

# Multi-locality and fusion rules on the generalized structure functions in two-dimensional and three-dimensional Navier-Stokes turbulence

Eleftherios Gkioulekas

*Department of Mathematics, University of Texas-Pan American , Edinburg, TX, United States\**

Using the fusion rules hypothesis for three-dimensional and two-dimensional Navier-Stokes turbulence, we generalize a previous non-perturbative locality proof to multiple applications of the nonlinear interactions operator on generalized structure functions of velocity differences. The resulting cross-terms pose a new challenge requiring a new argument and the introduction of a new fusion rule that takes advantage of rotational symmetry.

arXiv:1410.6227v1 [nlin.CD] 23 Oct 2014

Understanding the cascades of hydrodynamic turbulence by means of an analytical theory of the governing equations has been an ongoing effort over many decades, spearheaded by Kolmogorov's prediction of a downscale energy cascade in three-dimensional turbulence [1–3] and Kraichnan's prediction of a downscale enstrophy cascade and an inverse energy cascade in two-dimensional turbulence [4–6]. Kraichnan also formulated LHDIA [7, 8], the first successful first-order closure model of three-dimensional turbulence, realizing the need for a Lagrangian representation of the velocity field [9]. The main breakthrough that made it possible to move beyond Kraichnan's LHDIA theory to higher-order theories, was the discovery of the quasi-Lagrangian representation by Belinicher and L'vov [10, 11]. Thus it became possible to develop the L'vov-Procaccia theory [12–22], based on Feynman diagram methods [23–26], that successfully explained the locality, stability, and existence of intermittency corrections in the downscale energy cascade of three-dimensional turbulence. Recently, we began an effort to extend this approach to the cascades of two-dimensional turbulence [27–31]. The historical development of this theory and the open questions related to two-dimensional turbulence have been reviewed elsewhere [29, 32, 33].

Within the L'vov-Procaccia theory, generalized structure functions are defined as ensemble averages of some velocity difference product in which each velocity is evaluated at distinct points in space. The fusion rules govern the scaling of the generalized structure functions when some velocity difference endpoints are brought closer together, and they encapsulate, in mathematical terms, the physical understanding that turbulence cascades forget the details of random forcing within the inertial range, though they may remember the forcing length scale. As such, the fusion rules serve as a nexus point of contact between analytical theories and phenomenology: on one side, they can be derived from first principles, using diagrammatic methods [12–14]; on the other hand, they can be used in conjunction with the balance equations on the generalized structure functions to explain the locality and stability of cascades [14, 17, 30], placement of dissipation scales and the existence of anomalous sinks [16, 17, 31], both for the cascades of three-dimensional and two-dimensional turbulence. With generalized structure functions, the corresponding in-

ertial ranges are reinvisioned as multidimensional regions, a major step towards a deeper understanding of the cascades of two-dimensional turbulence [31]. In this Letter we provide a generalization of the argument that the fusion rules imply the non-perturbative locality of the nonlinear interactions term in the balance equations of the generalized structure functions [17, 30]. This generalization, which we have termed "multi-locality", is a major step towards broadening the range of results that can be derived by the fusion rules and also places some earlier results on more rigorous grounds.

Writing the definition of the  $n^{\text{th}}$ -order generalized structure functions  $F_n(\{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'\}_n, t)$  as

$$F_n^{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_n}(\{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'\}_n, t) = \left\langle \prod_{k=1}^n w_{\alpha_k}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{x}'_k, t) \right\rangle \quad (1)$$

with  $w_{\alpha_k}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}', t) = u_{\alpha_k}(\mathbf{x}, t) - u_{\alpha_k}(\mathbf{x}', t)$  and  $u_{\alpha}(\mathbf{x}, t)$  the Eulerian velocity field. Differentiating with respect to time  $t$  yields an equation of the form  $\partial F_n / \partial t + \mathcal{O}_n F_{n+1} = I_n + \mathcal{D}_n F_n + Q_n$ , with  $\mathcal{O}_n F_{n+1}$  representing the nonlinear local interactions that govern the cascades,  $I_n$  the sweeping interactions (see Ref. [29] for details),  $\mathcal{D}_n F_n$  the dissipation terms, and  $Q_n$  the forcing terms. Here  $\mathcal{O}_n$  and  $\mathcal{D}_n$  are linear operators and a detailed account of these terms is given in Ref. [30]. The locality of cascades is reflected mathematically in the locality of the integrals in  $\mathcal{O}_n F_{n+1}$ , which can be deduced from the fusion rules hypothesis [15, 17, 30]. Locality implies that if  $F_n$  scales as  $R^{\zeta_n}$  when all velocity difference endpoints are separated at length scale  $R$ , then the terms that comprise  $\mathcal{O}_n F_{n+1}$ , scale as  $R^{\zeta_{n+1}-1}$  and the extent of the inertial range can be determined by comparing them against  $Q_n$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_n F_n$  and  $I_n$ .

We will now consider the locality of the terms that comprise  $\mathcal{O}_n \mathcal{O}_{n+1} \dots \mathcal{O}_{n+p-1} F_{n+p}$ . These terms arise from more general balance equations for the  $p^{\text{th}}$ -order time derivative  $\partial^p F_n / \partial t^p$ . These equations were previously used to establish bridge relations between the scaling exponents of correlations involving velocity gradients and the scaling exponents  $\zeta_n$  [17] and they are also needed to continue the previous investigation of the cross-over of generalized structure functions to the dissipation range [16, 17, 31]. We will show that the integrals in the general term  $\mathcal{O}_n \mathcal{O}_{n+1} \dots \mathcal{O}_{n+p-1} F_{n+p}$  continue to be local, implying  $R^{\zeta_{n+p}-p}$  scaling, except that this generalization requires a careful consideration of the fusion rule for a new geometry that was not previously needed. We will begin with a review of the needed fusion rules. Then we will consider the mathematical structure of the relevant integrals and establish their

---

\*Electronic address: drlf@hushmail.com

convergence.

Let  $\{\mathbf{X}_k\}_{k=1}^n = (\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}'_n)$  be a given geometry of velocity differences, with all point-to-point distances having order of magnitude 1, and define  $F_n^{(p)}(r, R) = F_n(r\{\mathbf{X}_k\}_{k=1}^p, R\{\mathbf{X}_k\}_{k=p+1}^n)$ . For  $2 \leq p \leq n-1$ , and with  $r \ll R$  with both  $r, R$  in the inertial range, the fusion rules hypothesis is that  $F_n^{(p)}$  scales according to  $F_n^{(p)}(\lambda_1 r, \lambda_2 R) = \lambda_1^{\xi_{np}} \lambda_2^{\zeta_n - \xi_{np}} F_n^{(p)}(r, R)$  with  $\xi_{np} = \zeta_p$  for all downscale cascades and  $\xi_{np} = \zeta_n - \zeta_{n-p}$  for all upscale cascades [15, 17, 30]. For  $p=1$ , when the small velocity difference (i.e. the one that scales according to  $r$ ) is either attached or too close to one of the other velocity difference endpoints, the corresponding fusion exponent gives  $\xi_{n,1} = \zeta_2$ , due to a postulated rotational symmetry, reducing to  $\xi_{n,1} = \zeta_2$  in a downscale cascade and  $\xi_{n,1} = \zeta_n - \zeta_{n-2}$  in an upscale cascade. For  $p=n-1$ , we have one large velocity difference at scale  $R$  and  $n-1$  small velocity differences at scale  $r$ . If we assume that the small velocity differences are congregated within a blob of size  $r$ , and that one end of the large velocity difference is also within the same blob, then a generalization of the argument given in section II.C.3 of Ref. [17], gives  $\xi_{n,n-1} = \zeta_n$ , which corresponds to  $\xi_{n,n-1} = \zeta_n$  for a downscale cascade and  $\xi_{n,n-1} = 0$  for an upscale cascade. The argument takes advantage of the incompressibility of the velocity field, under the Navier-Stokes equations, and the rotational invariance, approached asymptotically in the limit  $r \ll R$ , of the overall generalized structure function when rotating the large velocity difference around the  $r$ -blob. As such, it is easily extended to upscale cascades, remaining independent of the cascade direction.

To formulate a locality proof for the general terms of  $\mathcal{O}_n \mathcal{O}_{n+1} \cdots \mathcal{O}_{n+p-1} F_{n+p}$  it becomes now necessary to give special consideration to a new velocity difference geometry: there are two blobs with length scales  $r$  and  $l$  separated by a distance scale  $R$ . The  $r$ -blob holds a congregation of  $n-p-1$  velocity differences with scale  $r$  point separations, the  $l$ -blob holds

$p$  velocity differences with scale  $l$  point separations, and the remaining velocity difference has length scale  $R$  with one end inside the  $r$ -blob and the other end inside the  $l$ -blob. We take the intermediate asymptotic limits  $r \ll R$  and  $l \ll R$  with  $r, l$ , and  $R$  all within the inertial range. Note that the velocity differences in the  $l$ -blob will be attached to each other in the geometries that arise from the locality integrals, however they can be detached with no consequence to the fusion rule scaling exponents, as long as all endpoints remain separated at length scale  $l$ . The rotational invariance argument that was previously used for the case  $p=n-1$  [17] can be now repeated from the viewpoint of either blob. So, from the viewpoint of the  $r$ -blob, we can rotate the  $R$  velocity difference around the  $R$ -blob, along with the  $l$ -blob attached on the other end. Then, the asymptotic rotational invariance of the generalized structure function with respect to such a rotation, in conjunction with incompressibility, gives an  $r^{\xi_{n,n-p}}$  dependence. Likewise, from the viewpoint of the  $l$ -blob, the invariance with respect to rotating the  $R$  velocity difference along with the attached  $l$ -blob gives  $l^{\xi_{n,p+1}}$  scaling dependence. The resulting fusion rule takes the form  $F_n^{(p)}(r, l, R) \sim (r/R)^{\xi_{n,n-p}} (l/R)^{\xi_{n,p+1}} R^{\zeta_n}$  which implies an  $R^{\zeta_n - \xi_{n,n-p} - \xi_{n,p+1}}$  dependence. For the special case  $p=1$ , this reduces to the fusion geometry needed to establish the IR locality of  $\mathcal{O}_n F_{n+1}$ . However, the resulting scaling with respect to  $R$  is stronger, in the sense that it helps establish a faster vanishing of the integrals in the IR limits. The stronger claim originates from the assumption that, aside from the  $R$  velocity difference, the remaining velocity differences are confined within their respective blobs. This is a valid assumption, for the velocity difference geometries that arise in the local interaction integrals, but previous arguments [15, 17, 30] did not take full advantage of it.

The main challenge with extending the locality proof to the terms of  $\mathcal{O}_n \mathcal{O}_{n+1} \cdots \mathcal{O}_{n+p-1} F_{n+p}$ , is the existence of cross-terms. The mathematical structure of  $\mathcal{O}_n F_{n+1}$  takes the form

$$\mathcal{O}_n F_{n+1}(\{\mathbf{X}\}_n, t) = \sum_{k=1}^n \iint d\mathbf{Y}_1 d\mathbf{Y}_2 \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}_k, \mathbf{Y}_1, \mathbf{Y}_2) F_{n+1}(\{\mathbf{X}\}_n^k, \mathbf{Y}_1, \mathbf{Y}_2). \quad (2)$$

Here,  $\{\mathbf{X}\}_n^k = (\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{k-1}, \mathbf{X}_{k+1}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n)$  and  $\mathcal{O}_n(\mathbf{X}_k, \mathbf{Y}_1, \mathbf{Y}_2)$  is a generalized function representing the appropriate integrodifferential operator. Note that in  $F_{n+1}$ ,  $\mathbf{X}_k$  is replaced with  $\mathbf{Y}_1$  and  $\mathbf{Y}_2$  is added thereafter. It is easy to show that  $\mathcal{O}_n \mathcal{O}_{n+1} F_{n+2}$  takes the form

$$\mathcal{O}_n \mathcal{O}_{n+1} F_{n+2}(\{\mathbf{X}\}_n, t) = \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{k=1, k \neq l}^n \iint d\mathbf{Z}_1 d\mathbf{Z}_2 \iint d\mathbf{Y}_1 d\mathbf{Y}_2 \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2) \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}_k, \mathbf{Y}_1, \mathbf{Y}_2) F_{n+2}(\{\mathbf{X}\}_n^{kl}, \mathbf{Y}_1, \mathbf{Y}_2, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2) \quad (3)$$

$$+ \sum_{l=1}^n \iint d\mathbf{Z}_1 d\mathbf{Z}_2 \iint d\mathbf{Y}_1 d\mathbf{Y}_2 \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{X}_l, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2) \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Y}_1, \mathbf{Y}_2) F_{n+2}(\{\mathbf{X}\}_n^l, \mathbf{Y}_1, \mathbf{Y}_2, \mathbf{Z}_1, \mathbf{Z}_2) \quad (4)$$

Here  $\{\mathbf{X}\}_n^{kl}$  consists of  $n-2$  arguments, with  $\mathbf{X}_k$  and  $\mathbf{X}_l$  deleted from the original set of points. Obviously, the locality of the first term in the above expression follows from the same argument that establishes locality in  $\mathcal{O}_n F_{n+1}$ . The problem is

that a separate argument is needed for the second term, corresponding to the case  $k=l$  in the double summation above. This argument was not previously given [16, 17] in the derivation of the bridge relations, with no explanation as to how one

dispatches the cross-terms.

We will now show that it is indeed possible to extend the

locality proof to these cross-terms. We begin with the observation that a typical contribution to  $\mathcal{O}_n F_{n+1}$  takes the form

$$\int d\mathbf{y} P_{\alpha_k \beta}(\mathbf{y}) \partial_{\gamma, \mathbf{x}_k} \left\langle \left[ \prod_{l=1, l \neq k}^n w_{\alpha_l}(\mathbf{X}_l) \right] w_\beta(\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}'_k - \mathbf{y}) w_\gamma(\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{s}) \right\rangle \quad (5)$$

with possible values of  $\mathbf{s}$  being  $\mathbf{s} \in \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}'_n\}$ . Here  $\partial_{\gamma, \mathbf{x}_k}$  is the spatial partial derivative with respect to the  $\gamma$  component of  $\mathbf{x}_k$  and  $P_{\alpha \beta}(\mathbf{x})$  is the kernel of the operator  $\mathcal{P}_{\alpha \beta} = \delta_{\alpha \beta} - \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta \nabla^{-2}$  with  $\delta_{\alpha \beta}$  the kronecker delta. It is given by

$$P_{\alpha \beta}(\mathbf{x}) = \delta_{\alpha \beta} \delta(\mathbf{x}) - g''(\|\mathbf{x}\|) \frac{x_\alpha x_\beta}{\|\mathbf{x}\|} - g'(\|\mathbf{x}\|) \left[ \frac{\delta_{\alpha \beta}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|} - \frac{x_\alpha x_\beta}{\|\mathbf{x}\|^3} \right] \quad (6)$$

with  $g(r)$  the Green's function for the inverse Laplacian  $\nabla^{-2}$ , which is  $g(r) = -1/(4\pi r)$  in three dimensions and  $g(r) = \ln r/(2\pi)$  in two dimensions, and it scales as  $P_{\alpha \beta}(\mathbf{x}) \sim \|\mathbf{x}\|^{-d}$  with  $d$  the number of dimensions.  $\mathcal{O}_n F_{n+1}$  also has contributions involving the  $\partial_{\gamma, \mathbf{x}'_k}$  derivative instead, where  $w_\gamma(\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{s})$  is replaced with  $w_\gamma(\mathbf{x}'_k - \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{s})$ .

It is worth noting how  $F_n(\{\mathbf{X}\}_n, t)$  is transformed into the above contributions to  $\mathcal{O}_n F_{n+1}(\{\mathbf{X}\}_n, t)$ , in order to understand the more general case: (a) The index  $\alpha_k$  is moved to  $P_{\alpha_k \beta}$  and in the velocity product we replace  $w_{\alpha_k}$  with  $w_\beta$ ; (b) both arguments of  $w_\beta$  are shifted by  $\mathbf{y}$ ; (c) A new velocity factor  $w_\gamma(\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{s})$  is introduced in the velocity product for the  $\partial_{\gamma, \mathbf{x}_k}$  terms and correspondingly we introduce  $w_\gamma(\mathbf{x}'_k - \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{s})$  for the  $\partial_{\gamma, \mathbf{x}'_k}$  terms.

UV locality corresponds to vanishing integral contributions in the limits  $\mathbf{y} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{y} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_l$  or  $\mathbf{x}'_l$ , and  $\mathbf{x}'_k - \mathbf{y} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_l$  or  $\mathbf{x}'_l$ . Locality in the limit  $\mathbf{y} \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$  follows from  $\xi_{n+1,2} > 0$  and for the other limits, the weaker condition  $\xi_{n+1,2} + d > 0$  is sufficient, with  $d$  the number of dimensions [30]. IR locality corresponds to the limit  $\rho \equiv \|\mathbf{y}\| \rightarrow +\infty$ , and it follows from the condition  $\zeta_{n+1} \leq \xi_{n+1,2} + \xi_{n+1,n-1}$ . As explained before [30], under the fusion rules hypothesis, these conditions are satisfied by both the upscale and downscale cascades of two-dimensional Navier-Stokes turbulence, and the entire argument carries over to three-dimensional Navier-Stokes turbulence. The case of three-dimensional turbulence was in fact considered earlier [16, 17].

Now, let us consider the locality of the cross-terms in  $\mathcal{O}_n \mathcal{O}_{n+1} F_{n+1}$ . First, we note that any terms involving the derivatives  $\partial_{\gamma_1, \mathbf{x}_k} \partial_{\gamma_2, \mathbf{x}_l}$ ,  $\partial_{\gamma_1, \mathbf{x}_k} \partial_{\gamma_2, \mathbf{x}'_l}$ ,  $\partial_{\gamma_1, \mathbf{x}'_k} \partial_{\gamma_2, \mathbf{x}_l}$  with  $k \neq l$  are not cross-terms, and their locality is an immediate consequence of the previously shown locality for  $\mathcal{O}_n F_{n+1}$ . For  $k = l$ , typical  $\partial_{\gamma_1, \mathbf{x}_k} \partial_{\gamma_2, \mathbf{x}_k}$  cross-terms take the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \int d\mathbf{y}_2 \int d\mathbf{y}_1 P_{\alpha_k \beta_1}(\mathbf{y}_2) P_{\beta_1 \beta_2}(\mathbf{y}_1) \partial_{\gamma_2, \mathbf{x}_k} \partial_{\gamma_1, \mathbf{x}_k} \\ & \times \left\langle \left[ \prod_{l=1, l \neq k}^n w_{\alpha_l}(\mathbf{X}_l) \right] w_{\beta_2}(\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{y}_1 - \mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{x}'_k - \mathbf{y}_1 - \mathbf{y}_2) \right. \\ & \left. \times w_{\gamma_1}(\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{y}_1 - \mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{s}_1) w_{\gamma_2}(\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{s}_2) \right\rangle \quad (7) \end{aligned}$$

with  $\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2 \in \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}'_n\}$ . Note that the  $\mathbf{y}_1$  integral comes from  $\mathcal{O}_{n+1}$  and the  $\mathbf{y}_2$  integral comes from  $\mathcal{O}_n$ . Starting from  $F_n(\{\mathbf{X}\}_n, t)$ , in the cross-terms of  $\mathcal{O}_n F_{n+1}$ , in the velocity product,  $w_{\alpha_k}$  is replaced with  $w_{\beta_1}(\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{x}'_k - \mathbf{y}_1)$ . We also append the factor  $w_{\gamma_1}(\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{s}_1)$  to the velocity product. Moving on to  $\mathcal{O}_n \mathcal{O}_{n+1} F_{n+2}$ , we introduce the  $\partial_{\gamma_2, \mathbf{x}_k}$  derivative and the  $\mathbf{y}_2$  integral, at which point all previous occurrences of  $\mathbf{x}_k$  are shifted by  $\mathbf{y}_2$ . As a result  $w_{\gamma_1}$  becomes  $w_{\gamma_1}(\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{y}_1 - \mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{s}_1)$ ,  $w_{\beta_1}$  becomes  $w_{\beta_2}(\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{y}_1 - \mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{x}'_k - \mathbf{y}_1 - \mathbf{y}_2)$ , the  $\beta_1$  index goes to the projection function of  $\mathbf{y}_1$  and the  $\alpha_k$  index is pushed onto the projection function of  $\mathbf{y}_2$ . A new factor  $w_{\gamma_1}(\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{s}_2)$  is also introduced. Note that if  $\mathbf{s}_1 = \mathbf{x}_k$ , then  $\mathbf{s}_1$  is also shifted by  $\mathbf{y}_2$ .

To establish locality, we stress that the integrals are done one at a time. Consequently, once the  $\mathbf{y}_1$  integral is shown to be local, the major contribution to the  $\mathbf{y}_1$  integral originates from the velocity differences situated at some length scale  $R_1$ , and given that, the locality of the  $\mathbf{y}_2$  integral is then considered. For UV locality, we consider the separate limits  $\mathbf{y}_1 \rightarrow 0^+$  and  $\mathbf{y}_2 \rightarrow 0^+$ , where the projection functions become singular. All other UV limits are less singular, owing to the regularity of the projection functions, so they do not require special consideration. First, we note that  $d\mathbf{y}_1$  contributes  $d\rho_1 \rho_1^{d-1}$  and  $P_{\beta_1 \beta_2}(\mathbf{y}_1)$  contributes  $\rho_1^{-d}$ , so the combination  $d\mathbf{y}_1 P_{\beta_1 \beta_2}(\mathbf{y}_1)$  makes no  $\rho_1$ -dependent contribution to the integral, when  $\rho_1 = \|\mathbf{y}_1\| \rightarrow 0^+$ . Likewise, no  $\rho_2$ -dependent contribution is expected from  $d\mathbf{y}_2 P_{\alpha_k \beta_1}(\mathbf{y}_2)$ , when  $\rho_2 = \|\mathbf{y}_2\| \rightarrow 0^+$ . With no loss of generality, let us consider the limit  $\rho_2 \rightarrow 0^+$ . There are three possibilities for the geometric configuration of velocity differences in the velocity product:

**Case 1:** There may be no fusions (e.g. for the case  $\mathbf{s}_2 \neq \mathbf{x}_k$ ). Then an argument similar to that of section IV.B. subcase (a) of Ref. [30] gives  $\rho_2$  scaling for the  $\mathbf{y}_2$  integral, implying a vanishing contribution in the limit  $\rho_2 \rightarrow 0^+$ .

**Case 2:** There may be a fusion of just one velocity difference which is either attached or very near another velocity difference, which occurs when  $\mathbf{s}_1 = \mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{y}_2$  and  $\mathbf{s}_2 = \mathbf{x}_k$ , and sometimes for the broader case with just  $\mathbf{s}_2 = \mathbf{x}_k$ , depending on the placement of the other velocity differences. In this case, the ensemble average of the velocity product gives a  $\rho_2^{\xi_{n+2,2}}$

contribution. The corresponding  $\rho_2$ -dependent factor is locally homogeneous (i.e. in the sense of velocity increments) with respect to shifting  $\mathbf{x}_k$ , and thus it has no dependence on  $\mathbf{x}_k$ . As a result the derivatives make no contributions to the power counting, to leading order. The details of this argument are in fact very similar to the argument given on section IV.B. subcase (b) of Ref. [30].

**Case 3:** Last, there may be a fusion of one velocity difference which is situated far away from all other velocity differences. This occurs, oftentimes, but not always, when we have  $\mathbf{s}_1 \neq \mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{y}_2$  and  $\mathbf{s}_2 = \mathbf{x}_k$ . The ensemble average of the velocity product is then governed by the fusion rule described in section II.C.2 of Ref. [17] resulting in  $\rho_2$  scaling, obtained via a Taylor expansion. Contrary to the previous case, where the scaling is expected to be fractional, the derivative of the velocity product ensemble average is analytic with respect to  $\mathbf{y}_2$ , and following the argument of section IV.B. subcase (a) of Ref. [30], we find that the overall scaling for the  $\mathbf{y}_2$  integral is again  $\rho_2$ .

The above three geometries are also encountered when considering the  $\mathbf{y}_1$  integral, or when considering cross-terms with derivatives  $\partial_{\gamma_1, \mathbf{x}_k} \partial_{\gamma_2, \mathbf{x}'_k}$  or  $\partial_{\gamma_1, \mathbf{x}'_k} \partial_{\gamma_2, \mathbf{x}'_k}$  assuring us that all cross-terms of  $\mathcal{O}_n \mathcal{O}_{n+1} \dots \mathcal{O}_{n+p-1} F_{n+2}$  are UV local.

Cross-terms for  $\mathcal{O}_n \mathcal{O}_{n+1} \dots \mathcal{O}_{n+p-1} F_{n+p}$  are more complicated and come in various combinations. One of them takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \int d\mathbf{y}_p \int d\mathbf{y}_{p-1} \dots \int d\mathbf{y}_1 P_{\alpha_k \beta_l}(\mathbf{y}_p) \left[ \prod_{l=1}^{p-1} P_{\beta_l \beta_{l+1}}(\mathbf{y}_{p-l}) \right] \\ & \times \left[ \prod_{l=1}^p \partial_{\gamma_l, \mathbf{x}_k} \right] \left\langle \left[ \prod_{l=1, l \neq k}^n w_{\alpha_l}(\mathbf{X}_l) \right] w_{\beta_p} \left( \mathbf{x}_k - \sum_{l=1}^p \mathbf{y}_l, \mathbf{x}'_k - \sum_{l=1}^p \mathbf{y}_l \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times \left[ \prod_{l=1}^p w_{\gamma_l} \left( \mathbf{x}_k - \sum_{q=l}^p \mathbf{y}_q, \mathbf{x}_k - \sum_{q=l+1}^p \mathbf{y}_q \right) \right] \right\rangle \quad (8) \end{aligned}$$

Many other combinations can be obtained by replacing the second argument for some selection of  $w_{\gamma_l}$  factors with  $\mathbf{s}_l \neq \mathbf{x}_k$  where  $\mathbf{s}_l$  can be any one of the remaining points from among  $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{x}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ . Different selection of  $w_{\gamma_l}$  factors and choices of  $\mathbf{s}_l$  for selected factors result in many different types of cross-terms. Many more variations are possible by replacing a selection of  $\partial_{\gamma_l, \mathbf{x}_k}$  derivatives with  $\partial_{\gamma_l, \mathbf{x}'_k}$  for some chosen  $l$ . Again, we do the integrals one at a time, and in the UV limit  $\mathbf{y}_l \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$ , we have a fusion in the coordinates of the  $w_{\gamma_l}$  factor that results in one of the three aforementioned geometries. The locality argument then carries through in the same manner as it did for the  $\mathcal{O}_n \mathcal{O}_{n+1} F_{n+2}$  case. For some terms, corresponding to the first and third geometries above, UV locality is unconditional, whereas for terms corresponding to the second geometry, in all cases, the locality condition is  $\xi_{n,2} > 0$ .

For IR locality we can now offer a stronger argument than what was given previously [16, 17, 30]. Considering the case of the cross-term given by Eq. (8) for  $\mathcal{O}_n \mathcal{O}_{n+1} \dots \mathcal{O}_{n+p-1} F_{n+p}$ , taking the IR limit  $\rho_m = \|\mathbf{y}_m\| \rightarrow +\infty$  results in the following fusion geometry: one small blob has  $n-1$  velocity dif-

ferences from the  $w_{\alpha_l}$  factors, and  $p-m$  velocity differences from the  $w_{\gamma_l}$  factors with  $l \in \{p, p-1, \dots, m+1\}$  with a total of  $n+p-m-1$  velocity differences. The other small blob has  $m$  velocity differences, including the  $w_{\gamma_l}$  factors with  $l \in \{m-1, \dots, 1\}$  and the  $w_{\beta_p}$  factor. The  $w_{\gamma_m}$  factor straddles across between the two small blobs over the large scale  $\rho_m$ . Altogether, we have a product of  $n+p$  velocity differences, and the corresponding fusion rule gives scaling  $\rho_m^{\Delta(m|n,p)}$  with  $\Delta(m|n,p) = \zeta_{n+p} - \zeta_{n+p,n+p-m} - \zeta_{n+p,m+1}$ . Following an argument similar to the one given in section IV.C of Ref. [30], the integral differential, the spatial derivatives, and the projection functions together do not contribute to the power-counting for  $\rho_m$ . Other types of cross-terms will still yield the same two-blob geometry, except the number of velocity differences on the two blobs may be  $n+p-m'-1$  and  $m'$  with  $m' \neq m$  but still  $1 \leq m' \leq p$ , leading to the same set of scaling exponents  $\Delta(m|n,p)$  with  $1 \leq m \leq p$ . We conclude that IR locality for  $\mathcal{O}_n \mathcal{O}_{n+1} \dots \mathcal{O}_{n+p-1} F_{n+p}$  requires  $\Delta(m|n,p) < 0$  for all  $1 \leq m \leq p$ .

Invoking the fusion rules hypothesis, for a downscale cascade we use  $\xi_{np} = \zeta_p$ , and therefore

$$\Delta(m|n,p) = \zeta_{n+p} - \zeta_{n+p-m} - \zeta_{m+1} \quad (9)$$

$$\leq \zeta_{n+p-m} + \zeta_m - \zeta_{n+p-m} - \zeta_{m+1} \quad (10)$$

$$= \zeta_m - \zeta_{m+1} \leq 0 \quad (11)$$

via the Hölder inequality  $\zeta_{n+p} \leq \zeta_{n+p-m} + \zeta_m$  and  $\zeta_m < \zeta_{m+1}$ . For an upscale cascade, we use  $\xi_{np} = \zeta_n - \zeta_{n-p}$  which gives

$$\Delta(m|n,p) = \zeta_{n+p} - (\zeta_{n+p} - \zeta_m) - (\zeta_{n+p} - \zeta_{n+p-(m+1)}) \quad (12)$$

$$= -\zeta_{n+p} + \zeta_m + \zeta_{n+p-(m+1)} \quad (13)$$

$$\leq -\zeta_{n+p} + \zeta_{n+p-1} \leq 0 \quad (14)$$

via the reversed Hölder inequality  $\zeta_m + \zeta_{n+p-(m+1)} \leq \zeta_{n+p-1}$  (due to the reversed cascade direction) and  $\zeta_{n+p} \geq \zeta_{n+p-1}$ . For monoscaling  $\zeta_n = nh$ , in both cases we find  $\Delta(m|n,p) = -h$ , so the corresponding locality condition is  $h > 0$ , which is satisfied by the cascades of both 3D and 2D turbulence.

It should be noted that this argument is stronger than the previous IR locality argument [16, 17, 30] for the special case  $p=1$ , where it was necessary to use the incompressibility condition to cancel the leading order scaling term of the velocity product. While this locality argument requires  $h > 0$ , it does not seem to require  $h < 1$ . We discussed this previously in the conclusion of Ref. [30], where it was pointed out that non-perturbative locality is weaker than perturbative locality. We speculated then that  $h < 1$  is needed for perturbative locality and possibly to establish the fusion rules from first principles. Finally, whereas the fusion rules hypothesis on  $\xi_{n,2}$  was sufficient for previous arguments on locality and anomalous sinks [16, 17, 30, 31], the locality of the cross-terms discussed in this Letter is the first occurrence of a locality argument where the fusion rules for  $\xi_{n,p}$  are needed for all possible values of  $p$ .

- 
- [1] A. Kolmogorov, Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR **30**, 301 (1941), english translation published in volume 434 of *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A*.
- [2] A. Kolmogorov, Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR **32**, 16 (1941), english translation published in volume 434 of *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A*.
- [3] G. Batchelor, Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. **43**, 533 (1947).
- [4] R. Kraichnan, Phys. Fluids **10**, 1417 (1967).
- [5] C. Leith, Phys. Fluids **11**, 671 (1968).
- [6] G. Batchelor, Phys. Fluids Suppl. II **12**, 233 (1969).
- [7] R. Kraichnan, Phys. Fluids **8**, 575 (1965).
- [8] R. Kraichnan, Phys. Fluids **9**, 1728 (1966).
- [9] R. Kraichnan, Phys. Fluids **7**, 1723 (1964).
- [10] V. Belinicher and V. L'vov, Sov. Phys. JETP **66**, 303 (1987).
- [11] V. L'vov, Phys. Rep. **207**, 2 (1991).
- [12] V. L'vov and I. Procaccia, Phys. Rev. E **52**, 3840 (1995).
- [13] V. L'vov and I. Procaccia, Phys. Rev. E **52**, 3858 (1995).
- [14] V. L'vov and I. Procaccia, Phys. Rev. E **53**, 3468 (1996).
- [15] V. L'vov and I. Procaccia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 2898 (1996).
- [16] V. L'vov and I. Procaccia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 3541 (1996).
- [17] V. L'vov and I. Procaccia, Phys. Rev. E **54**, 6268 (1996).
- [18] V. L'vov, E. Podivilov, and I. Procaccia, Phys. Rev. E **55**, 7030 (1997).
- [19] V. L'vov and I. Procaccia, Physica A **257**, 165 (1998).
- [20] V. Belinicher, V. L'vov, and I. Procaccia, Physica A **254**, 215 (1998).
- [21] V. Belinicher, V. L'vov, A. Pomyalov, and I. Procaccia, J. Stat. Phys. **93**, 797 (1998).
- [22] V. L'vov and I. Procaccia, Phys. Rev. E **62**, 8037 (2000).
- [23] H. Wyld, Ann. Phys. **14**, 143 (1961).
- [24] P. Martin, E. Siggia, and H. Rose, Phys. Rev. A **8**, 423 (1973).
- [25] R. Phythian, J. Phys. A **10**, 777 (1977).
- [26] V. L'vov and I. Procaccia, in *Fluctuating Geometries in Statistical Mechanics and Field Theory, Proceedings of the Les Houches 1994 Summer School of Theoretical Physics*, edited by F. David and P. Ginsparg (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1994).
- [27] E. Gkioulekas and K. Tung, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B **5**, 79 (2005).
- [28] E. Gkioulekas and K. Tung, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B **5**, 103 (2005).
- [29] E. Gkioulekas, Physica D **226**, 151 (2007).
- [30] E. Gkioulekas, Phys. Rev. E **78**, 066302 (2008).
- [31] E. Gkioulekas, Phys. Rev. E **82**, 046304 (2010).
- [32] V. L'vov and I. Procaccia, Physica Scripta **T64**, 131 (1996).
- [33] E. Gkioulekas and K. Tung, J. Low Temp. Phys. **145**, 25 (2006).