

Estimating intermittency in three-dimensional Navier-Stokes turbulence

J. D. Gibbon

Department of Mathematics,
Imperial College London SW7 2AZ, UK

email: j.d.gibbon@ic.ac.uk

Abstract

The issue of why computational resolution in Navier-Stokes turbulence is so hard to achieve is addressed. It is shown that Navier-Stokes solutions can potentially behave differently in two distinct regions of space-time \mathbb{R}^\pm where \mathbb{R}^- is comprised of a union of disjoint space-time ‘anomalies’. Large values of $|\nabla\omega|$ dominate \mathbb{R}^- , which is consistent with the formation of vortex sheets or tightly-coiled filaments. The local number of degrees of freedom \mathcal{N}^\pm needed to resolve the regions in \mathbb{R}^\pm satisfies

$$\mathcal{N}^\pm(\mathbf{x}, t) \leq c_\pm \mathcal{R}_u^3$$

where $\mathcal{R}_u = uL/\nu$ is a Reynolds number dependent on the local velocity field $u(\mathbf{x}, t)$.

1 Introduction

The space-time distribution and morphology of the vorticity and strain fields in three-dimensional Navier-Stokes turbulence has remained a puzzle since Batchelor and Townsend discovered experimentally the phenomenon of intermittency in experimental flows. Instead of observing Gaussian behaviour in the flatness factor and similar quantities, they discovered the spiky spectra which are now recognized as typical for intermittent turbulent flows [2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11].




Figure 1: The picture, courtesy of Jörg Schumacher of the Technical University Ilmenau, is a three-dimensional statistically stationary homogeneous isotropic flow at a Taylor microscale Reynolds number of 107 showing iso-surfaces of ω^2 at a level of 10 times the average of ω^2 . The cube with side-length 2π is resolved with 2048^3 grid points which translates into 3 grid spacings for the Kolmogorov length Λ_k .

The application of colour graphics in this past generation has dramatically illustrated how the morphologies of the vorticity and strain fields are typically dominated by ‘thin sets’: see [12, 13]. These usually form initially as quasi-two-dimensional vortex sheets which, under interaction, roll up into a tangle of quasi-one-dimensional tubes [14]. It is also important to note that vorticity and strain accumulate on significantly different sets [15]: indeed, there has been some debate over their relative

importance [16, 17, 7]. Figure 1, courtesy of Jörg Schumacher, is a snapshot illustration of the vorticity (enstrophy) field. Experiments show that these structures spontaneously appear and disappear [4, 5, 6]. While there exists an extensive literature on intermittency in the statistical physics literature concerning Kolmogorov's theory [9, 10, 11], no satisfactory theoretical explanation for the high degree of space-time complexity of these phenomenon has ever been given based on three-dimensional Navier-Stokes solutions, nor has any mathematical explanation been forthcoming why vortex sheets should be, at least initially, the favoured topology. The consequences of this behaviour is far-reaching. The spontaneous appearance of these structures, often at very short length scales, creates severe resolution problems which have not been wholly solved despite the increase of computing power in this past generation. To provide a partial theoretical explanation of this is one of the main aims of this paper. Landau's heuristic estimate for the number of degrees of freedom $\mathcal{N} \sim Re^{9/4}$ needed to resolve a turbulent flow is based on space-time averages and is by no means enough to resolve the thin structures discussed above: for instance see Kerr [15], Schumacher, Sreenivasan & Yakhot [20], Schumacher, Sreenivasan & Yeung [21] and Sreenivasan [22].

Turning now to the status of Navier-Stokes solutions, there are generally two prevailing views. The first, which is generally held by the computational fluid dynamics community, is that the Navier-Stokes equations are regular: that is, it is believed that unique solutions exist that can ultimately be resolved provided enough computing power is made available in the future. This is equivalent to the assumption that the Navier-Stokes equations possess strong solutions. The second view, held more by Navier-Stokes analysts, is that the unsolved regularity problem leaves open the possibility of singularity formation [23, 24, 25, 26]. Caffarelli, Kohn and Nirenberg [27] have shown that the potentially singular set has zero one-dimensional Hausdorff measure, which means that if singularities do occur in space-time then they must be rare events. Various routes to the efficient construction of suitable weak solutions are in evidence [28, 29, 30, 31].

For the purposes of providing a mathematical explanation for the resolution problem outlined above, the first view will be taken in this paper. In fact it cannot be emphasized enough that a flow may be regular but could nevertheless be highly intermittent thus rendering the singular set empty. To make these arguments accessible to a wide readership the proofs, although minimal, are relegated to appendices which can be ignored if the reader so wishes.

2 Results based on space-time averages

The setting is the following: we consider the incompressible ($\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0$), three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations for the velocity field $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ with mean-zero, divergence-free forcing,

$$\mathbf{u}_t + \mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} = \nu \Delta \mathbf{u} - \nabla p + \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}), \quad (2.1)$$

on a periodic three-dimensional domain $\mathcal{V} = [0, L]^3$. Leray's energy inequality [25, 26]

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\mathbf{u}\|_2^2 \leq -\nu \|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{u}\|_2 \|\mathbf{f}\|_2 \quad (2.2)$$

gives some information on the energy $\|\mathbf{u}\|_2^2$. In (2.2) $\|\cdot\|_2$ is the L^2 -norm on the periodic volume $\mathcal{V} = [0, L]^3$. The method of Doering and Foias [32] is now applicable in which the space-time averaged velocity U and the energy dissipation rate ε are found to be *a priori* bounded quantities

$$U^2 = L^{-3} \langle \|\mathbf{u}\|_2^2 \rangle \quad \varepsilon = \nu L^{-3} \langle \|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_2^2 \rangle, \quad (2.3)$$

in which the symbol $\langle \cdot \rangle$ for the long-time average is

$$\langle g \rangle = \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t g(\tau) d\tau. \quad (2.4)$$

For forcing concentrated around one length scale ℓ with ℓ taken for simplicity to be $\ell = L/2\pi$, the Reynolds and Grashof numbers are defined by

$$Re = \frac{U\ell}{\nu}, \quad Gr = \frac{\ell^3 f_{rms}}{\nu^2}, \quad (2.5)$$

in which $f_{rms} = L^{-3/2} \|\mathbf{f}\|_2$. (2.2) gives [32]

$$\left\langle \int_{\mathcal{V}} |\boldsymbol{\omega}|^2 dV \right\rangle \leq \nu^2 L^{-1} Gr Re, \quad \Rightarrow \quad \varepsilon \leq \nu^3 L^{-4} Gr Re. \quad (2.6)$$

Moreover, in [32] it has been shown that at high values of Gr Navier-Stokes solutions obey $Gr \leq Re^2$ and so the right hand side of (2.6) can be estimated as $Gr Re \leq c Re^3$. Because U and ε are bounded quantities, the definitions of the respective inverse Taylor micro-scale and Kolmogorov lengths Λ_T^{-1} and Λ_k^{-1} are on a sound footing:

$$\Lambda_T^{-2} = \frac{\varepsilon}{\nu U^2} = \frac{\langle \|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_2^2 \rangle}{\langle \|\mathbf{u}\|_2^2 \rangle}, \quad L\Lambda_k^{-1} = \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\nu^3} \right)^{1/4}. \quad (2.7)$$

Then it is easily shown that [32]

$$L\Lambda_T^{-1} \leq c Re^{1/2}, \quad L\Lambda_k^{-1} \leq c Re^{3/4}. \quad (2.8)$$

This leads to an estimate for the number of degree of freedom in the system $\mathcal{N}(\Lambda_k) \leq c Re^{9/4}$ based on the number of small vortices of volume Λ_k^3 relative to the box volume L^3 . This is consistent with Landau's heuristic and Kolmogorov's scaling arguments [10, 11]. These space-time averages are extremely useful in setting average magnitudes relative to which other quantities can be measured but they hide strong spiky variations in local behaviour. Two new results, which are based on an extension of (2.6) to higher moments ($m \geq 1$), are proved in Appendix A

$$\left\langle \left(\int_{\mathcal{V}} |\boldsymbol{\omega}|^{2m} dV \right)^{\frac{1}{4m-3}} \right\rangle \leq c_{0,m} \nu^{\frac{2m}{4m-3}} L^{-1} Re^3, \quad (2.9)$$

and

$$\left\langle \left(\int_{\mathcal{V}} |\nabla \boldsymbol{\omega}|^{2m} dV \right)^{\frac{1}{6m-3}} \right\rangle \leq c_{1,m} \nu^{\frac{2m}{6m-3}} L^{-1} Re^3. \quad (2.10)$$

In (2.10) when $m = 1$ the exponent on the integral within the time average is not unity but $1/3$. These averages hint at some control over large fluctuations in $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ but not enough information is available to understand the behaviour of local space-time variations. Nevertheless, (2.10) plays an important role and will be referred to later in §3.

3 Local space-time results

The task is now to consider how a fluid can behave in local regions of space-time based on the assumption, discussed in §2, that strong solutions exist. This approach requires some differences of definition, particularly in the Reynolds and Grashof numbers of the last section, Re and Gr , whose definitions were based on a space-time average in the case of Re and a spatial average in the case of Gr . Now we define local Reynolds and Grashof numbers as

$$\mathcal{R}_u(\mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{L|\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{x}, t)|}{\nu}, \quad \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{L^3|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})|}{\nu^2}. \quad (3.1)$$

The idea is to consider the enstrophy and palenstrophy

$$H_1(t) = \int_{\mathcal{V}} |\boldsymbol{\omega}|^2 dV \quad H_2(t) = \int_{\mathcal{V}} |\nabla \boldsymbol{\omega}|^2 dV. \quad (3.2)$$

and derive, as in Appendix B, a differential inequality involving these (valid for $6 \geq q > 3$)

$$\frac{1}{2} \dot{H}_1 \leq -\frac{(q-3)}{2(q+6)} \nu H_2 + c_q \nu^{-\frac{9}{q-3}} \|\mathbf{u}\|_q^{\frac{3q}{q-3}} + \frac{q+6}{2(q-3)} \nu^{-1} \|\mathbf{f}\|_2^2. \quad (3.3)$$

This is a modification of a version first proved by Ladyzhenskaya [24] in a regularity proof conditional upon the velocity \mathbf{u} being bounded in $\|\mathbf{u}\|_q$ for $q > 3$. Instead, when $q = 6$, the nonlinear term is proportional to the perfect integral $\|\mathbf{u}\|_6^6$. Time averaging as in (2.4) and re-scaling so that each term is dimensionless, (3.3) converts to a 4-integral

$$\left\langle \int_{\mathcal{V}} \left\{ c_6 \mathcal{R}_u^6 - \frac{L^2}{8\omega_0^2} |\nabla \boldsymbol{\omega}|^2 + 2\mathcal{G}^2 \right\} dV \right\rangle \geq 0. \quad (3.4)$$

A trivial but important observation is that a positive integral need not necessarily have an integrand that is positive everywhere in space-time. Some consequences of this are :

1. There are regions of space-time $\mathbb{R}^+ \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ on which

$$\frac{L^2}{8\omega_0^2} |\nabla \boldsymbol{\omega}|^2 \leq c_6 \mathcal{R}_u^6 + 2\mathcal{G}^2. \quad (3.5)$$

2. In contrast, there are (potential) disjoint regions of, or ‘anomalies’, in space-time on which

$$\frac{L^2}{8\omega_0^2} |\nabla \boldsymbol{\omega}|^2 > c_6 \mathcal{R}_u^6 + 2\mathcal{G}^2. \quad (3.6)$$

The union of these anomalies we call $\mathbb{R}^- \subset \mathbb{R}^4$. The contribution from \mathbb{R}^- cannot be too large given the positivity of the 4-integral in (3.4).

3. Given that the set \mathbb{R}^- is non-empty, *the first observation is that the very large nonlinearity \mathcal{R}_u^6 amplifies the response in the magnitude of $|\nabla \boldsymbol{\omega}|^2$ to relatively small fluctuations in the local velocity field \mathbf{u} .* Using the fact that the higher moments of $|\nabla \boldsymbol{\omega}|$ are controlled as in (2.10), it is clear that $|\nabla \boldsymbol{\omega}|$ cannot become too large everywhere in \mathbb{R}^4 or this average will be violated. Very large behaviour in \mathbb{R}^- must therefore be balanced by smaller behaviour in \mathbb{R}^+ .

The product of this amplified and highly uneven response is an intermittent spectrum. This is consistent with the remark of Batchelor and Townsend [1] where they suggested that large wave-number components are concentrated in isolated flow regions with an uneven energy distribution associated with the small scale components.

4. *The second observation is that the sudden rapid increase of the gradient $|\nabla\omega|$ as one moves from a region in \mathbb{R}^+ across into an anomaly in \mathbb{R}^- is consistent with the formation of vortex sheet-like structures¹ or perhaps tightly-coiled filaments.* The subsequent roll-up of these sheets when they interact, as observed in numerical experiments, is not explained but since both topologies have a small packing fraction the roll-up of one into the other would not change this.
5. Defining a local Kraichnan length as

$$(L\lambda_{kr}^{-1})^6 = \frac{|\nabla\omega|^2}{\nu^2} = \frac{L^2|\nabla\omega|^2}{\omega_0^2}, \quad (3.7)$$

then (3.5) and (3.6) can be re-written as

$$(L\lambda_{kr}^{-1})^6 \leq 8c_6\mathcal{R}_u^6 + 16\mathcal{G}^2 \quad \text{on} \quad \mathbb{R}^\pm. \quad (3.8)$$

Thus, to resolve the structures in \mathbb{R}^\pm , the number of degrees of freedom \mathcal{N}^\pm is estimated as

$$\mathcal{N}^\pm \leq c_\pm(\mathcal{R}_u^3 + \mathcal{G}) \quad \text{on} \quad \mathbb{R}^\pm \quad (3.9)$$

compared with the standard $Re^{9/4}$ needed on the space-time average. Moreover, \mathcal{R}_u in particular, might be considerably larger than Re in or near some anomalies. Given that (3.9) is a lower bound in \mathbb{R}^- , \mathcal{N}^- might be considerably larger than \mathcal{R}_u^3 , showing why resolution might be lost locally, if u becomes too large.

4 Summary and discussion : vorticity versus strain

The arguments of the previous section show clearly that for strong solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations, space-time can potentially be split into two parts \mathbb{R}^\pm . While the closed set \mathbb{R}^+ is dominant because of the positivity of the space-time integral in (3.4), the vary lare lower bound \mathcal{R}_u^6 in (3.8) provokes high values of $|\nabla\omega|$ in the space-time anomalies, whose union is the open set \mathbb{R}^- . The control of space-time averages of higher moments in (2.10) insists that large values of $|\nabla\omega|$ in \mathbb{R}^- must be balanced by smaller values in \mathbb{R}^+ . The violent increase of ω in the relatively small space-time region occupied by these anomalies suggests the formation of vortex sheet-like structures or tightly-coiled filaments. Numerical evidence suggests that sheets roll up into tubes when they interact, as in Figure 1 [14]. Indeed, both topologies have an appropriately small packing fraction which is no doubt why they are commonly observed. The bounds on \mathcal{N}^\pm in (3.9) are dependent on the velocity field at local space-time points of the flow. Despite the assumption of regularity of solutions, \mathcal{R}_u may potentially reach large values, making the \mathcal{R}_u^3 lower bound enormous. This would account for local difficulties in resolution and illustrates the need to carefully monitor values of \mathcal{R}_u in a numerical calculation : see, for instance, [20].

These ideas can also be used in an alternative manner to see the effect of strain : see [16, 17, 18, 7] and [19]. In this case it is more appropriate to define different local Reynolds numbers as

$$\mathcal{R}_\omega = \frac{L^2|\omega|}{\nu}, \quad \mathcal{R}_\rho = \frac{L^2\rho_s}{\nu}. \quad (4.1)$$

¹Formally, a vortex sheet is considered to have formed when a jump occurs in tangential vorticity as one moves in a normal direction ; in our case we are unable to make any distinction between the normal and tangential directions. See Majda & Bertozzi [34] for a discussion and references on the formation of vortex sheets in the Euler equations.

In (4.1) $\rho_s(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is the spectral radius of the strain rate matrix S which appears because $\boldsymbol{\omega} \cdot \boldsymbol{\omega} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} = \boldsymbol{\omega} \cdot S \boldsymbol{\omega}$. The equivalent of the 4-integral in (3.4) is

$$\left\langle \int_{\mathcal{V}} \left\{ 2\mathcal{R}_\rho \mathcal{R}_\omega^2 - \frac{L^2}{\omega_0^2} |\nabla \boldsymbol{\omega}|^2 + \mathcal{G}^2 \right\} dV \right\rangle \geq 0. \quad (4.2)$$

Similar conclusions can be reached to those of §3 regarding the effect the strain field and vorticity fields have on $|\nabla \boldsymbol{\omega}|$ in regions \mathbb{R}_s^\pm of space-time. These will be different from those regions contained in \mathbb{R}^\pm of (3.4). An estimate for the number of degrees of freedom needed to resolve \mathbb{R}_s^\pm – the equivalent of (3.9) – is

$$\mathcal{N}_s^\pm \leq c_s^\pm \left\{ \mathcal{R}_\rho^{1/2} \mathcal{R}_\omega + \mathcal{G} \right\}. \quad (4.3)$$

Acknowledgements: My thanks are due to Panagiota Daskalopoulos, Charles Doering, Raymond Hide, Darryl Holm, Bob Kerr, Gerald Moore, Trevor Stuart, Edriss Titi, Jörg Schumacher and Arkady Tsinober for discussions.

A Proof of (2.9) and (2.10) in §2

The estimates in this appendix are based on the assumption that strong solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations exist. Consider the result of Foias, Guillopé and Temam [33] for time averages of higher semi-norms which is deliberately written for our present purposes in terms of Gr and Re

$$\left\langle H_n^{\frac{1}{2n-1}} \right\rangle \leq c_n \nu^{\frac{2}{2n-1}} L^{-1} a_\ell^4 Gr Re. \quad (A.1)$$

A Sobolev inequality for $m > 1$ gives

$$\|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_{2m} \leq c_m \|\nabla^2 \boldsymbol{\omega}\|_2^a \|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_2^{1-a} \quad (A.2)$$

where $a = 3(m-1)/4m$. Thus, taking $n = 3$ in (A.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_{2m}^{\frac{2m}{4m-3}} \right\rangle &\leq c_{m,1} \left\langle \left(H_3^{1/5} \right)^{\frac{15(m-1)}{4(4m-3)}} H_1^{\frac{m+3}{4(4m-3)}} \right\rangle \\ &\leq c_{m,1} \left\langle \left(H_3^{1/5} \right)^{\frac{15(m-1)}{4(4m-3)}} \right\rangle \langle H_1 \rangle^{\frac{m+3}{4(4m-3)}} \\ &\leq c_{m,1} \nu^{\frac{2m}{4m-3}} L^{-1} a_\ell^4 Gr Re. \end{aligned} \quad (A.3)$$

The averages of $|\nabla \boldsymbol{\omega}|^{2m}$ in (2.10) can be found in the same way using $n = 4$ in (A.1).

B Proof of Ladyzhenskaya's inequality (3.3)

Consider H_1 defined in (3.2). For strong solutions

$$\dot{H}_1 = \int_{\mathcal{V}} \boldsymbol{\omega} \cdot \{ \nu \Delta \boldsymbol{\omega} + \boldsymbol{\omega} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} + \text{curl } \mathbf{f} \} dV. \quad (B.1)$$

Using the divergence theorem to estimate the vortex stretching term we find

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{V}} \boldsymbol{\omega} \cdot \boldsymbol{\omega} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} dV \right| \leq \|\nabla \boldsymbol{\omega}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_s \|\mathbf{u}\|_q \quad (B.2)$$

where $q^{-1} + s^{-1} = \frac{1}{2}$. A Sobolev inequality on $\|\omega\|_s$ gives

$$\|\omega\|_s \leq \|\nabla \mathbf{u}\|_s \leq c \|\nabla^2 \mathbf{u}\|_2^a \|\mathbf{u}\|_q^{1-a} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where a is given by $a = \frac{12-q}{6+q}$. There are restrictions on a in the form $\frac{1}{2} \leq a < 1$, which means that $3 < q \leq 6$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathcal{V}} \boldsymbol{\omega} \cdot \boldsymbol{\omega} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{u} \, dV \right| &\leq c \|\nabla \boldsymbol{\omega}\|_2^{1+a} \|\mathbf{u}\|_q^{2-a} \\ &= (\nu H_2)^{\frac{1+a}{2}} \left(c \nu^{-\frac{1+a}{1-a}} \|\mathbf{u}\|_q^{\frac{2(2-a)}{1-a}} \right)^{\frac{1-a}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} (1+a) \nu H_2 + c_q \nu^{-\frac{1+a}{1-a}} \|\mathbf{u}\|_q^{\frac{2(2-a)}{1-a}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

(B.1) becomes

$$\frac{1}{2} \dot{H}_1 \leq -\nu \left(\frac{q-3}{q+6} \right) H_2 + c_q \nu^{-\frac{9}{q-3}} \|\mathbf{u}\|_q^{\frac{3q}{q-3}} + \|\mathbf{f}\|_2 H_2^{1/2}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

We also know that

$$\left[\left(\frac{q-3}{q+6} \right) \nu H_2 \right]^{1/2} \left[\left(\frac{q+6}{q-3} \right) \nu^{-1} \|\mathbf{f}\|_2^2 \right]^{1/2} \leq \left(\frac{q-3}{2(q+6)} \right) \nu H_2 + \left(\frac{q+6}{2(q-3)} \right) \nu^{-1} \|\mathbf{f}\|_2^2 \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Together (B.5) gives

$$\frac{1}{2} \dot{H}_1 \leq -\frac{(q-3)}{2(q+6)} \nu H_2 + c_q \nu^{-\frac{9}{q-3}} \|\mathbf{u}\|_q^{\frac{3q}{q-3}} + \frac{q+6}{2(q-3)} \nu^{-1} \|\mathbf{f}\|_2^2, \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where one recalls that $6 \geq q > 3$. This is (3.3).

References

- [1] BATCHELOR, G. K. & TOWNSEND, A. A. 1949 The nature of turbulent flow at large wave-numbers, *Proc R. Soc. Lond. A* **199**, 238–255.
- [2] KUO, A. Y.-S. & CORRISIN, S. 1971 Experiments on internal intermittency and fine-structure distribution functions in fully turbulent fluid, *J. Fluid Mech.* **50**, 285–320.
- [3] MENEVEAU, C. & SREENIVASAN, K. 1991 The multifractal nature of turbulent energy dissipation, *J. Fluid Mech.* **224**, 429–484.
- [4] DOUADY, S., COUDER, Y., & BRACHET, M. E. 1991 Direct observation of the intermittency of intense vortex filaments in turbulence, *Phys. Rev. Letts.* **67**, 983–986.
- [5] CADOT, O., DOUADY, S., & COUDER, Y. 1995 Characterization of the low-pressure filaments in three-dimensional turbulent shear flow, *Phys. Fluids*, **7**, 630–646.
- [6] EMMONS, H. W. 1951 Laminar-turbulent transition in boundary layers, *J. Aero Sci.*, **18**, 490–498.
- [7] TSINOBER, A. 2001 *An informal introduction to turbulence*, Kluwer.
- [8] ZEFF, B. W., LANTERMAN, D. D., MCALLISTER, R., ROY, R., KOSTELICH, E. J., & LATHROP, D. P. 2003 Measuring intense rotation and dissipation in turbulent flows, *Nature* **421**, 146–149.
- [9] GROSSMANN, S. & LOHSE, D. 1993 Intermittency exponents *Europhys. Lett.* **21**, pp. 201–206.
- [10] FRISCH, U. 1995 *Turbulence: The legacy of A N Kolmogorov*, Cambridge University Press.
- [11] BOFFETTA, G., MAZZINO, A. & VULPIANI, A. 2008 Twenty five years of multifractals in fully developed turbulence: a tribute to Giovanni Paladin, *J. Phys. A* **41**, 363001.

- [12] YOKOKAWA, M., ITAKURA, K., UNO, A., ISHIHARA, T., & KANEDA, Y. 2002 16.4-Tflops Direct Numerical Simulation of Turbulence by a Fourier Spectral Method on the Earth Simulator, *Proc. 2002 ACM/IEEE conference on Supercomputing*, Baltimore, IEEE Comp. Soc. Press, Los Alamos, pp. 1–17.
- [13] KURIEN, S. & TAYLOR, M. 2005 Direct Numerical Simulation of Turbulence: data generation and statistical analysis, *Los Alamos Science*, 29.
- [14] VINCENT, A. & MENEGUZZI, M. 1994 The dynamics of vorticity tubes of homogeneous turbulence, *J. Fluid Mech.* **225**, 245–254.
- [15] KERR, R. M. 1985 Higher order derivative correlations and the alignment of smallscale structures in isotropic numerical turbulence. *J. Fluid Mech.*, **153**, 31–58.
- [16] JIMENEZ, J., WRAY, A. A., SAFFMAN, P. G. & ROGALLO, R. S. 1993 *The structure of intense vorticity in isotropic turbulence*, *J. Fluid Mech.* **255**, 65–91.
- [17] TSINOBER, A. 1998 Is concentrated vorticity that important? *Eur. J. Mech B/Fluids*, **17**, 421-449.
- [18] TSINOBER, A. 2000 Vortex stretching versus production of strain/dissipation (ed: Hunt, J. & Vassilicos, J.) in *Turbulence Structure & Vortex Dynamics*, Cambridge University Press pp. 164–191.
- [19] KERR, R.M. 2001 A new role for vorticity and singular dynamics in turbulence. In *Nonlinear Instability Analysis Volume II*. (ed. L. Debnath), WIT Press, Southampton, UK, pp 15–68.
- [20] SCHUMACHER, J., SREENIVASAN, K., & YAKHOT, V. 2007 Asymptotic exponents from low-Reynolds-number flows, *New J. Phys.* **9**, 89–108.
- [21] SCHUMACHER, J., SREENIVASAN, K. R. & YEUNG, P. K. 2005 Very fine structures in scalar mixing, *J. Fluid Mech.* **531**, 113–122.
- [22] SREENIVASAN, K. R. 2004 Possible effects of small-scale intermittency in turbulent reacting flows, *Flow Turb. Combust.* **72**, 115–141.
- [23] LERAY, J. 1934 Essai sur le mouvement d'un liquide visqueux emplissant l'espace, *Acta Math.* **63**, 193–248.
- [24] LADYZHENSKAYA, O. A. 1963 *The mathematical theory of viscous incompressible flow*, Gordon and Breach.
- [25] CONSTANTIN, P. & FOIAS, C. 1988 *Navier-Stokes Equations*, University of Chicago Press.
- [26] FOIAS, C., MANLEY, O., ROSA, R. & TEMAM, R. 2001 *Navier-Stokes equations & Turbulence*, Cambridge University Press.
- [27] CAFFARELLI, L., KOHN, R. & NIRENBERG, L. 1982 Partial regularity of suitable weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **35**, 771–831.
- [28] LIN, F. 1998 A new proof of the Caffarelli, Kohn & Nirenberg theorem, *Commun. Pure Appl. Maths.* **51**, 241–257.
- [29] LADYZHENSKAYA, O. A. & SEREGIN, G. 1999 On partial regularity of suitable weak solutions of the three dimensional Navier-Stokes equations, *St Petersburg Math. J.* **1**, 356–387.
- [30] CHOE, H. J. & LEWIS, J. L., 2000 On the singular set in the Navier-Stokes equations, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **175**, 348–369.
- [31] CHENG, H. 2004 On partial regularity for weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations, *J. Funct. Anal.* **211** no. 1, 153–162.
- [32] DOERING, C. R. & FOIAS, C. 2002 Energy dissipation in body-forced turbulence, *J. Fluid Mech.* **467**, 289–306.
- [33] FOIAS, C., GUILLOPÉ, C., & TEMAM, R. 1981 New a priori estimates for Navier-Stokes equations in Dimension 3, *Comm. Partial Diff. Equat.* **6**, (329–359).
- [34] MADJA, A. J. & BERTOZZI, A. 2001 *Vorticity & incompressible flow*, Cambridge University Press.