

Effect of differential diffusion and extrapolated Ekman dissipation on flux constraints on the two-layer quasi-geostrophic model.

By Eleftherios Gkioulekas

University of Texas-Pan American, Department of Mathematics, Edinburg TX, 78539-2999, USA

(Received 28 May 2022)

We continue our investigation of an inequality constraining the energy and potential enstrophy flux spectra in the two-layer quasi-geostrophic model. Its physical significance is that it can diagnose whether any given model that allows coexisting downscale cascades of energy and potential enstrophy can reproduce the Nastrom-Gage spectrum, in terms of the total energy spectrum. This inequality holds unconditionally for two-dimensional turbulence, however it is far from obvious that it generalizes to multi-layer quasi-geostrophic models. In previous work we considered the case of a two-layer quasi-geostrophic model in which the dissipation terms for each layer are dependent only on the streamfunction field of the corresponding layer. We now generalize this configuration as follows: First, following a 1980 paper by Salmon, we use an extrapolated Ekman term at the bottom layer which uses the streamfunction field of both layers to approximate the streamfunction field at the surface boundary layer. Second, for reasons explained in detail in the paper itself, we use small-scale dissipation terms with different hyperviscosity coefficients. Sufficient conditions for satisfying the flux inequality are given under this more general dissipation configuration, and we discuss the potential role of extrapolated Ekman dissipation and differential small-scale dissipation in violating the flux inequality.

1. Introduction

Since the seminal paper of Charney (1971), it became “folklore” knowledge that two-dimensional and quasi-geostrophic turbulence have “isomorphic” dynamics, implying that results of two-dimensional turbulence theory can be safely carried over to quasi-geostrophic turbulence. This point of view was challenged in later papers by Tung & Welch (2001), Tung & Orlando (2003*b*), Tung & Orlando (2003*a*). The most important difference was noted by Gkioulekas & Tung (2007) who argued that an asymmetric configuration of the dissipation terms in the two-layer quasi-geostrophic model can potentially allow coexisting downscale cascades of potential enstrophy and energy leading to a mixed energy spectrum exhibiting a transition from k^{-3} scaling to $k^{-5/3}$ scaling, thereby imitating the energy spectrum configuration of the Nastrom-Gage spectrum (Gage 1979; Gage & Nastrom 1986; Nastrom & Gage 1984; Nastrom, Gage & Jasperson 1984). Gkioulekas & Tung (2005*a,b*) proposed the hypothesis that such coexisting cascades already exist under two-dimensional turbulence, but a flux constraint on the downscale energy flux prevents the occurrence of a scaling transition. This constraint is given by $k^2\Pi_E(k) - \Pi_G(k) \leq 0$, for all wavenumbers k not in the forcing range, with $\Pi_E(k)$ the energy flux spectrum and

$\Pi_G(k)$ the enstrophy flux spectrum. Gkioulekas & Tung (2007) argued that asymmetric dissipation in the two-layer quasi-geostrophic model can lead to a violation of this flux inequality. Asymmetric dissipation means that the dissipation operators acting on each horizontal layer are different.

A preliminary but detailed investigation of the flux inequality was initiated by Gkioulekas (2012*b*) where I derived sufficient conditions for satisfying the flux inequality in two-layer quasi-geostrophic models. More importantly, I derived the general form of the dissipation spectra of energy and potential enstrophy for a generalized multi-layer quasi-geostrophic model, and for the specialized case of the two-layer quasi-geostrophic model. It should be emphasized that, although the flux inequality is easy to prove in two-dimensional turbulence, establishing it in quasi-geostrophic models requires very careful nontrivial calculations, that are sensitive to the actual configuration of the dissipation terms. In fact, we have reasons to believe, as was previously discussed by Gkioulekas & Tung (2007) and Gkioulekas (2012*b*), that the flux inequality can be violated under strong enough dissipative asymmetry between the two layers. The sufficient conditions given by Gkioulekas (2012*b*) and in the present paper are mathematically rigorous upper bounds on the amount of dissipative asymmetry that one can tolerate without violating the flux inequality, and can be derived without any phenomenological assumptions about the energy and potential enstrophy spectra.

In Gkioulekas (2012*b*), I considered two possible arrangements for the dissipation terms. Under *streamfunction dissipation*, in each layer, the dissipation terms are given by a Fourier-diagonal operator applied to the streamfunction field of the corresponding layer. I have also considered *potential vorticity dissipation*, where in each layer a Fourier-diagonal operator is applied to the potential vorticity field of the corresponding layer, instead of the streamfunction field. I have found that the corresponding sufficient conditions, which can be derived rigorously without resorting to any ad hoc assumptions, become tighter by a numerical factor but remain otherwise mathematically similar for the case of potential vorticity dissipation relative to the case of streamfunction dissipation. We have also seen indications that introducing differential small-scale dissipation, where the small-scale dissipation at the lower-layer is stronger than that at the upper layer, also has a stronger effect of tightening the sufficient conditions.

In both cases, it was assumed that the Ekman term operates only on the lower layer and is dependent only on the streamfunction or potential vorticity field of the lower layer. However, an alternate formulation of the two-layer quasi-geostrophic model that was given by Salmon (1980), requires that the Ekman term at the lower layer be dependent on the streamfunction fields of both layers. To explain why, one must recall that the two-layer model is an extreme vertical discretization of the full quasi-geostrophic model, which consists of a relative vorticity equation, a temperature equation, and additional constraining conditions. In a general multi-layer model, the relative vorticity equations are discretized in horizontal layers that are interlaced with the discretization layers of the temperature equations. Thus, for the case of the two-layer model we have altogether 5 physically relevant layers: the surface boundary layer corresponding approximately to 1Atm, the lower relative vorticity layer at 0.75Atm, the temperature midlayer at 0.5Atm, the upper relative vorticity layer at 0.25Atm, and the top boundary layer at 0Atm. The potential vorticity equations are derived from the relative vorticity equations by eliminating the temperature field from the system of equations, thereby placing the potential vorticity field and the corresponding streamfunction field at the 0.25Atm and 0.75Atm layers. As noted by Salmon (1980), the Ekman dissipation term is dependent on the streamfunction field at the surface boundary layer near 1Atm, which can be linearly extrapolated from the streamfunction field at the lower and upper layer (0.75Atm and

0.25Atm correspondingly). Consequently, even though the Ekman term is still placed on the lower-layer, owing to the linear extrapolation of the surface streamfunction field, it is dependent on the streamfunction field of both the lower and upper layers.

In the present paper we build on the results of Gkioulekas (2012*b*), and derive sufficient conditions for satisfying the flux inequality for the case of extrapolated Ekman dissipation and differential small-scale dissipation. While one could argue that Salmon (1980) placed his bottom potential vorticity layer too far from the surface layer, we may still entertain the possibility of a smaller gap between these layers, we have retained generality by parameterizing the placement of the bottom potential vorticity layer via an adjustable parameter μ , and our main propositions are valid for the entire range of the parameter μ . These resulting conditions are compared with the previous results of Gkioulekas (2012*b*) for the case of streamfunction dissipation. More importantly, we derive the formulas for the dissipation spectra of energy and potential enstrophy that can be used as the basis for a more thorough investigation of the flux inequality, as well as in the formulation of closure models.

Admittedly, both Salmon's idea of extrapolated Ekman dissipation and my idea of differential small-scale dissipation can be considered controversial. On the other hand, in the context of investigating the flux inequality, it is important to be thorough about considering every interesting configuration of the dissipation terms, to determine how much impact various choices of dissipation term configurations have on the robustness of the flux inequality. Furthermore, as will become apparent from the preliminary results of this paper, the dissipation configurations explored here are good candidates for a dissipation filter that could violate the flux inequality and ensure a controlled downscale energy dissipation rate in numerical simulations that exceeds the restrictions that are typical in two-dimensional turbulence. That would, in turn, enable a purely two-layer quasi-geostrophic model to reproduce the Nastrom-Gage spectrum and enable a numerical investigation of the underlying downscale energy cascade with respect to Kolmogorov constant, intermittency corrections, and so on.

The paper is organized as follows: In section 2 we give the formal setup and restate needed prior results from Gkioulekas (2012*a*) and Gkioulekas (2012*b*) for the generalized multi-layer quasi-geostrophic model. In section 3 we set up the special case of the two-layer quasi-geostrophic model with extrapolated Ekman dissipation and differential small-scale dissipation and derive the energy and potential enstrophy dissipation rate spectra $D_E(k)$ and $D_G(k)$. In section 4 we restate previous results of Gkioulekas (2012*b*) for the case of streamfunction dissipation and generalize them for the more general dissipation configuration that we wish to investigate. Sufficient conditions in terms of the viscosity coefficients are given. In section 5, we derive additional sufficient conditions in terms of the streamfunction spectra. Because the arguments in sections 4 and 5 are mathematically tedious, we have stated the main results in proposition-proof format with detailed discussions of the main results at the end of sections 4 and 5 correspondingly. Finally, a discussion of the main results and the underlying configuration of dissipation terms under consideration is given in section 6.

2. Preliminaries

The governing equations for a generalized multi-layer quasi-geostrophic model read:

$$\frac{\partial q_\alpha}{\partial t} + J(\psi_\alpha, q_\alpha) = d_\alpha + f_\alpha, \quad (2.1)$$

Eleftherios Gkioulekas

$$d_\alpha(\mathbf{x}, t) = \sum_{\beta} (\mathcal{D}_{\alpha\beta} \psi_\beta)(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad (2.2)$$

$$q_\alpha(\mathbf{x}, t) = \sum_{\beta} (\mathcal{L}_{\alpha\beta} \psi_\alpha)(\mathbf{x}, t). \quad (2.3)$$

Here ψ_α is the streamfunction field of the α -layer, q_α is the potential vorticity field of the α -layer, d_α is the dissipation term and f_α is the forcing term. Also $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha\beta}$ is a linear operator encapsulating the configuration of the dissipation terms, and $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha\beta}$ is a linear operator describing the relationship between the streamfunction field ψ_α and the potential vorticity field q_α . The sums run over all layers $\beta = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Following Gkioulekas (2012a,b), we are disregarding the β -effect, resulting from the latitudinal dependence of the Coriolis pseudoforce. Baroclinic instability is accounted for by the forcing term f_α and is assumed to inject energy and potential enstrophy only at large scales.

We assume that the operators $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha\beta}$ are diagonal in Fourier space. This means that given the following Fourier expansions for the streamfunction ψ_α and potential vorticity,

$$\psi_\alpha(\mathbf{x}, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \hat{\psi}_\alpha(\mathbf{k}, t) \exp(i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{k}, \quad (2.4)$$

$$q_\alpha(\mathbf{x}, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \hat{q}_\alpha(\mathbf{k}, t) \exp(i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{k}, \quad (2.5)$$

the relationship between \hat{q}_α and $\hat{\psi}_\alpha$ reads

$$\hat{q}_\alpha(\mathbf{k}, t) = \sum_{\beta} L_{\alpha\beta}(\|\mathbf{k}\|) \hat{\psi}_\alpha(\mathbf{k}, t), \quad (2.6)$$

and likewise the Fourier transform of the dissipation term d_α reads

$$\hat{d}_\alpha(\mathbf{k}, t) = \sum_{\beta} D_{\alpha\beta}(\|\mathbf{k}\|) \hat{\psi}_\alpha(\mathbf{k}, t). \quad (2.7)$$

In general, we assume that the operator $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha\beta}$ is symmetric which gives $L_{\alpha\beta}(k) = L_{\beta\alpha}(k)$.

This generalized multi-layer system conserves the total energy $E = -\sum_{\alpha} \langle\langle \psi_\alpha q_\alpha \rangle\rangle$ and the layer-by-layer potential enstrophy $G_\alpha = \langle\langle q_\alpha^2 \rangle\rangle$. Here, $\langle\langle \cdot \rangle\rangle$ represents a volume integral over \mathbb{R}^2 given by:

$$\langle\langle f \rangle\rangle = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^2} f(x, y) \, dx dy. \quad (2.8)$$

As shown by Gkioulekas (2012a), the conservation of layer-by-layer potential enstrophy is unconditional, whereas the conservation of total energy is dependent on the assumptions that the operator $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha\beta}$ be symmetric and self-adjoint. Following Gkioulekas (2012a) and Gkioulekas (2012b), we define the energy spectrum $E(k)$ and the layer-by-layer potential enstrophy $G_\alpha(k)$ in terms of a k -dependent inner product, defined in turn as:

$$\langle a, b \rangle_k = \frac{d}{dk} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbf{d}\mathbf{x} \langle a^{<k}(\mathbf{x}) b^{<k}(\mathbf{x}) \rangle. \quad (2.9)$$

Here $a^{<k}(\mathbf{x})$ and $b^{<k}(\mathbf{x})$ are obtained by eliminating all contributions from wavenumbers with magnitude greater than k in Fourier space. Then, we may write $E(k) = -\sum_{\alpha} \langle \psi_\alpha, q_\alpha \rangle_k$ and $G_\alpha(k) = \langle q_\alpha, q_\alpha \rangle_k$. The total potential enstrophy spectrum is $G(k) = \sum_{\alpha} G_\alpha(k)$. We note that $G(k) \geq 0$ by definition. The energy spectrum $E(k)$, is not necessarily positive definite for arbitrary $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha\beta}$, however, in Gkioulekas (2012b), we have shown

that if the operator spectrum $L_{\alpha\beta}(k)$ satisfies

$$L_{\alpha\beta}(k) \geq 0, \text{ for } \alpha \neq \beta, \quad (2.10)$$

$$2L_{\alpha\alpha}(k) + \sum_{\substack{\alpha\beta \\ \alpha \neq \beta}} (L_{\alpha\beta}(k) + L_{\beta\alpha}(k)) \leq 0, \quad (2.11)$$

then $E(k) \geq 0$. We have also shown that an indirect relationship between $E(k)$ and $G(k)$ can be established via the streamfunction spectra $C_{\alpha\beta}(k)$ defined as $C_{\alpha\beta}(k) = \langle \psi_\alpha, \psi_\beta \rangle_k$, which reads

$$E(k) = - \sum_{\alpha\beta} L_{\alpha\beta}(k) C_{\alpha\beta}(k), \quad (2.12)$$

$$G(k) = \sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma} L_{\alpha\beta}(k) L_{\alpha\gamma}(k) C_{\beta\gamma}(k). \quad (2.13)$$

In general, for $\alpha \neq \beta$, $C_{\alpha\beta}(k)$ can be positive or negative, whereas for $\alpha = \beta$ we may define $U_\alpha(k) = C_{\alpha\alpha}(k) = \langle \psi_\alpha, \psi_\alpha \rangle_k$, which is by definition positive-definite. Then, we have shown that $C_{\alpha\beta}(k)$ is restricted by a triangle inequality $2|C_{\alpha\beta}(k)| \leq U_\alpha(k) + U_\beta(k)$. We also define $U(k) = \sum_\alpha U_\alpha(k)$. Finally, if $D_E(k)$ is the energy dissipation spectrum and $D_G(k)$ is the potential enstrophy dissipation spectrum, we have shown that they can be written in terms of the streamfunction spectrum $C_{\alpha\beta}(k)$ as

$$D_E(k) = 2 \sum_{\alpha\beta} D_{\alpha\beta}(k) C_{\alpha\beta}(k), \quad (2.14)$$

$$D_{G_\alpha}(k) = -2 \sum_{\beta\gamma} L_{\alpha\beta}(k) D_{\alpha\gamma}(k) C_{\beta\gamma}(k). \quad (2.15)$$

and the corresponding conservation laws read

$$\frac{\partial E(k)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \Pi_E(k)}{\partial t} = -D_E(k) + F_E(k), \quad (2.16)$$

$$\frac{\partial G(k)}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial \Pi_G(k)}{\partial t} = -D_G(k) + F_G(k). \quad (2.17)$$

We see that positive $D_E(k)$ and $D_G(k)$ correspond to the case where the dissipation terms are truly dissipative. In Gkioulekas (2012b) we have used the above equations to derive expressions for the dissipation spectra $D_E(k)$ and $D_G(k)$ for the case of the two-layer quasi-geostrophic model under streamfunction dissipation and potential vorticity dissipation. In the next section we will extend the streamfunction dissipation results to the case of differential small-scale diffusion and extrapolated Ekman dissipation.

In all cases, the flux inequality is derived from the dissipation spectrum as follows: Let $\Pi_E(k)$ be the energy flux spectrum, representing the rate with which energy is transferred by nonlinear interactions from the $(0, k)$ interval to the $(k, +\infty)$ interval, per unit time and per unit volume. Likewise, let $\Pi_G(k)$ be the potential enstrophy flux spectrum, defined similarly. Assuming that both the energy spectrum $E(k)$ and the potential enstrophy spectrum $G(k)$ have reached steady state for all wavenumbers k , it can be shown that

$$\Pi_E(k) = \int_k^{+\infty} D_E(q) dq, \quad (2.18)$$

$$\Pi_G(k) = \int_k^{+\infty} D_G(q) dq, \quad (2.19)$$

and it follows that

$$k^2\Pi_E(k) - \Pi_G(k) = \int_k^{+\infty} [k^2 D_E(q) - D_G(q)] dq = \int_k^{+\infty} \Delta(k, q) dq. \quad (2.20)$$

As noted in Gkioulekas (2012b), a sufficient condition for establishing the flux inequality $k^2\Pi_E(k) - \Pi_G(k) \leq 0$ is to show that $\Delta(k, q) \leq 0$ for all wavenumbers $k < q$. Finally, showing $\Delta(k, q) \geq 0$ for all wavenumbers $k_t < k < q$ would establish a violation of the flux inequality for all wavenumbers $k > k_t$. It should be noted that in Eq. (2.18) and Eq. (2.19) one assumes that the wavenumber k does not lie within the forcing range. For the case of quasi-geostrophic models, the extent of the forcing spectrum is controlled by the baroclinic instability, consequently inherent in Eq. (2.18) and Eq. (2.19) is the assumption that the baroclinic instability is negligible at large wavenumbers.

3. Dissipation rate spectra for the two-layer model

The two-layer quasi-geostrophic model can be formulated in terms of two potential vorticity equations of the form

$$\frac{\partial q_1}{\partial t} + J(\psi_1, q_1) = f_1 + d_1, \quad (3.1)$$

$$\frac{\partial q_2}{\partial t} + J(\psi_2, q_2) = f_2 + d_2 + e_2, \quad (3.2)$$

with the relationship between the potential vorticities q_1, q_2 and the streamfunctions ψ_1, ψ_2 given by

$$q_1 = \nabla^2 \psi_1 + \frac{k_R^2}{2} (\psi_2 - \psi_1), \quad (3.3)$$

$$q_2 = \nabla^2 \psi_2 - \frac{k_R^2}{2} (\psi_2 - \psi_1). \quad (3.4)$$

Here q_1, ψ_1 correspond to the top layer and q_2, ψ_2 correspond to the bottom layer. As explained in the introduction, we situate the top layer at $p_1 = 0.25\text{Atm}$ and the bottom layer at $p_2 = 0.75\text{Atm}$. In terms of the generalized layer model, Eq. (3.3) and Eq. (3.4) correspond to an operator $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha\beta}$ with spectrum $L_{\alpha\beta}(k)$ given by

$$L(k) = - \begin{bmatrix} a(k) & b(k) \\ b(k) & a(k) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.5)$$

with $a(k)$ and $b(k)$ given by $a(k) = k^2 + k_R^2/2$ and $b(k) = -k_R^2$. Using differential hyperdiffusion at the small scales and extrapolated Ekman dissipation at the bottom layer gives

$$d_1 = \nu(-1)^{p+1} \nabla^{2p+2} \psi_1, \quad (3.6)$$

$$d_2 = (\nu + \Delta\nu)(-1)^{p+1} \nabla^{2p+2} \psi_2 - \nu_E \nabla^2 \psi_s. \quad (3.7)$$

Here we assume that the hyperdiffusion is stronger at the lower layer, thus $\Delta\nu > 0$. Furthermore, the Ekman term is given in terms of the streamfunction ψ_s at the surface layer ($p_s = 1\text{Atm}$) which is linearly extrapolated from ψ_1 and ψ_2 and it is given by $\psi_s = \lambda\psi_2 + \mu\lambda\psi_1$, with λ and μ given by

$$\lambda = \frac{p_s - p_1}{p_2 - p_1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu = \frac{p_2 - p_s}{p_s - p_1}. \quad (3.8)$$

In other words, ψ_s is defined so that, plotted on a pressure-streamfunction plane, the three points $(p_s, \psi_s), (p_1, \psi_1), (p_2, \psi_2)$ are geometrically collinear. Using $p_1 = 0.25\text{Atm}$

and $p_2 = 0.75\text{Atm}$ gives $\lambda = 3/2$ and $\mu = -1/3$. It is worth noting that for any arbitrary placement of the top and bottom layer that satisfies $0 < p_1 < p_2 < p_s$, we can show that $-1 < \mu < 0$. This constraint on μ is all that is needed to derive the main results of this paper, so the precise placement of the potential vorticity layers is not important for our argument below. This means that the unconventional contribution of ψ_1 to the Ekman term can be continuously regulated according to the modeler's wishes.

The dissipation term configuration given by Eq. (3.6) and Eq. (3.7) corresponds to setting the generalized dissipation operator spectrum $D_{\alpha\beta}(k)$ equal to

$$D(k) = \begin{bmatrix} D_1(k) & 0 \\ \mu d(k) & D_2(k) + d(k) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.9)$$

with $D_1(q)$, $D_2(q)$, and $d(q)$ given by

$$D_1(k) = \nu k^{2p+2} \text{ and } D_2(k) = (\nu + \Delta\nu)k^{2p+2} \text{ and } d(k) = \lambda\nu_E k^2. \quad (3.10)$$

Note that for $\mu = 0$ and $\lambda = 1$, this reduces to the case of streamfunction dissipation that was previously considered by Gkioulekas (2012b).

We may now leverage Eq. (2.14) and Eq. (2.15) to calculate the energy and potential enstrophy dissipation rate spectrum $D_E(k)$ and $D_G(k)$ in terms of the streamfunction spectra $U_1(k)$, $U_2(k)$, and $C_{12}(k)$. For the case of the energy dissipation rate spectrum $D_E(k)$, noting that $D_{12}(k) = 0$, a simple calculation gives

$$D_E(k) = 2D_{11}(k)U_1(k) + 2D_{22}(k)U_2(k) + 2D_{21}(k)C_{21}(k) \quad (3.11)$$

$$= 2D_{11}(k)U_1(k) + 2D_{22}(k)U_2(k) + D_{21}(k)[2C_{12}(k) - U(k)] \\ + D_{21}(k)U(k) \quad (3.12)$$

$$= [2D_{11}(k) + D_{21}(k)]U_1(k) + [2D_{22}(k) + D_{21}(k)]U_2(k) \\ + D_{21}(k)[2C_{12}(k) - U(k)] \quad (3.13)$$

$$= A_E^{(1)}(k)U_1(k) + A_E^{(2)}(k)U_2(k) + A_E^{(3)}(k)[2C_{12}(k) - U(k)], \quad (3.14)$$

with $A_E^{(1)}(k)$, $A_E^{(2)}(k)$, and $A_E^{(3)}(k)$ given by

$$A_E^{(1)}(k) = 2D_{11}(k) + D_{21}(k) = 2D_1(k) + \mu d(k), \quad (3.15)$$

$$A_E^{(2)}(k) = 2D_{22}(k) + D_{21}(k) = 2D_2(k) + 2d(k) + \mu d(k), \quad (3.16)$$

$$A_E^{(3)}(k) = D_{21}(k) = \mu d(k). \quad (3.17)$$

We note that terms involving the streamfunction cross-spectrum $C_{12}(k)$ have been re-organized in terms of $2C_{12}(k) - U(k)$ so that we can take advantage of the inequality $2C_{12}(k) - U(k) \leq 0$. For the potential enstrophy dissipation rate spectrum $D_G(k)$, we take advantage of the symmetry assumption $L_{\alpha\beta}(k) = L_{\beta\alpha}(k)$ to rewrite Eq. (2.15) as

$$D_G(k) = -2 \sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma} L_{\alpha\beta}(k)D_{\alpha\gamma}(k)C_{\beta\gamma}(k) = -2 \sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma} L_{\beta\alpha}(k)D_{\alpha\gamma}(k)C_{\beta\gamma}(k) \quad (3.18)$$

$$= -2 \sum_{\beta\gamma} (LD)_{\beta\gamma}(k)C_{\beta\gamma}(k). \quad (3.19)$$

The components of $(LD)(k)$ are given by

$$(LD)(k) = - \begin{bmatrix} a(k) & b(k) \\ b(k) & a(k) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} D_1(k) & 0 \\ \mu d(k) & D_2(k) + d(k) \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.20)$$

$$= - \begin{bmatrix} a(k)D_1(k) + \mu b(k)d(k) & b(k)[D_2(k) + d(k)] \\ b(k)D_1(k) + \mu a(k)d(k) & a(k)[D_2(k) + d(k)] \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.21)$$

and it follows that $D_G(k)$ is given by

$$D_G(k) = -2\{(LD)_{11}(k)U_1(k) + (LD)_{22}(k)U_2(k) + [(LD)_{12}(k) + (LD)_{21}(k)]C_{12}(k)\} \quad (3.22)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= -\{[2(LD)_{11}(k) + (LD)_{12}(k) + (LD)_{21}(k)]U_1(k) \\ &\quad + [2(LD)_{22}(k) + (LD)_{12}(k) + (LD)_{21}(k)]U_2(k) \\ &\quad + [(LD)_{12}(k) + (LD)_{21}(k)][2C_{12}(k) - U(k)]\} \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

$$= A_G^{(1)}(k)U_1(k) + A_G^{(2)}(k)U_2(k) + A_G^{(3)}(k)[2C_{12}(k) - U(k)], \quad (3.24)$$

with $A_G^{(1)}(k)$, $A_G^{(2)}(k)$, $A_G^{(3)}(k)$ given by

$$A_G^{(1)}(k) = -[2(LD)_{11}(k) + (LD)_{12}(k) + (LD)_{21}(k)] \quad (3.25)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= 2[a(k)D_1(k) + \mu b(k)d(k)] + b(k)D_1(k) + \mu a(k)d(k) \\ &\quad + b(k)[D_2(k) + d(k)] \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

$$= [2a(k) + b(k)]D_1(k) + b(k)D_2(k) + [2b(k) + a(k)]\mu d(k) + b(k)d(k), \quad (3.27)$$

$$A_G^{(2)}(k) = -[2(LD)_{22}(k) + (LD)_{12}(k) + (LD)_{21}(k)] \quad (3.28)$$

$$= 2a(k)[D_2(k) + d(k)] + b(k)D_1(k) + \mu a(k)d(k) + b(k)[D_2(k) + d(k)] \quad (3.29)$$

$$= b(k)D_1(k) + [2a(k) + b(k)]D_2(k) + [2a(k) + b(k)]d(k) + \mu a(k)d(k), \quad (3.30)$$

$$A_G^{(3)}(k) = -[(LD)_{12}(k) + (LD)_{21}(k)] \quad (3.31)$$

$$= b(k)D_1(k) + \mu a(k)d(k) + b(k)[D_2(k) + d(k)] \quad (3.32)$$

$$= b(k)[D_1(k) + D_2(k)] + b(k)d(k) + \mu a(k)d(k). \quad (3.33)$$

The above expressions for $D_E(k)$ and $D_G(k)$ are the point of departure for the investigation of the flux inequality under the general case of streamfunction dissipation with extrapolated Ekman dissipation and differential small-scale dissipation.

4. Sufficient conditions for satisfying the flux inequality

As we have discussed previously, to satisfy the flux inequality $k^2\Pi_E(k) - \Pi_G(k) \leq 0$ for a given wavenumber k , it is sufficient to show that $\Delta(k, q) \leq 0$ for all wavenumbers $k < q$. In Gkioulekas (2012b) we derived the following group of such sufficient conditions for the case of streamfunction dissipation, corresponding to the choice $\lambda = 1$ and $\mu = 0$ under the current more general setup.

PROPOSITION 1. *Assume streamfunction dissipation with $d(k) = 0$ and $k^2 - a(q) - b(q) < 0$ and $b(q) < 0$. Then $\Delta(k, q) \leq 0$.*

PROPOSITION 2. *Assume streamfunction dissipation with $d(k) > 0$ and $k^2 - a(q) - b(q) < 0$ and $b(q) < 0$ and*

$$\frac{d(q)}{2D(q)} \leq \frac{k^2 - a(q) - b(q)}{b(q)}. \quad (4.1)$$

Then it follows that $\Delta(k, q) \leq 0$.

PROPOSITION 3. *Assume streamfunction dissipation with $d(k) > 0$ and $k^2 - a(q) - b(q) < 0$ and $b(q) < 0$ and $C_{12}(q) \leq U_2(q)$. Then, it follows that $\Delta(k, q) \leq 0$.*

Proposition 1 showed that if the same dissipation operator is applied on both layers,

then we have $\Delta(k, q) \leq 0$ unconditionally. Propositions 2 and 3 cover the case of asymmetric dissipation where the dissipation operator applied on the bottom layer differs from the operator applied on the top layer. Substituting the definitions of $a(k)$ and $b(k)$ to proposition 2 gives the statement

$$\frac{d(q)}{D(q)} \leq \frac{4(q^2 - k^2)}{k_R^2} \implies \Delta(k, q) \leq 0, \quad (4.2)$$

and for the typical case of symmetric small-scale dissipation and Ekman dissipation at the lower layer, we have $D(q) = \nu q^{2p+2}$ and $d(q) = \nu_E q^2$, which gives

$$\frac{\nu_E}{4\nu q^{2p}} \leq \frac{q^2 - k^2}{k_R^2} \implies \Delta(k, q) \leq 0. \quad (4.3)$$

We stress that the above condition and propositions correspond to the following configuration of the dissipation terms

$$d_1 = \nu(-1)^{p+1} \nabla^{2p+2} \psi_1, \quad (4.4)$$

$$d_2 = \nu(-1)^{p+1} \nabla^{2p+2} \psi_2 - \nu_E \nabla^2 \psi_2. \quad (4.5)$$

This configuration, which we have designated as streamfunction dissipation, is a special case of Eq. (3.6) and Eq. (3.7) obtained for $\Delta\nu = 0$, $\lambda = 1$, and $\mu = 0$.

For the more general case corresponding to Eq. (3.6) and Eq. (3.7), $\Delta(k, q)$ is given by

$$\Delta(k, q) = k^2 D_E(q) - D_G(q) \quad (4.6)$$

$$= A_1(k, q)U_1(q) + A_2(k, q)U_2(q) + A_3(k, q)[2C_{12}(q) - U(q)], \quad (4.7)$$

with $A_1(k, q)$, $A_2(k, q)$, and $A_3(k, q)$ given by

$$A_1(k, q) = k^2 A_E^{(1)}(q) - A_G^{(1)}(q) \quad (4.8)$$

$$= k^2 [2D_1(q) + \mu d(q)] - [2a(q) + b(q)]D_1(q) - b(q)D_2(q) - [2b(q) + a(q)]\mu d(q) - b(q)d(q) \quad (4.9)$$

$$= [2k^2 - 2a(q) - b(q)]D_1(q) - b(q)D_2(q) - b(q)d(q) + [k^2 - 2b(q) - a(q)]\mu d(q), \quad (4.10)$$

$$A_2(k, q) = k^2 A_E^{(2)}(q) - A_G^{(2)}(q) \quad (4.11)$$

$$= k^2 [2D_2(q) + \mu d(q) + 2d(q)] - b(q)D_1(q) - [2a(q) + b(q)]D_2(q) - [2a(q) + b(q)]d(q) - \mu a(q)d(q) \quad (4.12)$$

$$= -b(q)D_1(q) + [2k^2 - 2a(q) - b(q)]D_2(q) + [2k^2 - 2a(q) - b(q)]d(q) + \mu[k^2 - a(q)]d(q), \quad (4.13)$$

$$A_3(k, q) = k^2 A_E^{(3)}(q) - A_G^{(3)}(q) \quad (4.14)$$

$$= k^2 \mu d(q) - b(q)[D_1(q) + D_2(q)] - b(q)d(q) - \mu a(q)d(q) \quad (4.15)$$

$$= -b(q)[D_1(q) + D_2(q)] - b(q)d(q) + \mu[k^2 - a(q)]d(q). \quad (4.16)$$

We observe that $U_1(q) \geq 0$ and $U_2(q) \geq 0$ and $2C_{12}(q) - U(q) \leq 0$, consequently the sign of $\Delta(k, q)$ depends on the sign of the coefficients $A_1(k, q)$, $A_2(k, q)$, and $A_3(k, q)$. For the argument below we may assume that $-1 < \mu < 0$ and $D_1(q) \leq D_2(q)$. Here $D_1(q) < D_2(q)$ corresponds to differential small-scale diffusion (i.e $\Delta\nu > 0$) and $D_1(q) = D_2(q)$ corresponds to symmetric small-scale dissipation (i.e $\Delta\nu = 0$). We begin our

argument with the following lemma, stating essentially that $A_2(k, q)$ is negative, as long as $D_1(q) \leq D_2(q)$, and $A_3(k, q)$ is always positive.

LEMMA 1. *Assume that $b(q) < 0$ and $k^2 - a(q) - b(q) < 0$. Assume also streamfunction dissipation with both differential small-scale dissipation and extrapolated Ekman dissipation with $-1 < \mu < 0$. Then $A_3(k, q) > 0$, and furthermore, if $D_1(q) \leq D_2(q)$, then we also have $A_2(k, q) < 0$.*

Proof. We recall that $A_3(k, q)$ is given by

$$A_3(k, q) = -b(q)[D_1(q) + D_2(q)] - b(q)d(q) + \mu[k^2 - a(q)]d(q). \quad (4.17)$$

Since, by definition, $D_1(q) > 0$, and $D_2(q) > 0$, and $d(q) > 0$, and since $b(q) < 0$, and $k^2 - a(q) = [k^2 - a(q) - b(q)] + b(q) < k^2 - a(q) - b(q) < 0$, and $\mu < 0$, it follows that all contributing terms to $A_3(k, q)$ are positive and therefore $A_3(k, q) > 0$. For the case of $A_2(k, q)$, let us assume first that $D_1(q) \leq D_2(q)$. We rewrite $A_2(k, q)$ as follows:

$$A_2(k, q) = -b(q)D_1(q) + [2k^2 - 2a(q) - b(q)]D_2(q) + [2k^2 - 2a(q) - b(q)]d(q) + \mu[k^2 - a(q)]d(q) \quad (4.18)$$

$$= -b(q)[D_1(q) - D_2(q)] + 2[k^2 - a(q) - b(q)]D_2(q) + 2[k^2 - a(q) - b(q)]d(q) + b(q)d(q) + \mu[k^2 - a(q) - b(q)]d(q) + \mu b(q)d(q) \quad (4.19)$$

$$= -b(q)[D_1(q) - D_2(q)] + [k^2 - a(q) - b(q)][2D_2(q) + (2 + \mu)d(q)] + (\mu + 1)b(q)d(q). \quad (4.20)$$

Since $b(q) < 0$, and $k^2 - a(q) - b(q) < 0$, and $\mu + 2 > 0$, and $\mu + 1 > 0$, we see that all contributing terms to $A_2(k, q)$ are negative and therefore $A_2(k, q) < 0$. This concludes the proof. \square

PROPOSITION 4. *Assume streamfunction dissipation with both differential small-scale dissipation and extrapolated Ekman dissipation with $-1 < \mu < 0$. Assume also that $k^2 - a(q) - b(q) < 0$, and $b(q) < 0$, and $\Delta D(q) \equiv D_2(q) - D_1(q) \geq 0$, and also that $D_1(q)$, $\Delta D(q)$, and $d(q)$ satisfy*

$$\frac{2D_1(q) + \mu d(q)}{\Delta D(q) + (\mu + 1)d(q)} > \frac{b(q)}{k^2 - a(q) - b(q)}. \quad (4.21)$$

Then it follows that $\Delta(k, q) \leq 0$.

Proof. We recall that $\Delta(k, q)$ is given by

$$\Delta(k, q) = A_1(k, q)U_1(q) + A_2(k, q)U_2(q) + A_3(k, q)[2C_{12}(q) - U(q)]. \quad (4.22)$$

Using the previous lemma, from the given assumptions above, we have $A_2(k, q) < 0$ and $A_3(k, q) > 0$. Now let us rewrite $A_1(k, q)$ as

$$A_1(k, q) = [2k^2 - 2a(q) - b(q)]D_1(q) - b(q)D_2(q) - b(q)d(q) + [k^2 - 2b(q) - a(q)]\mu d(q) \quad (4.23)$$

$$= 2[k^2 - a(q) - b(q)]D_1(q) - b(q)[D_2(q) - D_1(q)] - b(q)d(q) + [k^2 - a(q) - b(q)]\mu d(q) - \mu b(q)d(q) \quad (4.24)$$

$$= [k^2 - a(q) - b(q)][2D_1(q) + \mu d(q)] - b(q)[\Delta D(q) + (\mu + 1)d(q)]. \quad (4.25)$$

Since $k^2 - a(q) - b(q) < 0$ and $\Delta D(q) + (\mu + 1)d(q) > 0$, it follows that $A_1(k, q) < 0$ if and only if Eq. (4.21) is satisfied. Thus, since we also know that $U_1(q) \geq 0$, and $U_2(q) \geq 0$, and $2C_{12}(q) - U(q) \leq 0$, it follows that all terms contributing to $\Delta(k, q)$ are negative, and therefore $\Delta(k, q) \leq 0$. \square

It is easy to see that using $D_1(q) = \nu q^{2p+2}$, and $d(q) = (3/2)\nu_E q^2$ (the 3/2 factor follows from using $\lambda = 3/2$), and $\Delta D(q) = D_2(q) - D_1(q) = \Delta \nu q^{2p+2}$, and $\mu = -1/3$, proposition 4 gives the following statement

$$0 < \frac{\Delta \nu q^{2p} + \nu_E}{4\nu q^{2p} - \nu_E} < \frac{q^2 - k^2}{k_R^2} \implies \Delta(k, q) \leq 0. \quad (4.26)$$

Note that the hypothesis given by Eq. (4.26) requires that $\nu_E < 4\nu q^{2p}$, which allows us to invert both sides of Eq. (4.26) to yield Eq. (4.21), so the proposition can be then applied. For $\nu_E > 4\nu q^{2p}$, the Eq. (4.21) is violated, as the left-hand side becomes negative while the right-hand side remains positive. More precisely, in Eq. (4.21), the right-hand side is positive for $q > k$, the denominator of the left-hand side satisfies $\Delta D(q) + (\mu + 1)d(q) > 0$ by the given hypotheses, and the constraint $\nu_E < 4\nu q^{2p}$ is needed to ensure that the numerator $2D_1(q) + \mu d(q)$ is not negative, so that it can be possible for Eq. (4.21) to be satisfied. Consequently, we see that increasing either ν_E or $\Delta \nu$ indicates a tendency towards violating the flux inequality. The role of differential diffusion is very important here since, for $\Delta \nu > 0$, the left-hand-side of the hypothesis in Eq. (4.26) will approach $\Delta \nu / (4\nu)$ and remain bounded for large wavenumbers q , whereas for $\Delta \nu = 0$, the same left-hand-side will vanish rapidly with increasing wavenumber q . As a result, violating the flux inequality is probably easier under differential small-scale dissipation $\Delta \nu$. On the other hand, the role of ν_E becomes even more dramatic, since increasing ν_E from 0 towards $4\nu q^{2p}$ will result in a hyperbolic blow-up of the left-hand-side of the hypothesis of Eq. (4.26), thus yielding an even more rapid violation of the hypothesis.

The presence of ν_E in the denominator of the left-hand-side fraction of Eq. (4.26) is due to the use of extrapolated Ekman dissipation. For the case $\mu = 0$ and $\lambda = 1$ of streamfunction dissipation, proposition 4 reduces to the statement given by

$$\frac{\Delta \nu q^{2p} + \nu_E}{4\nu q^{2p}} < \frac{q^2 - k^2}{k_R^2} \implies \Delta(k, q) \leq 0, \quad (4.27)$$

where the hyperbolic blow-up is no longer possible. Differential small-scale dissipation however maintains its tendency towards violating the flux inequality for increasing $\Delta \nu$ since the left-hand-side in the hypothesis of Eq. (4.27) still approaches $\Delta \nu / (4\nu)$ in the limit of large wavenumbers q .

It is also interesting to consider yet another special case in which we eliminate differential small-scale dissipation but retain extrapolated Ekman dissipation. This corresponds to choosing $\mu = -1/3$ and $\Delta \nu = 0$, and the statement of Eq. (4.26) can be now simplified to read

$$\frac{\nu_E}{4\nu q^{2p}} < \frac{q^2 - k^2}{k_R^2 + (q^2 - k^2)} \implies \Delta(k, q) \leq 0. \quad (4.28)$$

Now let us compare that against the case where both differential small-scale dissipation and extrapolated Ekman dissipation are eliminated (i.e. $\mu = 0$ and $\Delta \nu = 0$). The corresponding sufficient condition was derived by Gkioulekas (2012b) and it is given by Eq. (4.3). We see that the right-hand-side in the hypothesis of Eq. (4.3) grows quadratically with increasing wavenumber q , thereby making it very easy to satisfy the hypothesis regardless of how much one increases the Ekman dissipation coefficient ν_E . On the other hand, under extrapolated Ekman dissipation, even without help from differential small-

scale dissipation, the right-hand-side of the hypothesis of Eq. (4.28) remains bounded in the limit of increasing wavenumber q . Consequently, it is clear that for sufficiently large ν_E , the hypothesis of Eq. (4.28) can be easily violated, and including differential small-scale dissipation should make it all the more easier.

It should be stressed that in the above discussion, the hypotheses given by Eq. (4.26), Eq. (4.27), and Eq. (4.28) are sufficient conditions, however they are not necessary conditions. A violation of Eq. (4.21) will ensure that the term $A_1(k, q)U_1(q)$ gives a positive contribution to $\Delta(k, q)$. However, according to Lemma 1, the contributions of $A_2(k, q)U_2(q)$ and $A_3(k, q)[2C_{12}(q) - U(q)]$ will remain negative, so the sign of $\Delta(k, q)$ is dependant on which term gets to be dominant. Therefore, it is far from a foregone conclusion that a violation of the flux inequality is possible under the dissipation configurations considered above. However, the significant tightening of the sufficient condition with the introduction of extrapolated Ekman dissipation and differential small-scale dissipation indicates that a violation of the flux inequality is becoming more likely.

5. Sufficient conditions in terms of streamfunction spectra

We would now like to consider statements analogous to Proposition 3 providing sufficient conditions for satisfying the flux inequality, formulated in terms of the streamfunction spectra $U_1(q)$, $U_2(q)$, and $C_{12}(q)$, for the dissipation configuration given by Eq. (3.6) and Eq. (3.7), i.e. streamfunction dissipation with differential small-scale dissipation and extrapolated Ekman dissipation. Such conditions imply corresponding constraints on the distribution of energy and potential enstrophy between layers, to be explored in future work. Let us recall that Proposition 3 showed that under streamfunction dissipation alone, the inequality $C_{12}(q) \leq U_2(q)$ implies $\Delta(k, q) \leq 0$ for all wavenumbers $k < q$. We also know that $C_{12}(q)$ is mathematically restricted via the triangle inequality $2|C_{12}(q)| \leq U_1(q) + U_2(q)$ over an interval of values intersecting with the constraint $C_{12}(q) \leq U_2(q)$. We were able to find similar sufficient conditions for the cases of extrapolated Ekman dissipation and differential small-scale dissipation, however including either or both features on top of streamfunction dissipation makes the sufficient conditions more restrictive. This is, of course, expected and consistent with the preceding discussion of the consequences of Proposition 4.

The first step towards deriving the propositions below is to rewrite $\Delta(k, q)$ in terms of $D_1(q)$, $D_2(q)$, and $d(q)$ as follows

$$\Delta(k, q) = B_1(k, q)D_1(q) + B_2(k, q)D_2(q) + B_3(k, q)d(q), \quad (5.1)$$

with $B_1(k, q)$, $B_2(k, q)$, and $B_3(k, q)$ given by

$$B_1(k, q) = [2k^2 - 2a(q) - b(q)]U_1(q) - b(q)U_2(q) - b(q)[2C_{12}(q) - U(q)] \quad (5.2)$$

$$= 2[k^2 - a(q)]U_1(q) - 2b(q)C_{12}(q), \quad (5.3)$$

$$B_2(k, q) = -b(q)U_1(q) + [2k^2 - 2a(q) - b(q)]U_2(q) - b(q)[2C_{12}(q) - U(q)] \quad (5.4)$$

$$= 2[k^2 - a(q)]U_2(q) - 2b(q)C_{12}(q), \quad (5.5)$$

$$B_3(k, q) = -b(q)U_1(q) + [k^2 - a(q) - 2b(q)]\mu U_1(q) + [2k^2 - 2a(q) - b(q)]U_2(q) \\ + \mu[k^2 - a(q)]U_2(q) - b(q)[2C_{12}(q) - U(q)] + \mu[k^2 - a(q)][2C_{12}(q) - U(q)] \quad (5.6)$$

$$= 2[k^2 - a(q)]U_2(q) - 2b(q)C_{12}(q) \\ + \mu[k^2 - a(q)][U_1(q) + U_2(q) + 2C_{12}(q) - U(q)] - 2\mu b(q)U_1(q) \quad (5.7)$$

$$= 2[k^2 - a(q)]U_2(q) - 2b(q)C_{12}(q) + \mu[k^2 - a(q)]2C_{12}(q) - 2\mu b(q)U_1(q). \quad (5.8)$$

More specifically, we were able to derive the following two propositions from the above equations.

PROPOSITION 5. *Assume that $b(q) < 0$ and $k^2 - a(q) - b(q) < 0$. Assume also streamfunction dissipation with both differential small-scale dissipation and extrapolated Ekman dissipation with $-1 < \mu < 0$.*

(a) *If $C_{12}(q) \leq 0$, then $\Delta(k, q) \leq 0$.*

(b) *If $C_{12}(q) \leq \min\{U_1(q), U_2(q)\}$ and $U_1(q) + \mu U_2(q) \geq 0$, then $\Delta(k, q) \leq 0$.*

Proof. To show (a) we first note that $k^2 - a(q) = [k^2 - a(q) - b(q)] + b(q) < k^2 - a(q) - b(q) < 0$. Combined with the given assumptions, we find that $B_1(k, q)$, $B_2(k, q)$ and $B_3(k, q)$ satisfy

$$B_1(k, q) = 2[k^2 - a(q)]U_1(q) - 2b(q)C_{12}(q) \leq 2[k^2 - a(q)]U_1(q) \leq 0, \quad (5.9)$$

$$B_2(k, q) = 2[k^2 - a(q)]U_2(q) - 2b(q)C_{12}(q) \leq 2[k^2 - a(q)]U_2(q) \leq 0, \quad (5.10)$$

$$B_3(k, q) = 2[k^2 - a(q)]U_2(q) - 2b(q)C_{12}(q) + \mu[k^2 - a(q)]2C_{12}(q) - 2\mu b(q)U_1(q) \quad (5.11)$$

$$\leq 2[k^2 - a(q)]U_2(q) - 2\mu b(q)U_1(q) \leq 0. \quad (5.12)$$

Here we used the inequalities $-2b(q)C_{12}(q) \leq 0$, and $\mu[k^2 - a(q)]2C_{12}(q) \leq 0$, and $2\mu b(q)U_1(q) \leq 0$, that follow from the given assumptions. It follows that $\Delta(k, q) \leq 0$.

To show (b) we use the given assumptions to show that

$$B_1(k, q) = 2[k^2 - a(q)]U_1(q) - 2b(q)C_{12}(q) \leq 2[k^2 - a(q)]U_1(q) - 2b(q)U_1(q) \quad (5.13)$$

$$\leq 2[k^2 - a(q) - b(q)]U_1(q) \leq 0, \quad (5.14)$$

$$B_2(k, q) = 2[k^2 - a(q)]U_2(q) - 2b(q)C_{12}(q) \leq 2[k^2 - a(q)]U_2(q) - 2b(q)U_2(q) \quad (5.15)$$

$$= 2[k^2 - a(q) - b(q)]U_2(q) \leq 0. \quad (5.16)$$

The above two inequalities for $B_1(k, q)$ and $B_2(k, q)$ are based on the assumptions $C_{12}(q) \leq U_1(q)$ and $C_{12}(q) \leq U_2(q)$. We also show that $B_3(k, q)$ is bounded by

$$B_3(k, q) = 2[k^2 - a(q)]U_2(q) - 2b(q)C_{12}(q) + \mu[k^2 - a(q)]2C_{12}(q) - 2\mu b(q)U_1(q) \quad (5.17)$$

$$\leq 2[k^2 - a(q)]U_2(q) - 2b(q)U_2(q) + \mu[k^2 - a(q)]2U_1(q) - 2\mu b(q)U_1(q) \quad (5.18)$$

$$= 2[k^2 - a(q) - b(q)]U_2(q) + 2\mu[k^2 - a(q) - b(q)]U_1(q) \quad (5.19)$$

$$= 2[k^2 - a(q) - b(q)][U_2(q) + \mu U_1(q)]. \quad (5.20)$$

Since $k^2 - a(q) - b(q) < 0$ and by hypothesis $U_1(q) + \mu U_2(q) \geq 0$ it follows that $B_3(k, q) \leq 0$, and consequently $\Delta(k, q) \leq 0$. \square

PROPOSITION 6. *Assume that $k^2 - a(q) - b(q) < 0$ and $b(q) < 0$. We also assume streamfunction dissipation with extrapolated Ekman dissipation with $-1 < \mu < 0$ and symmetric small-scale dissipation with $D_1(q) = D_2(q)$. It follows that if $C_{12}(q) \leq \min\{U_1(q), U_2(q)\}$ then $\Delta(k, q) \leq 0$.*

Proof. Under the assumption of symmetric small-scale dissipation (i.e. $D_1(q) = D_2(q)$), we may rewrite $\Delta(k, q)$ as

$$\Delta(k, q) = [B_1(k, q) + B_2(k, q)]D(q) + B_3(k, q)d(q). \quad (5.21)$$

We note that from the given assumptions, we have

$$B_1(k, q) + B_2(k, q) = 2[k^2 - a(q)]U_1(q) - 2b(q)C_{12}(q) + 2[k^2 - a(q)]U_2(q) - 2b(q)C_{12}(q) \quad (5.22)$$

$$= 2[k^2 - a(q)]U(q) - 4b(q)C_{12}(q) \quad (5.23)$$

$$= 2[k^2 - a(q) - b(q)]U(q) - 2b(q)[2C_{12}(q) - U(q)] \leq 0, \quad (5.24)$$

using $k^2 - a(q) - b(q) < 0$, $b(q) < 0$, and $2C_{12}(q) - U(q) \leq 0$. We also have

$$B_3(k, q) = 2[k^2 - a(q)]U_2(q) - 2b(q)C_{12}(q) + \mu[k^2 - a(q)]2C_{12}(q) - 2\mu b(q)U_1(q) \quad (5.25)$$

$$\leq 2[k^2 - a(q)]U_2(q) - 2b(q)U_2(q) + \mu[k^2 - a(q)]2C_{12}(q) - 2\mu b(q)C_{12}(q) \quad (5.26)$$

$$= 2[k^2 - a(q) - b(q)]U_2(q) + 2\mu[k^2 - a(q) - b(q)]C_{12}(q) \quad (5.27)$$

$$\leq 2[k^2 - a(q) - b(q)]U_2(q) + 2\mu[k^2 - a(q) - b(q)]U_2(q) \quad (5.28)$$

$$= 2(1 + \mu)[k^2 - a(q) - b(q)]U_2(q) \leq 0. \quad (5.29)$$

Here, on the first line we used the assumptions $C_{12}(q) \leq U_1(q)$ and $C_{12}(q) \leq U_2(q)$ to argue that $-2b(q)C_{12}(q) \leq -2b(q)U_2(q)$ and $-2\mu b(q)U_1(q) \leq -2\mu b(q)C_{12}(q)$. The remainder of the argument continues to apply the given assumptions and it is easy to follow. We conclude that $\Delta(k, q) \leq 0$. \square

Proposition 5 shows that for the general case of streamfunction dissipation with both differential small-scale dissipation and extrapolated Ekman dissipation, if the streamfunction spectrum $C_{12}(q)$ is negative for all wavenumbers $q > k$, then the flux inequality is satisfied at the wavenumber k . It also shows that the restriction on the streamfunction spectrum $C_{12}(q)$ can be relaxed to the wider inequality $C_{12}(q) \leq \min\{U_1(q), U_2(q)\}$ if we choose to introduce the restriction $U_1(q) + \mu U_2(q) \geq 0$ on the streamfunction spectra $U_1(q)$ and $U_2(q)$. In proposition 6 we eliminate differential small-scale dissipation but retain extrapolated Ekman dissipation. This eliminates the restriction $U_1(q) + \mu U_2(q) \geq 0$ whereas the restriction on the streamfunction spectrum $C_{12}(q)$ remains the same as in Proposition 5. This shows that the restriction $U_1(q) + \mu U_2(q) \geq 0$ originates from differential small-scale dissipation, and since μ is negative, it constitutes a non-trivial constraint on the streamfunction spectra $U_1(q)$ and $U_2(q)$. As a result, the sufficient conditions of Proposition 6 are rigorously wider than the sufficient conditions of Proposition 5. It goes without saying that eliminating both differential small-scale dissipation and extrapolated Ekman dissipation reverts us back to Proposition 3 where the stated sufficient condition is clearly wider than that of Proposition 6. Specifically, for $\mu = 0$, the inequality $U_1(q) + \mu U_2(q) \geq 0$ reduces to the trivial inequality $U_1(q) \geq 0$. Furthermore, in the proof of proposition 6, if $\mu = 0$, we no longer need the constraint $C_{12}(q) \leq U_1(q)$ to show that $B_3(k, q) \leq 0$, and only the constraint $C_{12}(q) \leq U_2(q)$ is needed by the remainder of the proof.

6. Conclusions and Discussion

We have derived rigorous sufficient conditions for satisfying the flux inequality $k^2\Pi_E(k) - \Pi_G(k) \leq 0$ under the two-layer quasi-geostrophic model, dissipated under streamfunction dissipation with extrapolated Ekman dissipation and differential small-scale dissipation. These results extend previous results by Gkioulekas (2012b) for the same model. The only physical assumption inherent in these results is that forcing via the baroclinic instability is limited to large scales. The propositions 1-6 are mathematically rigorous and do not require this assumption, however the assumption comes into play at the very last

step where the conclusion of propositions 1-6 is used to infer the flux inequality itself. More importantly we have derived the precise mathematical relationship between the energy dissipation spectrum $D_E(k)$ and the potential enstrophy dissipation rate spectrum $D_G(k)$ with the streamfunction spectra $U_1(q)$, $U_2(q)$, and $C_{12}(q)$ under this new and more general dissipation configuration. These relations are relevant to any attempts to formulate correct closure models and also for further investigation of the flux inequality.

Overall, we have noticed that, starting from a streamfunction dissipation configuration, adding either extrapolated Ekman dissipation or differential small-scale dissipation (or both) tends to tighten the sufficient conditions for satisfying the flux inequality. This indicates, but does not establish, an increased likelihood that the flux inequality $k^2\Pi_E(k) - \Pi_G(k) \leq 0$ can be more easily violated under these more general dissipation configurations. As was previously argued by Gkioulekas & Tung (2005*a,b*) and Gkioulekas & Tung (2007), a violation of the flux inequality beyond a wavenumber k_t would allow a downscale energy flux large enough to result in a transition from k^{-3} to $k^{-5/3}$ scaling in the energy spectrum near the wavenumber k_t .

We have seen that extrapolated Ekman dissipation makes it harder to satisfy the flux inequality and that there is a plausible physical motivation for using this particular type of Ekman dissipation. While the details of the physical motivation itself may be subject to some debate as to which choice for the Ekman term is better from a physical standpoint, we note that one can continuously regulate between both choices via the parameter μ , and that, from the standpoint of this investigation, it is useful to assess the impact of either choice on the robustness of the flux inequality. Already, the preliminary results in this paper indicate that using extrapolated Ekman dissipation seems to reduce the robustness of the flux inequality to some extent, but more work is necessary to determine whether the reduction is significant or marginal. Differential small-scale dissipation also seems to be very promising in facilitating a breakdown of the flux inequality. However, there is no obvious physical motivation for introducing an asymmetric configuration of the small-scale dissipation terms. We would therefore like to expand on the reasons why we believe that this is an idea worth pursuing.

Any kind of small-scale dissipation in quasi-geostrophic models is not physical either but it is tolerated mainly because it is intended to model the dissipative mechanisms that exist at smaller scales where quasi-geostrophic dynamics breaks down and three-dimensional dynamics becomes dominant. Lindborg (2009) estimates that quasi-geostrophic dynamics breaks down at a length scale of about 100km. However, the scaling transition wavenumber k_t of the Nastrom-Gage spectrum (Gage 1979; Gage & Nastrom 1986; Nastrom & Gage 1984; Nastrom *et al.* 1984), and consequently the breakdown of the flux inequality, occurs at a greater length scale of about 1000km to 700km in wavelength, which is still within the quasi-geostrophic regime. The hypothesis underlying the quasi-geostrophic modeling of atmospheric turbulence is that the locality of the coexisting downscale potential enstrophy cascade and downscale energy cascade shields them from the three-dimensional dominated regime at the smallest scales. Both cascades are furthermore protected by the continuing conservation of potential enstrophy under the stratified turbulence dynamics that becomes dominant at scales less than 100km. The above considerations suggest the hypothesis that three-dimensional effects are not likely to contaminate the nonlinear quasi-geostrophic dynamics driving the coexisting cascades of potential enstrophy and energy in the quasi-geostrophic regime, which allows us to model small-scale three-dimensional processes, as seen from the quasi-geostrophic regime's point of view, via small-scale hyperdiffusion terms applied to all layers.

That said, there is one non-local effect that the three-dimensional regime can inflict on the quasi-geostrophic regime, and that is to boost the downscale energy dissipation

rate, thereby increasing the downscale energy flux passing through the quasi-geostrophic regime of length scales and decreasing the transition wavenumber k_t . Gkioulekas & Tung (2007) and Gkioulekas (2012*b*) have already noted that symmetric dissipation on both layers of the two-layer quasi-geostrophic model suppresses the downscale energy dissipation rate, similarly to what occurs in two-dimensional turbulence, thereby ruling out the occurrence of an observable scale transition in the inertial range. On the other hand, the observational data itself, namely the Nastrom-Gage spectrum (Gage 1979; Gage & Nastrom 1986; Nastrom & Gage 1984; Nastrom *et al.* 1984) combined with the flux analysis by Cho & Lindborg (2001*a,b*), suggest the existence of small-scale dissipation mechanisms that can dissipate energy at a significantly greater rate. This is why we propose that if differential small-scale dissipation can be shown to achieve an equivalent effect, then it should be accepted as a more realistic configuration, for modelling purposes. One may then inquire whether there is a physical eddy-viscosity interpretation underlying such an asymmetric configuration that may have escaped the attention of previous investigators. Implicit in such an inquiry is the need to expand the study of the flux inequality beyond the two-layer model to multi-layer models.

The idea of a flux inequality was first brought up in email communication between Sergey Danilov with the author and Ka-Kit Tung, in the context of two-dimensional Navier-Stokes turbulence.

REFERENCES

- CHARNEY, J. 1971 Geostrophic turbulence. *J. Atmos. Sci.* **28**, 1087–1095.
- CHO, J. & LINDBORG, E. 2001*a* Horizontal velocity structure functions in the upper troposphere and lower stratosphere. 1. Observations. *J. Geophys. Res.* **106 D10**, 10,223–10,232.
- CHO, J. & LINDBORG, E. 2001*b* Horizontal velocity structure functions in the upper troposphere and lower stratosphere. 2. Theoretical considerations. *J. Geophys. Res.* **106 D10**, 10 223–10 241.
- GAGE, K. 1979 Evidence for a $k^{-5/3}$ law inertial range in mesoscale two-dimensional turbulence. *J. Atmos. Sci.* **36**, 1950–1954.
- GAGE, K. & NASTROM, G. 1986 Theoretical interpretation of atmospheric wavenumber spectra of wind and temperature observed by commercial aircraft during GASP. *J. Atmos. Sci.* **43**, 729–740.
- GKIOULEKAS, E. 2012*a* The effect of asymmetric large-scale dissipation on energy and potential enstrophy injection in two-layer quasi-geostrophic turbulence. *J. Fluid. Mech.* **694**, 493–523.
- GKIOULEKAS, E. 2012*b* Energy and potential enstrophy flux constraints in the two-layer quasi-geostrophic model. *J. Fluid. Mech.* Resubmitted. [arXiv:1201.0567v2 [nlin.CD]].
- GKIOULEKAS, E. & TUNG, K. 2005*a* On the double cascades of energy and enstrophy in two dimensional turbulence. Part 1. Theoretical formulation. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B* **5**, 79–102.
- GKIOULEKAS, E. & TUNG, K. 2005*b* On the double cascades of energy and enstrophy in two dimensional turbulence. Part 2. Approach to the KLB limit and interpretation of experimental evidence. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B* **5**, 103–124.
- GKIOULEKAS, E. & TUNG, K. 2007 Is the subdominant part of the energy spectrum due to downscale energy cascade hidden in quasi-geostrophic turbulence? *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B* **7**, 293–314.
- LINDBORG, E. 2009 Two comments on the surface quasigeostrophic model for the atmospheric energy spectrum. *J. Atmos. Sci.* **66**, 1069–1072.
- NASTROM, G. & GAGE, K. 1984 A climatology of atmospheric wave number spectra of wind and temperature observed by commercial aircraft. *J. Atmos. Sci.* **42**, 950–960.
- NASTROM, G., GAGE, K. & JASPERSON, W. 1984 The atmospheric kinetic energy spectrum, $10^0 - 10^4$ km. *Nature* **310**, 36–38.

- SALMON, R. 1980 Baroclinic instability and geostrophic turbulence. *Geophys. Astrophys. Fluid Dyn.* **15**, 167–211.
- TUNG, K. & ORLANDO, W. 2003*a* The k^{-3} and $k^{-5/3}$ energy spectrum of the atmospheric turbulence: quasi-geostrophic two level model simulation. *J. Atmos. Sci.* **60**, 824–835.
- TUNG, K. & ORLANDO, W. 2003*b* On the differences between 2D and QG turbulence. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B* **3**, 145–162.
- TUNG, K. & WELCH, W. 2001 Remarks on note on geostrophic turbulence. *J. Atmos. Sci.* **58**, 2009–2012.