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} = -\nabla p + \nu \Delta \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{f}. \quad (3)$$

where  $p$  denotes the pressure and  $\mathbf{f}$  an external large-scale forcing injecting energy at a mean rate  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{f} \rangle$ . Eq. (3) is calculated by means of a pseudospectral code for the fluid part with a second order Adams-Bashforth




FIG. 1: Test of the RKSH along the trajectories of tracers and heavy particles. (a) For  $p = 4$  we show Eq. (5) for  $St = 0$  (circles) and  $St = 2$  (triangles). (b) We show the validity of Eq. (6) for the same values of  $p$  and  $St$ . Straight lines correspond to the theoretical scaling.

integrator, also used for the millions of particles evolving according to (2), integrated by means of tri-linear interpolation of the velocity field at the particle positions. Energy was injected by maintaining the spectral content of the first two shells in Fourier space constant. Here we will report data coming from two sets of simulations with  $N^3 = 2048^3$  and  $N^3 = 512^3$  collocation points, corresponding to  $Re_\lambda = 400$  and 185, respectively, and sampling the parameter space  $\beta \in [0 : 3]$ ,  $St \in [0 : 4]$  with 64 particles families. A total amount of  $\sim 10^8$  are tracked in time. Results on the clustering of these particles in the turbulence have already been reported in Ref. [10]. Inertia requires some time before particles reach their fractal (or multifractal) statistically stationary distributions [11, 12]. We therefore waited till the Lagrangian statistics became stationary before performing the measurements here presented.

We remark that effects of inertia may be of particular interest for the present study. Inertial particles are not distributed homogeneously in the volume, centrifugal force tends to concentrate light particle inside strong elliptical regions, with high vorticity [6, 9, 10]; and heavy particle in hyperbolic regions, typical of intense shear. One thus expects pretty different temporal correlations between particle trajectories and the underlying topology of the carrier flow. The topology is locally defined in terms of the symmetric and antisymmetric component of the velocity gradients  $A_{ij} = \partial_i u_j$ , hence the intimate link between the statistics of energy dissipation and/or enstrophy with particles' evolution [13, 14, 15].

Along the trajectory of a fluid tracer the velocity difference will be denoted as  $\delta_\tau v = v(t + \tau) - v(t)$  and similarly we define a coarse grained energy dissipation as measured along the trajectory as  $\varepsilon_\tau = \int_t^{t+\tau} \varepsilon(\mathbf{x}(t); t) dt$  (see also [17]). Translating the RKSH (1) from space to time by means of the definition of the eddy turnover time, i.e.  $r \sim \tau \delta_\tau v$ , one obtains the Lagrangian RKSH




FIG. 2: Test of the RKSH along the trajectories of tracers. It is plotted  $\langle (\delta_\tau v)^4 \rangle / (\langle (\delta_\tau v)^2 \rangle^2 \langle X_\tau^2 \rangle \langle X_\tau \rangle^{-2})$ : (circles) represent the case  $X = \varepsilon$ , (squares) the case  $X = \omega$ , and (triangles) the case  $X = \text{const.}$  In the inset the joint pdf:  $P(\varepsilon'_\tau, |\delta_\tau v|)$  and  $P(\Omega'_\tau, |\delta_\tau v|)$  at  $\tau = 13\tau_\eta$ ; (note that the prime symbol denotes variables normalized respect to their mean values, i.e.  $x' \equiv x/\langle x \rangle$ ).

(LRKSH):

$$\delta_\tau v \sim \tau^{1/2} \varepsilon_\tau^{1/2}. \quad (4)$$

In order to test Eq. (4) one should verify, for any exponent  $p$ , the scaling relations:

$$\langle (\delta_\tau v)^p \rangle \simeq \tau^{p/2} \langle \varepsilon_\tau^{p/2} \rangle, \quad (5)$$

(where  $\simeq$  means equal apart from a multiplicative constant depending only on  $p$ , in the inertial range). In contrast to the 4/5 law leading to exact scaling properties for third order velocity increments in the Eulerian frame, we do not have any exact scaling relation derivable from NS equations in the Lagrangian domain. Furthermore, it is known that in the Lagrangian frame, finite Reynolds effects induce larger deviations from a power law regime than what observed in Eulerian frame [16]. To overcome these effects, following [19], we can generalize the above expression by using its Extended Self Similarity (ESS) form, namely:

$$\langle (\delta_\tau v)^p \rangle \simeq \left( \frac{\langle (\delta_\tau v)^2 \rangle}{\langle \varepsilon_\tau \rangle} \right)^{p/2} \langle \varepsilon_\tau^{p/2} \rangle \quad (6)$$

In Figure 1(a) we present a test of Eq. (5) for  $p = 4$  for particles at  $St = 0$ , i.e. passive tracers (circles) and heavy particles with  $\beta = 0$ ,  $St = 2$  (triangles). In Figure 1(b), we show the relation from Eq. (6) for the same particle types. Two major results emerge. First the RKSH, as expressed by Eq. (6) is very well verified for the transport of particle in turbulent flows. The use of the ESS version

for the RKSH is able to overcome finite size effects which are usually observed at relatively low Reynolds number (see [16]). The second important result, which will be investigated in the following, comes from inspecting the validity of (6) for different Stokes numbers. Equation (6) is supposed to be valid both in the inertial range and in the dissipative range (where the velocity field is smooth) though with different offset. This is clearly observed in Figure 1(b) for the case  $St = 0$ . It is already known that by increasing the Stokes number, particles tend to escape from strong vorticity region, thus decreasing the effect of the dip present in between dissipative and inertial scales [18]. As a consequence, for  $St = 2$  we do not observe any deviation of Eq. (6) in the range of scales between the inertial and the dissipative ranges.

To have a more quantitative check, we look now at the ratio between the two sides of Eq. (6), namely at  $\langle(\delta_\tau v)^p\rangle$  divided by  $\langle\varepsilon_\tau^{p/2}\rangle\langle(\delta_\tau v)^2\rangle^{p/2}\langle\varepsilon_\tau\rangle^{-p/2}$ , as a function of the time difference  $\tau$ . In Figure 2 we show its behavior for the order  $p = 4$  fluid tracers particles. We observe a plateau (see circles symbols, in Fig 2) for  $\tau/\tau_\eta \geq 5$ . Notice that also in the dissipative range the compensation works well, as it should from the requirement that the velocity field becomes differentiable. However, the plotted ratio shows a mismatch with the value attained in the inertial range. The transition between the two plateaux occurs around the dissipative time scale, where the presence of vortex trapping has been shown to spoil the scaling behavior of Lagrangian structure functions  $\langle(\delta_\tau v)^p\rangle$  of the tracers [20, 21, 22]. In the same figure we show that using the coarse grained enstrophy, i.e.,  $\Omega_\tau$  instead of  $\varepsilon_\tau$ , the compensation is worse (squares). Similarly, compensation with enstrophy does not work neither for heavy nor for light particles(not shown). Compensating without coarse grained quantities, i.e. checking the deviation from dimensional, non-intermittent, scaling does not provide a good plateau (triangles in Fig 2). This result supports the validity of LRKSH only when using the energy dissipation as the main driving process along the particle motion. The behaviour for intense fluctuations (higher moments) cannot be checked quantitatively due to the lack of statistics. Nevertheless, in the same figure, we show the joint probability density functions,  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega_\tau, |\delta_\tau v|)$  and  $\mathcal{P}(\varepsilon_\tau, |\delta_\tau v|)$ , for a time lag  $\tau = 13 \tau_\eta$ . Velocity increments are more correlated with coarse-grained energy than with enstrophy, as shown by the high probability measured for simultaneous intense values of  $|\delta_\tau v|$  and  $\varepsilon_\tau$ . Having established the validity of the RKSH, we strive now at investigating the effect of different Stokes number and different inertial properties.

*Heavy particles ( $\beta = 0$ ) at changing  $St$*  . When particles have inertia their trajectories deviate from material lines of the flow. In principle, one expects that for very small value of the inertia (particles very close to tracers) no appreciable discrepancies with respect to the case of a tracer can be measured. A particle with a given Stokes




FIG. 3: Same as in fig. 2, here also along the trajectories of heavy particles. It is plotted  $\langle(\delta_\tau v)^4\rangle\langle\varepsilon_\tau\rangle^2 / (\langle\varepsilon_\tau^2\rangle\langle(\delta_\tau v)^2\rangle^2)$ . Particles with  $St = 0.6, 1.0, 2.0, 10.0$  are compared with the result for tracers (solid black line). The LRKSH is satisfied both in the inertial and in the dissipative ranges. The prefactors,  $A_I$  and  $A_D$ , however differs in the two regions. Notice that for the largest Stokes,  $St = 10$ , the smallest time lags where LRKSH is verified is correctly of the order of  $\tau \sim 10\tau_\eta$ . In the inset, the behavior of ratio of prefactors  $A_D/A_I$  is plotted vs.  $St$ . For small  $St$  values a behavior as  $St^{-0.38}$  is found (solid line in the inset).

$St = \tau/\tau_\eta$  has a typical response time  $\tau$ . In Figure 3 it is shown the test for the LRKSH compensated with the energy dissipation. From Fig. 3 one sees that in the inertial range, e.g.  $\tau/\tau_\eta \geq 5$  the LRKSH is well verified for all the Stokes considered. In the dissipative range it is also verified but with a different proportionality constant. In particular, the important mismatch observed between the two plateaux for tracers (in Fig.2) here is reduced considerable as soon as some inertia is switched on. This confirms that heavy particles are quickly expelled out of vortex filaments, and therefore much less sensitive to the transition around  $\tau/\tau_\eta \sim 1$  than tracers [18] (the opposite will happens for light particles, see below).

The behavior of the ratio ( $A_D/A_I$ ) of the plateaux displayed by  $\langle(\delta_\tau v)^4\rangle\langle\varepsilon_\tau\rangle^2 / (\langle\varepsilon_\tau^2\rangle\langle(\delta_\tau v)^2\rangle^2)$  respectively in the dissipative range ( $A_D$ ) and in the inertial range ( $A_I$ ), is shown in the inset of Fig. 3. The estimate for the slope of  $A_D/A_I$  vs.  $St$  can be provided by the following reasoning. First we notice that the inertial constant  $A_I$  is almost insensitive from the Stokes value, the dissipative constant  $A_D$  carries all the  $St$  dependency. Moreover, we have measured that the single point energy dissipation is pretty insensitive to the Stokes number. As a consequence the main dependency on  $St$  for the ratio  $A_D/A_I$  comes from the factor  $\langle(\delta_\tau v)^4\rangle / \langle(\delta_\tau v)^2\rangle^2$  in the small  $\tau$  limit. It is reasonable to estimate the difference between the small scale flatness at changing Stokes, and at fixed Reynolds, as given by the value of the flatness at the




FIG. 4: Same as in fig. 2 along the trajectories of heavy/light inertial particles with  $St = 1.0$ . It is plotted  $\langle (\delta_\tau v)^4 \rangle / (\langle \varepsilon_\tau \rangle^2 / (\langle \varepsilon_\tau \rangle^2 \langle (\delta_\tau v)^2 \rangle^2))$ . Particles with  $\beta = 0, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0, 1.5, 3.0$  are compared with the result for tracers (solid black line). The LRKSH is satisfied both in the inertial and in the dissipative ranges. As for the case of heavy particles the prefactors differs in the two regions. In the inset, the behavior of ratio of prefactors  $A_D/A_I$  is plotted vs.  $\beta$ .

Stokes time:  $St^{\zeta_4 - 2\zeta_2}$ , where  $\zeta_p$  is the  $p^{\text{th}}$  order scaling exponent for Lagrangian structure functions. Based on the experimental values  $\zeta_4 \sim 1.6$  and  $\zeta_2 \sim 1$  [22], this estimate gives  $A_D/A_I \sim St^{-0.4}$ , not too far from the fit  $St^{-0.38 \pm 0.05}$  to our numerical data, see inset of Fig 3.

*Heavy and Light particles* We focus now on the statistical properties of particles with finite density contrast, i.e.  $\beta \neq 0$ . In Figure 4 it is shown, for  $St = 1$  the behavior of the compensated tests for the LRKSH for different values of  $\beta = 0 \dots 3$ . In the inset it is also shown the behavior, as a function of  $\beta$ , of the  $A_D/A_I$  ratio. Notice how the critical value  $\beta = 1$ , discriminating between heavy ( $\beta < 1$ ) and light ( $\beta > 1$ ) particles play a crucial role, again LRKSH is well verified in the inertial range, but the change to a different plateau around  $\tau/\tau_\eta \sim 1$  is now much more abrupt when light particles are considered: for those the vortex trapping is more pronounced, as all light particles quickly move towards high vorticity regions, showing a very sensitive dependency around the dissipative time dynamics.

In summary, the statistical properties of velocity gradients along trajectories of tracers, heavy and light particles has been investigated. We used high-resolution, high-statistic numerical data to correlate the temporal properties of velocity gradients along the trajectories of tracers and heavy particles. We demonstrated that the Refined Kolmogorov Similarity Hypothesis is well verified for neutral tracers, a feature that we dubbed Lagrangian RKSH. Around the dissipative time lags, heavy and light particles behave strongly differently, due to the effect of being expelled/concentrated out/in vortex filaments.

The dynamics at those time lags becomes strongly dependent on the underlying topological flow properties. We expect a new behaviour for very large Stokes, i.e. when the particle response time fall inside the inertial range. Further studies toward this direction will be reported elsewhere.

Understanding the RKSH in the Lagrangian domain has also important applied consequences. In many applications, the geometry of the system and/or the intensity of turbulence do not allow for a direct attack of the problem using numerical simulations of the Navier-Stokes equations. Modeling is needed for both the underlying fluid and for the particle equations. Typically, the ideal model, would like to replace Eqs.(2)-(3) with a Langevin-like equation for the particle evolution [23, 24]:

$$\frac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt} = \mathbf{v}, \quad \frac{d\mathbf{v}}{dt} = \mathcal{A}[\partial u]\mathbf{v} + \Gamma(t) \quad (7)$$

where the  $\Gamma$  represents some stochastic noise induced by the underlying turbulent fluctuations. The hard physical problem is in the modelization of the drift term,  $\mathcal{A}$ , depending on the local gradient structure along the trajectories (see [25, 26, 27] for recent attempts). Such term should also take into account effects induced by preferential concentration in/out vortex filaments, for the case of inertial particles around the dissipative time lags. The ultimate goal would be to integrate the sort of empirical and phenomenological results shown here in a modelisation like (7). The numerical data base presented here will play a crucial role for benchmarking any stochastic models for inertia and tracer particle in turbulence.

*Acknowledgements* We thank J. Bec, A. S. Lanotte and M. Cencini for several discussion. We thank the DEISA Consortium (co-funded by the EU, FP6 project 508830), for support within the DEISA Extreme Computing Initiative ([www.deisa.org](http://www.deisa.org)). Data from this study are publicly available in unprocessed raw format from the iCFDdatabase (<http://cfd.cineca.it>). LB acknowledges partial support from CNISM. EC acknowledges CNRS support.

- 
- [1] U. Frisch, *Turbulence: The legacy of A.N. Kolmogorov* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995).
  - [2] A.M. Oboukhov, J. Fluid Mech., **13**, 77-81, (1962), and A.N. Kolmogorov, J. Fluid Mech., **13**, 82-85, (1962).
  - [3] G. Stolovitzky and K. R. Sreenivasan, Rev. Mod. Phys. **66**, 229 (1994).
  - [4] S. Chen et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 2253 (1997).
  - [5] F. Toschi et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 1436 (2000).
  - [6] J. K. Eaton and J. R. Fessler, Int. J. Multiphase Flow **20**, 169 (1994).
  - [7] M. R. Maxey and J. J. Riley, Phys. Fluids **26**, 883 (1983).
  - [8] R. Gatignol, J. Mec. Theor. Appl. **1**, 143-160 (1983).
  - [9] I. M. Mazzitelli et al., J. Fluid Mech. **488**, 283 (2003); Phys. Fluids **15**, L5-L8 (2003).

- [10] E. Calzavarini et al., *J. Fluid Mech.* **607**, 13-24 (2008).
- [11] J. Bec, *Phys. Fluids* **15**, L81 (2003).
- [12] J. Bec et al., *J. Fluid Mech.* **550**, 349 (2006).
- [13] P. K. Yeung et al., *J. Fluid Mech.* **582**, 399 (2007).
- [14] B. Lüthi et al., *J. Fluid Mech.* **528**, 87 (2005).
- [15] M. Guala et al., *J. Fluid Mech.* **574**, 405 (2007).
- [16] P. K. Yeung, *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **34**, 115 (2002).
- [17] M. S. Borgas, *Phil. Trans.: Phys. Sci. Eng.* **342**, 379-411 (1993).
- [18] J. Bec et al., *Phys. Fluids* **18**, 081702 (2006).
- [19] R. Benzi et al., *Physica D* **96**, 162 (1996).
- [20] I. M. Mazzitelli and D. Lohse *New J. Phys.* **6**, 203 (2004).
- [21] L. Biferale et al., *Phys. Fluids* **17**, 021701 (2005).
- [22] L. Biferale et al., *Phys. Fluids* **20**, 065103 (2008).
- [23] S. B. Pope, *Turbulent Flows* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000).
- [24] B. L. Sawford and F. M. Guest, *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* **54**, 147 (1991).
- [25] A. Naso and A. Pumir, *Phys. Rev. E* **72**, 056318 (2005).
- [26] L. Chevillard and C. Meneveau, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 174501 (2006).
- [27] L. Biferale et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 214501 (2007).