

The energy- and flux budget theory for surface layers in atmospheric convective and stably stratified turbulence

I. Rogachevskii^{1,2,*}, N. Kleeorin^{1,2}, and S. Zilitinkevich^{3,4}

¹*Department of Mechanical Engineering, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer-Sheva 8410530, Israel*

²*Nordita, Stockholm University and KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 10691 Stockholm, Sweden*

³*Institute for Atmospheric and Earth System Research (INAR), University of Helsinki, 00014 Helsinki, Finland*

⁴*Finnish Meteorological Institute, 00101 Helsinki, Finland*

(Dated: June 14, 2022)

The energy- and flux budget (EFB) turbulence closure theory for the atmospheric surface layers in convective and stably stratified turbulence has been developed using budget equations for turbulent energies and fluxes in the Boussinesq approximation. In the lower part of the surface layer in the atmospheric convective boundary layer (CBL), the rate of turbulence production of the turbulent kinetic energy (TKE) caused by the mean-flow surface shear and the shear of self-organised coherent structures is much larger than that caused by the buoyancy, which results in three-dimensional turbulence of very complex nature. In the upper part of the surface layer, the rate of turbulence production of TKE due to the shear is much smaller than that caused by the buoyancy, which causes unusual strongly anisotropic buoyancy-driven turbulence. Considering the applications of the obtained results to the atmospheric convective and stably stratified boundary-layer turbulence, the theoretical relationships potentially useful in modelling applications have been derived. In particular, the developed theory for the surface layers in turbulent convection and stably stratified turbulence allows us to determine the vertical profiles for all turbulent characteristics, including TKE, the intensity of turbulent potential temperature fluctuations, the vertical turbulent fluxes of momentum and buoyancy (proportional to potential temperature), the integral turbulence scale, the turbulence anisotropy, the turbulent Prandtl number and the flux Richardson number.

I. INTRODUCTION

In spite of turbulent transport have been studied theoretically, in laboratory and field experiments and numerical simulations during a century [1–8], some crucial questions remain. This is particularly true in applications such as geophysics and astrophysics, where the governing parameter values are too large to be modelled either experimentally or numerically. The classical Kolmogorov's theory has been formulated for a neutrally stratified homogeneous and isotropic turbulence [9–12]. This turbulence is different from convective and stably stratified turbulence.

Modern understanding of atmospheric convective turbulence is based on the following [13]:

- buoyancy produces chaotic vertical plumes, which are different from small-scale turbulent eddies;
- the small-scale turbulent eddies which are produced by the mean-flow shear and the shear of self-organised coherent structures, are unstable and break down in smaller unstable eddies, thus causing the direct cascade of the turbulent kinetic energy;
- merging of small plumes into larger plumes results in an inverse energy cascade towards their conversion into the self-organized large-scale coherent structures;

- in convective turbulence, there are countergradient and nongradient turbulent transports. The gradient transport of momentum, energy, and matter implies that the turbulent flux of any quantity is determined by the product of the mean gradient of the transferred quantity and the turbulent transport coefficient. The nongradient turbulent transports means that the turbulent flux is not determined by the mean gradient of the transferred quantity.

This concept is based on various experimental, numerical and theoretical studies [14–27]. The atmospheric turbulent convective boundary layer (CBL) consists in three basic parts:

- Surface layer strongly unstably stratified and dominated by small-scale turbulence of very complex nature including usual 3-D turbulence, generated by mean-flow surface shear and structural shears (the lower part of the surface layer), and unusual strongly anisotropic buoyancy-driven turbulence (the upper part of the surface layer);
- CBL core dominated by the structural energy-, momentum- and mass-transport, with only minor contribution from usual 3-D turbulence generated by local structural shears on the background of almost zero vertical gradient of potential temperature (or buoyancy);
- turbulent entrainment layer at the CBL upper boundary, characterised by essentially stable stratification with negative (downward) turbulent flux of potential temperature (or buoyancy).

* gary@bgu.ac.il; <http://www.bgu.ac.il/~gary>

The goal of this paper is to develop the energy and flux budget (EFB) turbulence closure theory for the surface layer in convective and stably stratified turbulence using budget equations for turbulent energies and fluxes. The EFB theory of turbulence closure has been previously developed for stably stratified dry atmospheric flows [28–33] and for passive scalar transport in stratified turbulence [34]. The EFB turbulence closure theory is based on the budget equations for the densities of turbulent kinetic and potential energies, and turbulent fluxes of momentum and heat.

In agreement with wide experimental evidence [35–43], the EFB theory for the stably stratified turbulence [28–33] demonstrates that strong turbulence is maintained by large-scale shear for any stratification, and the "critical Richardson number", treated many years as a threshold between the turbulent and laminar regimes, actually separates two turbulent regimes: the strong turbulence typical of atmospheric boundary layers and the weak three-dimensional turbulence typical of the free atmosphere, and characterized by strong decrease in heat transfer in comparison to momentum transfer.

The physical mechanism of self-existence of a stably stratified turbulence is as follows [32, 34]. The increase of the vertical gradient of the mean potential temperature (i.e., the increase of the buoyancy) causes a conversion of turbulent kinetic energy into turbulent potential energy. On the other hand, the negative down-gradient vertical turbulent heat flux is decreased by the counteracting positive non-gradient heat flux that is increased with the increase of the turbulent potential energy. The latter is the mechanism of the self-control feedback resulting in a decrease of the buoyancy. Due to this feedback, the stably stratified turbulence is maintained up to strongly supercritical stratifications. The EFB theory have been verified against scarce data from the atmospheric experiments, direct numerical simulations (DNS), large-eddy simulations (LES) and laboratory experiments relevant to the steady state turbulence regime.

The EFB theory is a sort of the turbulence closure. Previously, various closure models have been adopted in turbulence and turbulent transport [1, 2, 6–8, 44–47]. Some of the turbulent closure models for stably stratified atmospheric turbulence also do not imply a critical Richardson number [43, 48–57], see also [58].

In the present study we develop the EFB theory for the surface layers in convective and stably stratified turbulence which allows us to determine the vertical profiles for all turbulent characteristics. This paper is organized as follows. In Section II we formulate governing equations for the energy and flux budget turbulence-closure theory for convective and stably stratified turbulence. In this section we also discuss assumptions used in the EFB theory. In Section III we develop the EFB theory for surface layers in stratified turbulence considering the steady-state and homogeneous regime of turbulence. In Section IV we discuss the EFB theory for the atmospheric stably stratified boundary-layer turbulence. In Section V

we apply the EFB theory to surface layers in turbulent convection. Finally, conclusions are drawn in Section VI.

II. ENERGY- AND FLUX-BUDGET EQUATIONS AND BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

We consider plain-parallel, unstably and stably stratified dry-air flow and employ the budget equations underlying turbulence-closure theory in the Boussinesq approximation. We assume that vertical component of the mean-wind velocity is negligibly small compared to horizontal component, and horizontal gradients of all properties of the mean flow (the mean velocity and the mean potential temperature) are negligibly small compared to vertical gradients.

In this section we outline the energy and flux budget (EFB) closure theory based on the budget equations for the density of turbulent kinetic energy, the intensity of potential temperature fluctuations and turbulent fluxes of momentum and heat. In our analysis, we use budget equations for the one-point second moments to develop a mean-field theory. We do not study small-scale structure of turbulence like intermittency described by high-order moments for turbulent quantities. We are interested by large-scale long-term dynamics and consider effects in the spatial scales which are much larger than the integral scale of turbulence and in timescales which are much longer than the turbulent timescales.

We start with the basic equations of the EFB theory. The budget equation for the density of turbulent kinetic energy (TKE), $E_K = \langle \mathbf{u}^2 \rangle / 2$, reads

$$\frac{DE_K}{Dt} + \nabla_z \Phi_K = -\tau_{iz} \nabla_z \bar{U}_i + \beta F_z - \varepsilon_K, \quad (1)$$

where the first term, $-\tau_{iz} \nabla_z \bar{U}_i$, in the right-hand side of Eq. (1) is the rate of production of TKE by the vertical gradient of horizontal mean velocity $\bar{\mathbf{U}}(z)$, $D/Dt = \partial/\partial t + \bar{\mathbf{U}} \cdot \nabla$ is the convective derivative, $\tau_{iz} = \langle u_i u_z \rangle$ with $i = x, y$ are the off-diagonal components of the Reynolds stress describing the vertical turbulent flux of momentum, and the angular brackets imply ensemble averaging. The second term βF_z in Eq. (1) describes buoyancy, $\beta = g/T_*$ is the buoyancy parameter, \mathbf{g} is the gravity acceleration, $F_z = \langle u_z \theta \rangle$ is the vertical component of the turbulent flux of potential temperature, $\Theta = T(P_*/P)^{1-\gamma^{-1}}$ is the potential temperature, T is the fluid temperature with the reference value T_* , P is the fluid pressure with the reference value P_* and $\gamma = c_p/c_v$ is the specific heat ratio.

The potential temperature $\Theta = \bar{\Theta} + \theta$ is characterized by the mean potential temperature $\bar{\Theta}(z)$ and fluctuations θ , the fluid velocity $\bar{\mathbf{U}} + \mathbf{u}$ is characterized by the mean fluid velocity [which generally includes the mean-wind velocity $\bar{\mathbf{U}}^{(w)}(z) = (\bar{U}_x, \bar{U}_y, 0)$ and the local three-dimensional mean velocity $\bar{\mathbf{U}}^{(s)}$ related to the large-scale semi-organised coherent structures in a convective turbulence, and small-scale fluctuations $\mathbf{u} = (u_x, u_y, u_z)$].

The last term, $\varepsilon_K = \nu \langle (\nabla_j u_i)^2 \rangle$, in the right-hand side of Eq. (1) is the dissipation rate of the density of the turbulent kinetic energy, where ν is the kinematic viscosity of fluid. The term $\Phi_K = \rho_0^{-1} \langle u_z p \rangle + (\langle u_z \mathbf{u}^2 \rangle - \nu \nabla_z \langle \mathbf{u}^2 \rangle)/2$ determines the flux of E_K , where the fluid pressure $P = \bar{P} + p$ is characterized by the mean pressure \bar{P} and fluctuations p , and ρ_0 is the fluid density.

The budget equation for the intensity of potential temperature fluctuations $E_\theta = \langle \theta^2 \rangle/2$ is

$$\frac{DE_\theta}{Dt} + \nabla_z \Phi_\theta = -F_z \nabla_z \bar{\Theta} - \varepsilon_\theta, \quad (2)$$

where $\Phi_\theta = (\langle u_z \theta^2 \rangle - \chi \nabla_z \langle \theta^2 \rangle)/2$ describes the flux of E_θ and $\varepsilon_\theta = \chi \langle (\nabla \theta)^2 \rangle$ is the dissipation rate of the intensity of potential temperature fluctuations E_θ , and χ is the molecular temperature diffusivity.

The budget equation for the turbulent flux $F_i = \langle u_i \theta \rangle$ of potential temperature is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial t} + \nabla_z \Phi_i^{(F)} = & -\tau_{iz} \nabla_z \bar{\Theta} + 2\beta E_\theta \delta_{i3} - \frac{1}{\rho_0} \langle \theta \nabla_i p \rangle \\ & - F_z \nabla_z \bar{U}_i - \varepsilon_i^{(F)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker unit tensor, $\Phi_i^{(F)} = \langle u_i u_z \theta \rangle - \nu \langle \theta (\nabla_z u_i) \rangle - \chi \langle u_i (\nabla_z \theta) \rangle$ determines the flux of F_i , and $\varepsilon_i^{(F)} = (\nu + \chi) \langle (\nabla_j u_i) (\nabla_j \theta) \rangle$ is the dissipation rate of the turbulent heat flux. The first term, $-\tau_{iz} \nabla_z \bar{\Theta}$, in the right-hand side of Eq. (3) contributes to the traditional turbulent flux of potential temperature which describes the classical gradient mechanism of the turbulent heat transfer. The second and third terms in the right-hand side of Eq. (3) describe a non-gradient contribution to the turbulent flux of potential temperature. The budget equation for the vertical turbulent flux $F_z = \langle u_z \theta \rangle$ of potential temperature is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial F_z}{\partial t} + \nabla_z \Phi_z^{(F)} = & -2E_z \nabla_z \bar{\Theta} + 2\beta E_\theta - \frac{1}{\rho_0} \langle \theta \nabla_z p \rangle \\ & - \varepsilon_z^{(F)}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $E_z = \langle u_z^2 \rangle/2$ is the density of the vertical turbulent kinetic energy.

The budget equation for the off-diagonal components of the Reynolds stress $\tau_{iz} = \langle u_i u_z \rangle$ with $i = x, y$ reads

$$\frac{D\tau_{iz}}{Dt} + \nabla_z \Phi_i^{(\tau)} = -2E_z \nabla_z \bar{U}_i + \beta F_i + Q_{iz} - \varepsilon_{iz}^{(\tau)}, \quad (5)$$

where $\Phi_i^{(\tau)} = \langle u_i u_z^2 \rangle + \rho_0^{-1} \langle p u_i \rangle - \nu \nabla_z \tau_{iz}$ describes the flux of τ_{iz} , the tensor $Q_{ij} = \rho_0^{-1} (\langle p \nabla_i u_j \rangle + \langle p \nabla_j u_i \rangle)$ and $\varepsilon_{iz}^{(\tau)} = 2\nu \langle (\nabla_j u_i) (\nabla_j u_z) \rangle$ is the molecular-viscosity dissipation rate.

The budget equations for the horizontal and vertical turbulent kinetic energies $E_\alpha = \langle u_\alpha^2 \rangle/2$ can be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{DE_\alpha}{Dt} + \nabla_z \Phi_\alpha = & -\tau_{\alpha z} \nabla_z \bar{U}_\alpha + \delta_{\alpha 3} \beta F_z \\ & + \frac{1}{2} Q_{\alpha\alpha} - \varepsilon_\alpha, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $\alpha = x, y, z$, the term $\varepsilon_\alpha = \nu \langle (\nabla_j u_\alpha)^2 \rangle$ is the dissipation rate of E_α and Φ_α determines the flux of E_α . Here $\Phi_z = \rho_0^{-1} \langle u_z p \rangle + (\langle u_z^3 \rangle - \nu \nabla_z \langle u_z^2 \rangle)/2$ and $\Phi_{x,y} = (\langle u_z u_{x,y}^2 \rangle - \nu \nabla_z \langle u_{x,y}^2 \rangle)/2$. The terms $Q_{\alpha\alpha} = 2\rho_0^{-1} (\langle p \nabla_\alpha u_\alpha \rangle)$ are the diagonal terms of the tensor Q_{ij} . In Eq. (6) we do not apply the summation convention for the double Greek indices. Different aspects related to budget equations (1)–(6) have been discussed in a number of publications [28–34, 50, 58–60].

The energy and flux budget turbulence closure theory assumes the following. The characteristic times of variations of the densities of the turbulent kinetic energies E_K and E_α , the intensity of potential temperature fluctuations E_θ , the turbulent flux F_i of potential temperature and the turbulent flux τ_{iz} of momentum (i.e., the off-diagonal components of the Reynolds stress) are much larger than the turbulent timescale. This allows us to obtain steady-state solutions of the budget equations (1)–(6).

Dissipation rates of the turbulent kinetic energies E_K and E_α , the intensity of potential temperature fluctuations E_θ and F_i are expressed using the Kolmogorov hypothesis, i.e., $\varepsilon_K = E_K/t_T$, $\varepsilon_\theta = E_\theta/(C_p t_T)$, and $\varepsilon_i^{(F)} = F_i/(C_F t_T)$, where $t_T = \ell_z/E_z^{1/2}$ is the turbulent dissipation timescale, ℓ_z is the vertical integral scale, and C_p and C_F are dimensionless empirical constants [1, 2, 8, 9, 11]. Note also that the dissipation rate of the TKE components E_α (where $\alpha = x, y, z$) is $\varepsilon_\alpha = E_K/3t_T$. This is because the main contribution to the rate of dissipation of the TKE components is from the Kolmogorov viscous scale where turbulence is nearly isotropic, so that $\varepsilon_x = \varepsilon_y = \varepsilon_z = E_K/3t_T$.

The term $\varepsilon_{iz}^{(\tau)} = \varepsilon_{iz}^{(\tau)} - \beta F_i - Q_{iz}$ in Eq. (5) is the effective dissipation rate of the off-diagonal components of the Reynolds stress τ_{iz} [28, 32, 34], where $\varepsilon_{iz}^{(\tau)}$ is the molecular-viscosity dissipation rate of τ_{iz} , that is small because the smallest eddies associated with viscous dissipation are nearly isotropic [61]. In the framework of EFB theory, the role of the dissipation rate of τ_{iz} is assumed to be played by the combination of terms $-\beta F_i - Q_{iz}$, and it is assumed that $\varepsilon_{iz}^{(\tau)} = \tau_{iz}/(C_\tau t_T)$, where C_τ is the effective-dissipation time-scale empirical constant for stably stratified turbulence [28, 32, 34], while for a convective turbulence C_τ is a function of the flux Richardson number (see Sect. V).

The effective dissipation rate assumption has been justified by Large Eddy Simulations (see Fig. 1 in [32]), where LES data by [62, 63] have been used for the two types of atmospheric boundary layer: “nocturnal stable” (with essentially negative buoyancy flux at the surface and neutral stratification in the free flow) and “conventionally neutral” (with a negligible buoyancy flux at the surface and essentially stably stratified turbulence in the free flow). The effective dissipation rate assumption was based on our prior analysis of the Reynolds stress equation in the \mathbf{k} -space using the τ -approximation (see [20, 21]). Remarkably, the effective dissipation as-

sumption directly yields the familiar down-gradient formulation of the vertical turbulent flux of momentum [see Eq. (7) below], that is well-known result which is valid for any turbulence with a non-uniform mean velocity field.

Note that the diagonal and off-diagonal components of the Reynolds stress have different physical meaning. The diagonal components of the Reynolds stress describe turbulent kinetic energy components. They have the Kolmogorov spectrum $\propto k^{-5/3}$, that is related to the direct energy cascade. The latter is the main reason for turbulent viscosity and turbulent diffusivity. The off-diagonal components of the Reynolds stress are related to the tangling mechanism of generation of anisotropic velocity fluctuations. They have different spectrum $\propto k^{-7/3}$ [64–67]. The off-diagonal components of the Reynolds stress are determined by spatial derivatives of the mean velocity field. The diagonal components of the Reynolds stress are much larger than the off-diagonal components.

We assume that the term $\rho_0^{-1} \langle \theta \nabla_z p \rangle$ in Eq. (4) for the vertical turbulent flux of potential temperature is parameterised so that $\beta \langle \theta^2 \rangle - \rho_0^{-1} \langle \theta \nabla_z p \rangle = 2C_\theta \beta E_\theta$, with the positive dimensionless empirical constant C_θ which is less than 1. This assumption has been justified by Large Eddy Simulations (see Fig. 2 in [32]), where LES data by [62, 63] have been used for the two types of atmospheric boundary layer: “nocturnal stable” and “conventionally neutral”. In addition, this assumption has been justified analytically (see Appendix A in [28]).

III. THE EFB THEORY FOR SURFACE LAYERS IN STRATIFIED TURBULENCE

In this section we develop the EFB theory for surface layers in convective and stably stratified turbulence. We use the down-gradient formulation of the vertical turbulent flux of momentum which follows from Eq. (5), i.e., the turbulent fluxes of the momentum are

$$\tau_{iz} = -K_M \nabla_z \bar{U}_i, \quad i = x, y, \quad (7)$$

$$K_M = 2C_\tau t_T E_z = 2C_\tau \ell_z E_z^{1/2}, \quad (8)$$

where K_M is the turbulent viscosity, $t_T = \ell_z / E_z^{1/2}$ is the turbulent dissipation timescale, ℓ_z is the vertical integral scale and E_z is the vertical turbulent kinetic energy. The production rate, $\Pi_K = -\tau_{iz} \nabla_z \bar{U}_i$ of the turbulent kinetic energy by the vertical gradient of horizontal mean velocity [see Eq. (1)] can be rewritten by means of Eq. (7) as $\Pi_K = -(\tau_{xz} \nabla_z \bar{U}_x + \tau_{yz} \nabla_z \bar{U}_y) = K_M S^2$, where $S^2 = (\nabla_z \bar{U}_x)^2 + (\nabla_z \bar{U}_y)^2$ is the squared mean velocity shear caused by the horizontal mean wind velocity.

The steady-state version of the budget equations for the density of turbulent kinetic energy $E_K = \langle \mathbf{u}^2 \rangle / 2$ reads

$$\nabla_z \Phi_K = K_M S^2 + \beta F_z - \frac{E_K}{t_T}, \quad (9)$$

where the dissipation rate ε_K of the turbulent kinetic energy is expressed using the Kolmogorov hypothesis,

$\varepsilon_K = E_K / t_T$. We stress that all results obtained in the present study are mainly valid for temperature stratified turbulence (convective turbulence or stably stratified turbulence), where fluctuations of the vertical velocity u_z depend on the buoyancy, βF_z . Since for temperature stratified turbulence, $\rho_0^{-1} \langle u_z p \rangle$ and $\langle u_z \mathbf{u}^2 \rangle$ do depend on the buoyancy, the third-order moments Φ_K should depend on buoyancy. We assume that the vertical gradient $\nabla_z \Phi_K$ of the flux of E_K is determined by the buoyancy, i.e., $\nabla_z \Phi_K = -C_\Phi \beta F_z$, where C_Φ is the dimensionless empirical constant. The justification of this assumption for a convective turbulence has been performed in Ref. [13], where experimental data obtained from meteorological observations at the Eureka station (located in the Canadian territory of Nunavut) in conditions of the long-lived convective boundary layer typical of the Arctic summer have been used for validation of the assumption $\nabla_z \Phi_K = -C_\Phi \beta F_z$ (see the right panel in Fig. 1 in Ref. [13]). Turbulent fluxes were calculated directly from the measured velocity and temperature fluctuations. In these meteorological observations warming of the convective layer from the surface is balanced by pumping of colder air into the layer via the general-circulation mechanisms. Note also that no principal contradictions have been found between the available data from observations at mid- or low latitudes and the data from Eureka [68].

Using the expression,

$$\tau = (\tau_{xz}^2 + \tau_{yz}^2)^{1/2} = K_M S \equiv u_*^2, \quad (10)$$

Eq. (9) is reduced by simple algebraic calculations to a nonlinear equation for the vertical profile of the normalised TKE, $\tilde{E}_K(\tilde{Z}) = E_K(\tilde{Z}) / E_{K0}$ as

$$\tilde{E}_K^2 + \tilde{Z} \tilde{E}_K^{1/2} - 1 = 0, \quad (11)$$

where the normalised height $\tilde{Z} = \ell_z / (C_* L)$, $E_{K0} = u_*^2 / (2C_\tau A_z)^{1/2}$, $C_*^{-1} = (1 + C_\Phi) (2C_\tau)^{3/4} A_z^{1/4}$, $A_z = E_z / E_K$ is the vertical share of TKE, u_* is the local (z -dependent) friction velocity, and L is the local Obukhov length defined as

$$L = -\frac{\tau^{3/2}}{\beta F_z}, \quad (12)$$

and F_z is the local vertical turbulent flux of potential temperature. For stably stratified turbulence, the vertical turbulent flux F_z of potential temperature is negative, and the local Obukhov length L is positive. For stably stratified turbulence ($\tilde{Z} > 0$), Eq. (11) has two asymptotic solutions:

(i) for a lower part ($\tilde{Z} \ll 1$) of the surface layer, Eq. (11) yields

$$\tilde{E}_K = 1 - \frac{\tilde{Z}}{2} + \frac{\tilde{Z}^2}{8}, \quad (13)$$

(ii) for an upper part ($\tilde{Z} \gg 1$) of the surface layer, it is

$$\tilde{E}_K = \tilde{Z}^{-2} \left(1 - 2\tilde{Z}^{-4} \right). \quad (14)$$




FIG. 1. The normalized turbulent kinetic energy $\tilde{E}_K = E_K/E_{K0}$ versus \tilde{Z} for convective and stably stratified turbulence.

In the framework of the EFB theory of surface layers, we use the same definition (12) for L in convective turbulence as well, where the vertical turbulent flux F_z of potential temperature is positive, and L is negative. Equation (11) for the surface layer in convective turbulence ($\tilde{Z} < 0$) reads

$$\tilde{E}_K^2 - |\tilde{Z}| \tilde{E}_K^{1/2} - 1 = 0, \quad (15)$$

and it has two asymptotic solutions:

(i) for a lower part ($|\tilde{Z}| \ll 1$) of the surface convective layer, Eq. (15) yields

$$E_K = E_{K0} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} |\tilde{Z}|\right), \quad (16)$$

(ii) for an upper part ($|\tilde{Z}| \gg 1$) of the surface convective layer, the balance of the first and the second terms in Eq. (11) yields $\tilde{E}_K = \tilde{Z}^{2/3}$, i.e.,

$$E_K = E_{K0} \tilde{Z}^{2/3}. \quad (17)$$

Note that as follows from the definition of $\tilde{Z} = \ell_z/(C_* L)$, the ratio z/L for convective turbulence is

$$\frac{z}{L} = \frac{\tilde{Z}}{\kappa_0 (1 + C_\Phi)}, \quad (18)$$

where $\ell_z = C_\ell z$ with $C_\ell = \kappa_0 (2C_\tau)^{-3/4} A_z^{-1/4}$ and $\kappa_0 = 0.4$ is the von Karman constant. Note that generally, Eq. (18) can be valid also for arbitrary z , but in this case C_ℓ should be a function of height (see Section V).

In Fig. 1 we show a numerical solution of Eq. (11). In particular, in Fig. 1 we plot the normalized turbulent kinetic energy $\tilde{E}_K = E_K/E_{K0}$ versus \tilde{Z} for convective ($\tilde{Z} < 0$) and stably stratified ($\tilde{Z} > 0$) turbulence. This numerical solution is in a good agreement with the above asymptotic solutions for convective and stably stratified turbulence.

Now we define the flux Richardson number as

$$\text{Ri}_f = -\frac{\beta F_z}{K_M S^2}, \quad (19)$$

so that for stably stratified turbulence, Ri_f is positive and varies from 0 to the limiting value $R_\infty = 0.2$ at very large

gradient Richardson number $\text{Ri} \gg 1$. Here the gradient Richardson number, Ri , is defined as

$$\text{Ri} = \frac{N^2}{S^2}, \quad (20)$$

where $N^2 = \beta \nabla_z \bar{\Theta}$ and N is the Brunt-Väisälä frequency. In the framework of the EFB theory of surface layers, we use the same definition (19) for the flux Richardson number in turbulent convection, so that Ri_f is negative in turbulent convection, and its absolute value is not limited and can be large.

Equations (12) and (19) allow us to relate the turbulent viscosity K_M with the flux Richardson number Ri_f as [34]

$$K_M = \text{Ri}_f \tau^{1/2} L, \quad (21)$$

where τ is given by Eq. (10). Using Eqs. (8) and (21), we rewrite the flux Richardson number as

$$\text{Ri}_f = (1 + C_\Phi)^{-1} \tilde{Z} \tilde{E}_K^{1/2}. \quad (22)$$

Equations (10) and (21) allow us to relate the large-scale shear S with the flux Richardson number as

$$S = \frac{\tau^{1/2}}{L \text{Ri}_f}. \quad (23)$$

Using Eqs. (8), we rewrite Eq. (9) as the dimensionless ratio

$$\left(\frac{E_K}{\tau}\right)^2 = \frac{1 - \text{Ri}_f (1 + C_\Phi)}{2C_\tau A_z}. \quad (24)$$

In addition, by means of Eqs. (8), (21) and (24), we obtain the normalized vertical integral scale ℓ_z as the function of the flux Richardson number:

$$\frac{\ell_z}{L} = \frac{(2C_\tau)^{-3/4} A_z^{-1/4} \text{Ri}_f}{[1 - \text{Ri}_f (1 + C_\Phi)]^{1/4}}, \quad (25)$$

where $1 - \text{Ri}_f (1 + C_\Phi) > 0$. This condition implies that $C_\Phi < R_\infty^{-1} - 1$. For stably stratified turbulence $R_\infty = 0.2$, so that $C_\Phi < 4$. Thus, the normalised height $\tilde{Z} = \ell_z/(C_* L)$ as the function of the flux Richardson number reads

$$\tilde{Z} = \frac{\text{Ri}_f (1 + C_\Phi)}{[1 - \text{Ri}_f (1 + C_\Phi)]^{1/4}}. \quad (26)$$

Note also that using Eq. (26) we can rewrite Eq. (25) as

$$\frac{\ell_z}{L} = \frac{C_\ell \tilde{Z}}{\kappa_0 (1 + C_\Phi)}. \quad (27)$$

Since convective turbulence is essentially different from stably stratified turbulence, the behaviour of the flux Richardson number $\text{Ri}_f \propto \tilde{Z} \tilde{E}_K^{1/2}$ is also different for these two kinds of turbulence. In particular, in convection both, the buoyancy and large-scale shear produce convective turbulence, so that the flux Richardson number can be enough large. Contrary, in stably stratified turbulence the large-scale shear produces turbulence, while the buoyancy decreases TKE, so that the flux

Richardson number is limited by some value, $R_\infty = 0.2$. However, in the presence of internal gravity waves the maximum value of the flux Richardson number can be larger in several times in comparison with the case without waves [30, 33].

Equations (11) and (22) yield the normalized turbulent kinetic energy $\tilde{E}_K = E_K/E_{K0}$ as a function of the flux Richardson number as

$$\tilde{E}_K = [1 - (1 + C_\Phi) \text{Ri}_f]^{1/2}. \quad (28)$$

This implies that the normalized turbulent kinetic energy \tilde{E}_K in stably stratified turbulence decreases up to the minimum value

$$\tilde{E}_K^{\min} = [1 - (1 + C_\Phi) R_\infty]^{1/2}. \quad (29)$$

As follows from Eq. (22), the function $\tilde{Z} \tilde{E}_K^{1/2} \leq (1 + C_\Phi) R_\infty$, so that the maximum value of the height \tilde{Z}^{\max} in stably stratified turbulence is

$$\tilde{Z}^{\max} = \frac{R_\infty (1 + C_\Phi)}{[1 - R_\infty (1 + C_\Phi)]^{1/4}}. \quad (30)$$

Since in convective turbulence, the flux Richardson number is negative, the normalized turbulent kinetic energy, $\tilde{E}_K = [1 + (1 + C_\Phi) |\text{Ri}_f|]^{1/2}$, increases with the flux Richardson number.

Now we derive expression for the turbulent Prandtl number, $\text{Pr}_T = K_M/K_H$. To this end, we use the steady-state versions of Eqs. (2) and (4):

$$F_z \nabla_z \bar{\Theta} + \frac{E_\theta}{C_p t_T} = 0, \quad (31)$$

$$2E_z \nabla_z \bar{\Theta} - 2C_\theta \beta E_\theta + \frac{F_z}{C_F t_T} = 0. \quad (32)$$

Equations (31)–(32) and the expression for the turbulent heat flux, $F_z = -K_H \nabla_z \bar{\Theta}$, yield the turbulent heat conductivity K_H as

$$K_H = 2C_F t_T E_z \left[1 + \frac{C_\theta C_p t_T \beta F_z}{E_z} \right]. \quad (33)$$

By means of Eq. (9) for TKE,

$$E_K = K_M S^2 t_T [1 - \text{Ri}_f (1 + C_\Phi)], \quad (34)$$

and Eq. (19) for Ri_f , we derive the identity for the dimensionless ratio as

$$\frac{\beta F_z t_T}{E_z} = -\frac{\text{Ri}_f}{A_z [1 - \text{Ri}_f (1 + C_\Phi)]}. \quad (35)$$

Thus, Eqs. (8), (33) and (35) yield the turbulent Prandtl number, $\text{Pr}_T = K_M/K_H$ as

$$\text{Pr}_T = \text{Pr}_T^{(0)} \left[1 - \frac{C_\theta C_p \text{Ri}_f}{A_z [1 - \text{Ri}_f (1 + C_\Phi)]} \right]^{-1}, \quad (36)$$

where $\text{Pr}_T^{(0)} = C_\tau/C_F$ is the turbulent Prandtl number for a non-stratified turbulence when the mean potential

temperature gradient vanishes. The gradient Richardson number Ri and the flux Richardson number Ri_f are related as $\text{Ri} = \text{Ri}_f \text{Pr}_T$.

Using Eqs. (31)–(32), we determine the level of temperature fluctuations characterised by the dimensional ratio E_θ/θ_*^2 as

$$\frac{E_\theta}{\theta_*^2} = C_p (2C_\tau A_z)^{-1/2} \text{Pr}_T \tilde{E}_K^{-1}, \quad (37)$$

where $\theta_* = |F_z|/u_* = u_*^2/\beta |L|$. Equation (23), and expressions for the friction velocity, $u_*^2 = K_M S$, and the turbulent heat flux, $F_z = -K_H \nabla_z \bar{\Theta}$, yield the vertical gradient of the mean potential temperature as

$$\nabla_z \bar{\Theta} = \frac{\theta_* \text{Pr}_T}{|L| \text{Ri}_f}. \quad (38)$$

The steady-state version of Eq. (3) for homogeneous turbulence yields the horizontal turbulent flux F_i of potential temperature:

$$F_i = -C_F t_T (1 + \text{Pr}_T) F_z \nabla_z \bar{U}_i, \quad i = x, y. \quad (39)$$

Since in convective turbulence the vertical turbulent flux F_z is positive, the horizontal turbulent flux F_i of potential temperature is directed opposite to the wind velocity \bar{U}_i , i.e., Eq. (39) describes the counter-wind horizontal turbulent flux in convective turbulence. Contrary, in a stably stratified turbulence the vertical turbulent flux F_z is negative, so that Eq. (39) determines the co-wind horizontal turbulent flux.

The physics of the counter-wind turbulent flux in a convective turbulence is as follows [34]. In horizontally homogeneous, convective turbulence with a large-scale shear velocity (e.g., directed along the x -axis), the mean shear velocity \bar{U}_x increases with increasing height, while the mean potential temperature $\bar{\Theta}$ decreases with height. Uprising fluid particles produce positive fluctuations of potential temperature ($\theta > 0$) since $\partial\theta/\partial t \propto -(\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \bar{\Theta}$, and negative fluctuations of horizontal velocity ($u_x < 0$) since $\partial u_x/\partial t \propto -(\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla) \bar{U}_x$. It results in negative horizontal temperature flux, $u_x \theta < 0$. Similarly, sinking fluid particles cause negative fluctuations of potential temperature ($\theta < 0$), and positive fluctuations of horizontal velocity ($u_x > 0$), that implies negative horizontal temperature flux $u_x \theta < 0$. Therefore, the net horizontal turbulent flux is negative ($\langle u_x \theta \rangle < 0$) even for a zero horizontal mean temperature gradient. This is the counter-wind turbulent flux of potential temperature that results in modification of the potential-temperature flux by the non-uniform velocity field.

Let us find dependence of the horizontal turbulent flux F_i of potential temperature on the flux Richardson number. To this end we use the identity,

$$(S t_T)^2 = \frac{1}{2 C_\tau A_z [1 - \text{Ri}_f (1 + C_\Phi)]}, \quad (40)$$

that is derived by means of Eqs. (8), (10) and (24). Therefore, the ratio of the horizontal and vertical turbulent fluxes of potential temperature, F_x/F_z , is given

by

$$\frac{F_x}{F_z} = -C_F (1 + \text{Pr}_T) (2C_\tau A_z)^{-1/2} \times \left[1 - \text{Ri}_f (1 + C_\Phi) \right]^{-1/2}. \quad (41)$$

Most of the results obtained in this section depend on the vertical share of TKE, $A_z \equiv E_z/E_K$, which is determined below. The mean shear velocity $\bar{U}_x(z)$ produces the energy of longitudinal velocity fluctuations E_x , which in turns feeds the transverse E_y and the vertical E_z components of turbulent kinetic energy. The inter-component energy exchange term $Q_{\alpha\alpha}$ in the right-hand side of Eq. (6) is traditionally parameterized through the "return-to-isotropy" hypothesis [69]. On the other hand, the temperature stratified turbulence is usually anisotropic, and the inter-component energy exchange term $Q_{\alpha\alpha}$ should depend on the flux Richardson number Ri_f .

Here we adopt the following model for the inter-component energy exchange term $Q_{\alpha\alpha}$ which generalizes the "return-to-isotropy" hypothesis to the case of the convective and stably stratified turbulence. We use the normalised flux Richardson number Ri_f/R_∞ that is varying from 0 for a non-stratified turbulence to 1 for a strongly stratified turbulence, where the limiting value of the flux Richardson number, $R_\infty \equiv \text{Ri}_f|_{\text{Ri} \rightarrow \infty}$, is defined for very strong stratifications when the gradient Richardson number $\text{Ri} \rightarrow \infty$. The model for the inter-component energy exchange term $Q_{\alpha\alpha}$ is described by

$$Q_{xx} = -\frac{2(1+C_r)}{t_T} \left(E_x - \frac{1}{3} E_{\text{int}} \right), \quad (42)$$

$$Q_{yy} = -\frac{2(1+C_r)}{t_T} \left(E_y - \frac{1}{3} E_{\text{int}} \right), \quad (43)$$

$$Q_{zz} = -\frac{2(1+C_r)}{t_T} \left(E_z - E_K + \frac{2}{3} E_{\text{int}} \right), \quad (44)$$

where

$$E_{\text{int}} = E_K \left[1 - \frac{\text{Ri}_f}{R_\infty} \left(\frac{C_r}{1+C_r} \right) \right], \quad (45)$$

and C_r is the dimensionless empirical constant. When $\text{Ri}_f = 0$, Eqs. (42)–(45) describe the "return-to-isotropy" hypothesis [69]. To derive equation for the vertical share of TKE in a stratified turbulence, we use the steady-state version of Eq. (6) for vertical TKE E_z as

$$\nabla_z \Phi_z = \beta F_z + \frac{1}{2} Q_{zz} - \frac{E_K}{3t_T}. \quad (46)$$

We assume that the vertical gradient $\nabla_z \Phi_z$ of the flux of E_z is determined by the buoyancy, i.e., $\nabla_z \Phi_z = -C_z \beta F_z$, where C_z is the dimensionless empirical constant. The justification of this assumption for a convective turbulence has been performed in Ref. [13], where

experimental data obtained from meteorological observations at the Eureka station have been used for validation of this assumption (see the left panel in Fig. 1 in Ref. [13]). Thus, by means of Eqs. (35) and (44)–(46), we determine the vertical share of TKE $A_z \equiv E_z/E_K$ as a function of the flux Richardson number:

$$A_z(\text{Ri}_f) = A_z^{(0)} - \text{Ri}_f \left[\frac{(1 - 3A_z^{(0)})(1 + C_z)}{1 - \text{Ri}_f(1 + C_\Phi)} - \frac{2A_z^{(0)}}{R_\infty} \right]. \quad (47)$$

According to Eq. (47), the vertical share A_z of TKE for a non-stratified turbulence is $(A_z)_{\text{Ri} \rightarrow 0} \equiv A_z^{(0)} = C_r/3(1 + C_r)$. Usually in surface layers in convective turbulence, $|\text{Ri}_f| \ll |R_\infty|$. This implies that the vertical share of TKE in a convective turbulence is given by

$$A_z(\text{Ri}_f) = A_z^{(0)} + (1 - 3A_z^{(0)}) \frac{|\text{Ri}_f|(1 + C_z)}{1 + |\text{Ri}_f|(1 + C_\Phi)}. \quad (48)$$

In convective turbulence for large $|\text{Ri}_f| \gg 1$, the vertical share of TKE $A_z \rightarrow 1$ [13]. This condition yields

$$\frac{1 + C_z}{1 + C_\Phi} = \frac{1 - A_z^{(0)}}{1 - 3A_z^{(0)}}. \quad (49)$$

Substituting Eq. (49) into Eq. (48), we obtain that the vertical share of TKE in a stably stratified turbulence is

$$A_z(\text{Ri}_f) = A_z^{(0)} - \text{Ri}_f \left[\frac{1 - A_z^{(0)}}{(1 + C_\Phi)^{-1} - \text{Ri}_f} - \frac{2A_z^{(0)}}{R_\infty} \right], \quad (50)$$

while in a convective turbulence (where $|\text{Ri}_f| \ll |R_\infty|$ and $\text{Ri}_f < 0$), the vertical share of TKE is

$$A_z(\text{Ri}_f) = A_z^{(0)} + \frac{(1 - A_z^{(0)})|\text{Ri}_f|}{(1 + C_\Phi)^{-1} + |\text{Ri}_f|}. \quad (51)$$

Note that Eqs. (42)–(45) describes a simple generalization of the "return-to-isotropy" hypothesis [69]. These equations affect only Eq. (50) for the dependence of the vertical share of TKE on the flux Richardson number, $A_z(\text{Ri}_f)$. This function is the most unknown in observations.

When turbulence is isotropic in the horizontal plane, the horizontal shares of TKE are $A_x = A_y = 1 - A_z$. This yields the horizontal components of TKE as

$$E_x = E_y = \frac{1}{2} E_K (1 - A_z), \quad (52)$$

where $A_x = E_x/E_K$ and $A_y = E_y/E_K$. When turbulence is anisotropic in the horizontal plane, the inter-component energy exchange term $Q_{\alpha\alpha}$ and the horizontal shares of TKE are given in Appendix.

Let us consider stably stratified turbulence. Neglecting the term $\nabla_z \Phi_K$ in Eq. (9), we rewrite this equation as $\text{Ri}_f^{-1} = 1 - \varepsilon_K/\beta F_z$, where we use the definition (19)

for the flux Richardson number. By means of this equation and the expressions for the squared Brunt-Väisälä frequency, $N^2 = \beta \nabla_z \bar{\Theta}$, and the turbulent heat flux, $F_z = -K_H \nabla_z \bar{\Theta}$, we obtain equation for the turbulent heat conductivity K_H as

$$K_H = (\text{Ri}_f^{-1} - 1)^{-1} \frac{\varepsilon_K}{N^2}. \quad (53)$$

In very strong stable stratification, the gradient Richardson number admits a limit $\text{Ri} \rightarrow \infty$ and the flux Richardson number $\text{Ri}_f \rightarrow 0.2$. This implies that the turbulent heat conductivity for a very strong stable stratification $K_H \approx 0.25 \varepsilon_K / N^2$. This is a well-known Cox-Osborn equation [70, 71] that plays an important role in Physical Oceanography.

IV. THE ATMOSPHERIC STABLY STRATIFIED BOUNDARY-LAYER TURBULENCE

In view of the applications of the obtained results to the atmospheric stably stratified boundary-layer turbulence, we outline below the useful in modelling theoretical relationships [32, 34]. It is known that the wind shear in stably stratified turbulence has two asymptotic results: (i) $S = \tau^{1/2} / (\kappa_0 z)$ at $\varsigma \ll 1$, which describes the log-profile for the mean velocity, and (ii) $S = \tau^{1/2} / (R_\infty L)$ when $\varsigma \gg 1$. The latter result follows from Eq. (23), where $\varsigma = \int_0^z dz' / L(z')$ is the dimensionless height based on the local Obukhov length scale $L(z)$, and $\kappa_0 = 0.4$ is the von Karman constant. For surface layer in stably stratified turbulence (defined as the lower layer which is 10 % of the turbulent boundary layer), the Obukhov length scale L is independent of z and the dimensionless height $\varsigma = z/L$. Interpolating these two asymptotic results, we obtain that the wind shear $S(\varsigma)$ can be written as

$$S = \frac{\tau^{1/2}}{L} \left(R_\infty^{-1} + \frac{1}{\kappa_0 \varsigma} \right). \quad (54)$$

The latter allows us to get the vertical profile of the turbulent viscosity $K_M(\varsigma) = \tau/S$ as

$$K_M = \tau^{1/2} L \frac{\kappa_0 \varsigma}{1 + R_\infty^{-1} \kappa_0 \varsigma}. \quad (55)$$

Using Eqs. (21) and (55), we arrive at the expression for the vertical profile of the flux Richardson number $\text{Ri}_f(\varsigma)$ as

$$\text{Ri}_f = \frac{\kappa_0 \varsigma}{1 + R_\infty^{-1} \kappa_0 \varsigma}. \quad (56)$$

Equation (56) yields the expression for ς as

$$\varsigma = \frac{\text{Ri}_f}{\kappa_0 (1 - \text{Ri}_f / R_\infty)}. \quad (57)$$

In this case, the vertical share of TKE $A_z(\varsigma) \equiv E_z / E_K$ reads

$$A_z = A_z^{(0)} + \frac{1 - A_z^{(0)}}{1 - (1 + C_\Phi)^{-1} [(\kappa_0 \varsigma)^{-1} + R_\infty^{-1}]} + \frac{2A_z^{(0)}}{1 + R_\infty (\kappa_0 \varsigma)^{-1}}, \quad (58)$$

and the vertical profile of the turbulent Prandtl number $\text{Pr}_T(\varsigma)$ is given by:

$$\text{Pr}_T = \text{Pr}_T^{(0)} \left[1 - \frac{C_\theta C_p}{A_z [R_\infty^{-1} + (\kappa_0 \varsigma)^{-1} - (1 + C_\Phi)]} \right]^{-1}. \quad (59)$$

Note that the gradient Richardson number Ri and the flux Richardson number Ri_f are related as $\text{Ri}(\varsigma) = \text{Ri}_f(\varsigma) \text{Pr}_T(\varsigma)$.

Equations (55)–(59) are in agreement with Monin-Obukhov-Nieuwstadt similarity theories [72, 73]. In the Monin-Obukhov similarity theory [72], the turbulent fluxes of momentum τ , heat F_z , the Obukhov length scale L and other scalars are approximated by their surface values, while the similarity theory by Nieuwstadt [73] is extended to the entire stably stratified boundary layer employing local z -dependent values of the turbulent fluxes $\tau(z)$ and $F_z(z)$, and the length $L(z)$ instead of their surface values.

Using Eqs. (22) and (57), we can relate ς and \tilde{Z} for stably stratified turbulence as

$$\varsigma = \frac{\tilde{Z} \tilde{E}_K^{1/2}}{\kappa_0 (1 + C_\Phi - \tilde{Z} \tilde{E}_K^{1/2} / R_\infty)}. \quad (60)$$

For the surface layer ($\tilde{Z} \ll 1$) of the stably stratified turbulence, the dimensionless height is $\varsigma = z/L$, and the normalised TKE is $\tilde{E}_K \approx 1$ [see Eq. (16)]. Therefore, Eq. (60) in this case is reduced to

$$\frac{z}{L} = \frac{\tilde{Z}}{\kappa_0 (1 + C_\Phi)}. \quad (61)$$

This equation coincides with Eq. (18) derived for the low part ($|\tilde{Z}| \ll 1$) of the surface layer in convective turbulence.

V. SURFACE LAYERS IN CONVECTIVE TURBULENCE

In this section we apply results obtained in Section III to convective turbulence. In this case, the nonlinear equation for the vertical profile of the normalized TKE, $\tilde{E}_K(\tilde{Z}) = E_K(\tilde{Z}) / E_{K0}$ is given by Eq. (15). In Fig. 2 we show the normalized turbulent kinetic energy $E_K^* = E_K / u_*^2$ versus z/L obtained in the EFB theory. This dependence has been compared with the data [13] obtained from meteorological observations at the Eureka station




FIG. 2. The normalized turbulent kinetic energy $E_K^* = E_K/u_*^2$ versus z/L obtained in the EFB theory (solid line) which is compared with the data obtained from meteorological observations at the Eureka station located in the Canadian territory of Nunavut [68] in the conditions of long-lived convective boundary layer typical of the arctic summer.




FIG. 3. The function C_τ versus z/L for convective and stably stratified turbulence.

located in the Canadian territory of Nunavut [68] in the conditions of long-lived convective boundary layer typical of the arctic summer. The better agreement between theoretical predictions and the observation data is achieved when C_τ is the following function of z/L (see Fig. 3):

$$C_\tau = \left(0.1 + \frac{1.72 |X(z)|}{1 + 2|X(z)|}\right) \left(1 + \frac{4z}{|L|}\right)^{-2/3}, \quad (62)$$

where $X(z) = \text{Ri}_f(z)/\text{R}_\infty$. We remind that C_τ is related to the effective dissipation time scale of the Reynolds stress.

Asymptotic solutions of Eq. (15) for the normalized TKE, $\tilde{E}_K(\tilde{Z})$ are given by Eq. (16) for a lower part ($|\tilde{Z}| \ll 1$) of the surface convective layer, and by Eq. (17) for an upper part ($|\tilde{Z}| \gg 1$) of the surface convective layer. Below we present asymptotic formulas for various turbulent characteristics based on Eqs. (21), (22)–(26), (36)–(38), (41) and (51)–(52) for the lower and upper parts of the surface layer in convective turbulence. In particular, the turbulence characteristics for a lower part ($|\tilde{Z}| \ll 1$) of the surface convective layer are given by

- the flux Richardson number,

$$\text{Ri}_f = -(1 + C_\Phi)^{-1} |\tilde{Z}|, \quad (63)$$

- the large-scale shear,

$$S = \frac{u_*}{\kappa_0 z}, \quad (64)$$

- the turbulent viscosity,

$$K_M = \kappa_0 u_* z, \quad (65)$$

- the vertical share of TKE,

$$A_z(\text{Ri}_f) = A_z^{(0)} + (1 - A_z^{(0)}) |\tilde{Z}|, \quad (66)$$

- the turbulent Prandtl number,

$$\text{Pr}_T = \text{Pr}_T^{(0)} \left[1 - \frac{C_\theta C_P}{A_z^{(0)} (1 + C_\Phi)} |\tilde{Z}|\right], \quad (67)$$

- the level of temperature fluctuations,

$$\frac{E_\theta}{\theta_*^2} = C_P (2C_\tau A_z^{(0)})^{-1/2} \text{Pr}_T^{(0)} (1 - C_E |\tilde{Z}|), \quad (68)$$

- the vertical gradient of the mean potential temperature,

$$\nabla_z \bar{\Theta} = -\frac{\theta_* \text{Pr}_T^{(0)}}{\kappa z}, \quad (69)$$

- the ratio of the horizontal and vertical turbulent fluxes of potential temperature,

$$\frac{F_i}{F_z} = -C_F (1 + \text{Pr}_T^{(0)}) (2C_\tau A_z^{(0)})^{-1/2}, \quad (70)$$

- the horizontal components of TKE,

$$E_x = E_y = \frac{1}{2} E_{K0} (1 - A_z^{(0)}) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} |\tilde{Z}|\right), \quad (71)$$

where

$$C_E = \frac{1}{6} \left[1 + 2 (A_z^{(0)})^{-1}\right] + \frac{C_\theta C_P}{A_z^{(0)} (1 + C_\Phi)}. \quad (72)$$

In Eq. (64) we take into account that for the surface layer in convective turbulence, the vertical integral turbulent scale, $\ell_z = C_\ell z$ and in Eq. (70) we consider the case when the mean velocity \bar{U}_i is directed along the x -axis.

For an upper part ($|\tilde{Z}| \gg 1$) of the surface convective layer, the turbulence characteristics are given by

- the flux Richardson number,

$$\text{Ri}_f = -(1 + C_\Phi)^{-1} \tilde{Z}^{4/3}, \quad (73)$$

- the large-scale shear,

$$S = \frac{u_*}{|L|} (1 + C_\Phi) \tilde{Z}^{-4/3}, \quad (74)$$

- the turbulent viscosity,

$$K_M = (1 + C_\Phi)^{-1} u_* |L| \tilde{Z}^{4/3}, \quad (75)$$

- the normalized vertical integral scale ℓ_z ,

$$\frac{\ell_z}{|L|} = (2C_\tau)^{-3/4} \tilde{Z}^{4/3}, \quad (76)$$

- the normalized TKE,

$$\frac{E_K}{u_*^2} = (2C_\tau)^{-1/2} \tilde{Z}^{2/3}, \quad (77)$$

- the vertical share of TKE,

$$A_z(\text{Ri}_f) = 1 - \left(1 - A_z^{(0)}\right) \tilde{Z}^{-4/3}, \quad (78)$$

- the turbulent Prandtl number,

$$\text{Pr}_T = \text{Pr}_T^{(\infty)} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{\text{Pr}_T^{(\infty)}}{\text{Pr}_T^{(0)}}\right) \tilde{Z}^{-4/3} \right], \quad (79)$$

- the level of temperature fluctuations E_θ/θ_*^2 ,

$$\frac{E_\theta}{\theta_*^2} = C_p (2C_\tau)^{-1/2} \text{Pr}_T^{(\infty)} \tilde{Z}^{-2/3}, \quad (80)$$

- the vertical gradient of the mean potential temperature,

$$\nabla_z \bar{\Theta} = -\frac{\theta_*}{|L|} \text{Pr}_T^{(\infty)} \tilde{Z}^{-4/3}, \quad (81)$$

- the ratio of the horizontal and vertical turbulent fluxes of potential temperature,

$$\frac{F_x}{F_z} = -C_F (1 + \text{Pr}_T) (2C_\tau)^{-1/2} \tilde{Z}^{-2/3}, \quad (82)$$

- the horizontal components of TKE,

$$E_x = E_y = \frac{1}{2} E_{K0} \left(1 - A_z^{(0)}\right) \tilde{Z}^{-2/3}, \quad (83)$$




FIG. 4. The flux Richardson number Ri_f versus z/L for convective and stably stratified turbulence.




FIG. 5. The turbulent Prandtl number Pr_T versus z/L for convective and stably stratified turbulence.

where

$$\text{Pr}_T^{(\infty)} = \text{Pr}_T^{(0)} \left[1 + \frac{C_\theta C_p}{1 + C_\Phi} \right]^{-1}, \quad (84)$$

and in Eq. (82) we consider the case when the mean velocity \bar{U}_i is directed along the x -axis.

Substituting Eq. (12) and the relation $\ell_z = C_\ell z$ into Eq. (77), we arrive at the famous expression for the convective turbulent energy,

$$E_K = C_c (\beta F_z z)^{2/3}, \quad (85)$$

obtained using dimension analysis in Ref. [74]. Scalings for convective turbulence similar to Eqs. (73)–(75) and (80)–(81) (where $\ell_z = C_\ell z$), were obtained in Refs. [74–76] using dimensional analysis (see also for a review books by [1, 2, 16]). The scalings similar to Eqs. (82)–(83) were derived using dimensional analysis in Refs. [14, 15]. Most of the above scalings are in agreement with the data of the atmospheric observations discussed in Ref. [77].

In Figs. 4–13 we show vertical profiles of various turbulent characteristics for convective ($L < 0$) and stably stratified ($L > 0$) turbulence. These dependencies are based on Eqs. (11), (15), (18), (21), (22)–(26), (36)–(38), (41), (50)–(52) and (60). Three basic dimensional numbers, Ri_f , Pr_T and Ri , plotted in Figs. 4–6, are related by the expression $\text{Ri} = \text{Ri}_f \text{Pr}_T$.

Let us discuss the choice of the dimensionless empirical constants [32, 34]. There are two well-known universal constants: the limiting value of the flux Richardson number $R_\infty = 0.2$ for an extremely strongly stratified




FIG. 6. The gradient Richardson number Ri versus z/L for convective and stably stratified turbulence.




FIG. 7. The normalized mean velocity $\tilde{U}_y = \overline{U}_y/u_*$ (solid line) versus z/L for convective and stably stratified turbulence, where the normalized height of the roughness elements is $z_*/L = 5.28 \times 10^{-4}$. The dotted line corresponds to $\tilde{U}_y = \kappa^{-1} \ln(z/z_*)$.




FIG. 8. The normalized mean temperature difference $\tilde{\Theta} = (\overline{T} - \overline{T}_b)/\theta_*$ versus z/L for convective and stably stratified turbulence, where \overline{T}_b is the mean temperature at the lower boundary.




FIG. 9. The normalized turbulent kinetic energy $E_K^* = E_K/u_*^2$ versus z/L for convective and stably stratified turbulence.




FIG. 10. The normalized intensity of potential temperature fluctuations $\tilde{E}_\theta = E_\theta/\theta_*^2$ versus z/L for convective and stably stratified turbulence.




FIG. 11. The normalized vertical share A_z of turbulent kinetic energy versus z/L for convective and stably stratified turbulence.

turbulence (i.e., for $Ri \rightarrow \infty$) and the turbulent Prandtl number $Pr_T^{(0)} = 0.8$ for a nonstratified turbulence (i.e., for $Ri \rightarrow 0$) [78–80]. The constant C_p describes the deviation of the dissipation timescale of $E_\theta = \langle \theta^2 \rangle / 2$ from the dissipation timescale of TKE. The constant C_θ is given by $C_\theta = A_z^{(\infty)} [(1 - R_\infty(1 + C_\phi)) / (C_p R_\infty)]$ [see Eq. (36)]. We use here the following values of the non-dimensional empirical constants: $C_p = 0.417$, $C_\theta = 0.744$, $C_\phi = 0.899$, $\kappa_0 = 0.4$, $Pr_T^{(0)} = 0.8$, $A_z^{(0)} = 0.2$, $A_z^{(\infty)} = 0.1$. These constants are determined from the data of numerous meteorological observations, laboratory experiments, direct numerical simulations (DNS) and large eddy simulations (LES) [28, 32, 35–40, 56, 81–86]. The parameter $C_\tau = 0.1$ for stably stratified turbulence and $C_F = C_\tau / Pr_T^{(0)} = 0.125$. For convective turbulence, the parameters $C_\tau(Ri_f)$




FIG. 12. The normalized turbulent kinetic energy $\tilde{E}_{K0} = E_{K0}/u_*^2$ versus z/L for convective and stably stratified turbulence.




FIG. 13. The normalized vertical integral scale ℓ_z/L versus z/L for convective and stably stratified turbulence.

and $C_F(\text{Ri}_f) = C_\tau(\text{Ri}_f)/\text{Pr}_\tau^{(0)}$ are the functions of the flux Richardson number Ri_f (see the beginning of Section V).

Absolute values of the gradient Richardson number Ri in convective turbulence are much larger than in stably stratified turbulence. The reason is that the large-scale shear in convective turbulence is much smaller than in stably stratified turbulence (see Fig. 10). This is because TKE in convective turbulence is much larger than in stably stratified turbulence (see Fig. 12), because in convection, both, the buoyancy and large-scale shear produce turbulence. Contrary, in stably stratified turbulence, the large-scale shear produces TKE, while the buoyancy decreases TKE and produces the temperature fluctuations.

On the other hand, the normalized intensity of potential temperature fluctuations $\tilde{E}_\theta = E_\theta/\theta_*^2$ (see Fig. 10) in convective turbulence is much weaker than in stably stratified turbulence. The latter is caused by a weak gradient of the mean potential temperature in convective turbulence in comparison with that of stably stratified turbulence (see Fig. 8). The vertical share A_z of turbulent kinetic energy in stably stratified turbulence is changed stronger than in the surface layers of convective turbulence (see Fig. 11). Indeed, turbulence tends to be two-dimensional one for very large gradient Richardson number in stably stratified turbulence, i.e., A_z becomes very small. Contrary, in convection the buoyancy is dominated in the energy production in the upper part of the surface layer, resulting in a strong increase of the vertical TKE, i.e., the vertical share $A_z \rightarrow 1$.

Since the normalized turbulent kinetic energy $\tilde{E}_{K0} = E_{K0}/u_*^2$ is inversely proportional to the vertical share A_z , it changes significantly in stably stratified turbulence in comparison with convective turbulence (see Fig. 12). In Fig. 13 we show the normalized vertical integral scale ℓ_z/L versus z/L for convective and stably stratified turbulence. In stably stratified turbulence, the vertical integral scale reaches the Obukhov length scale at high gradient Richardson numbers. Contrary, in convective turbulence the ratio $|\ell_z/L|$ is strongly increases with height.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We develop the energy and flux budget theory for the atmospheric surface layers in turbulent convection and

stably stratified turbulence. This theory uses the budget equations for turbulent energies and fluxes. In the framework of this theory we determine the vertical profiles for all turbulent characteristics and for the mean velocity and mean potential temperature. In particular, we find the vertical profiles of turbulent kinetic energy, the intensity of turbulent potential temperature fluctuations, the vertical turbulent fluxes of momentum and buoyancy (proportional to potential temperature), the integral turbulence scale, the turbulent anisotropy, the turbulent Prandtl number and the flux Richardson number.

Since the large-scale shear in convective turbulence is much smaller than in stably stratified turbulence, the absolute values of the gradient Richardson number in convective turbulence are much larger than in stably stratified turbulence. This is natural result, since turbulent kinetic energy (produced by both, the buoyancy and large-scale shear) in convective turbulence is much stronger than in stably stratified turbulence. On the other hand, the large-scale shear produces turbulent kinetic energy in stably stratified turbulence, and the buoyancy decreases TKE and produces the temperature fluctuations. In convective turbulence, the gradient of the mean potential temperature is usually small in comparison with stably stratified turbulence. Therefore, potential temperature fluctuations are much smaller than in stably stratified turbulence. The vertical integral scale in stably stratified turbulence can only reach the Obukhov length scale at high gradient Richardson numbers. On the other hand, the vertical integral scale in convective turbulence can be much larger than the absolute value of the Obukhov length scale.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper is dedicated to Prof. Sergej Zilitinkevich (1936-2021) who initiated this work and discussed the obtained results. This research was supported in part by the PAZY Foundation of the Israel Atomic Energy Commission (grant No. 122-2020), and the Israel Ministry of Science and Technology (grant No. 3-16516).

APPENDIX 1: THE MODEL FOR THE INTER-COMPONENT ENERGY EXCHANGE TERMS $Q_{\alpha\alpha}$ FOR ANISOTROPIC TURBULENCE IN THE HORIZONTAL PLANE

In this Appendix, we discuss the model for the inter-component energy exchange term $Q_{\alpha\alpha}$ for anisotropic turbulence in the horizontal plane. In particular, the inter-component energy exchange terms $Q_{\alpha\alpha}$ are given

by

$$Q_{xx} = -\frac{2(1+C_r)}{t_T} \left[E_x - \frac{E_{\text{int}}}{3} + A_z^{(0)} \left(C_1 + C_2 \frac{\text{Ri}_f}{R_\infty} \right) \right], \quad (86)$$

$$Q_{yy} = -\frac{2(1+C_r)}{t_T} \left[E_y - \frac{E_{\text{int}}}{3} - A_z^{(0)} \left(C_1 + C_2 \frac{\text{Ri}_f}{R_\infty} \right) \right]. \quad (87)$$

Using Eq. (6) for E_x , we obtain that the horizontal shares $A_x = E_x/E_K$ and $A_y = E_y/E_K$ of TKE for stably stratified turbulence as

$$A_x(\text{Ri}_f) = A_z^{(0)} \left[1 - C_1 - \frac{\text{Ri}_f}{R_\infty} (1 - C_2) \right] + \frac{1 - 3A_z^{(0)}}{1 - \text{Ri}_f (1 + C_\Phi)}, \quad (88)$$

$A_y = 1 - A_x - A_z$, and the vertical share A_z is given by Eq. (50). The free constants C_1 and C_2 are determined by the values $A_x^{(0)}$ at $\text{Ri}_f = 0$ and $A_x^{(\infty)}$ at $\text{Ri}_f \rightarrow R_\infty$.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

-
- [1] A. S. Monin and A. M. Yaglom, *Statistical Fluid Mechanics*, Vol. 1 (MIT Press, 1971).
- [2] A. S. Monin and A. M. Yaglom, *Statistical Fluid Mechanics*, Vol. 2 (Courier Corporation, 2013).
- [3] W. D. McComb, *The Physics of Fluid Turbulence* (Oxford Science Publications, 1990).
- [4] U. Frisch, *Turbulence: the Legacy of A. N. Kolmogorov* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995).
- [5] S. B. Pope, *Turbulent Flows* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
- [6] M. Lesieur, *Turbulence in Fluids* (Springer, 2008).
- [7] P. A. Davidson, *Turbulence in Rotating, Stratified and Electrically Conducting Fluids* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013).
- [8] I. Rogachevskii, *Introduction to Turbulent Transport of Particles, Temperature and Magnetic Fields* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2021).
- [9] A. N. Kolmogorov, Dissipation of energy in the locally isotropic turbulence, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR A **32**, 16 (1941).
- [10] A. N. Kolmogorov, Energy dissipation in locally isotropic turbulence, Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR A **32**, 19 (1941).
- [11] A. N. Kolmogorov, The equations of turbulent motion in an incompressible fluid, Izvestia Akad. Sci., USSR; Phys. **6**, 56 (1942).
- [12] A. N. Kolmogorov, The local structure of turbulence in incompressible viscous fluid for very large reynolds numbers, Proc. Roy. Soc. London A **434**, 9 (1991).
- [13] S. Zilitinkevich, E. Kadantsev, I. Repina, E. Mortikov, and A. Glazunov, Order out of chaos: Shifting paradigm of convective turbulence, J. Atmosph. Sci. **78**, 3925 (2021).
- [14] S. S. Zilitinkevich, Turbulence and diffusion in free convection, Izv. Acad. Sci. USSR Atmos. Ocean. Phys. **7**, 825 (1971).
- [15] S. S. Zilitinkevich, Shear convection, Boundary-Layer Meteor., **3**, 416 (1973).
- [16] S. S. Zilitinkevich, *Turbulent Penetrative Convection* (Aldershot: Avebury Technical, 1991).
- [17] S. Zilitinkevich, J. Hunt, I. N. Esau, A. Grachev, D. Lalas, E. Akylas, M. Tombrou, C. Fairall, H. Fernando, A. Baklanov, *et al.*, The influence of large convective eddies on the surface-layer turbulence, Quart. J. Roy. Meteorolog. Soc. **132**, 1426 (2006).
- [18] J. Wyngaard and O. Coté, The budgets of turbulent kinetic energy and temperature variance in the atmospheric surface layer, J. Atmosph. Sci. **28**, 190 (1971).
- [19] B. Kader and A. Yaglom, Mean fields and fluctuation moments in unstably stratified turbulent boundary layers, J. Fluid Mech. **212**, 637 (1990).
- [20] T. Elperin, N. Kleeorin, I. Rogachevskii, and S. Zilitinkevich, Formation of large-scale semi-organized structures in turbulent convection, Phys. Rev. E **66**, 066305 (2002).
- [21] T. Elperin, N. Kleeorin, I. Rogachevskii, and S. Zilitinkevich, Tangling turbulence and semi-organized structures in convective boundary layers, Boundary-Layer Meteorol. **119**, 449 (2006).
- [22] T. Elperin, I. Golubev, N. Kleeorin, and I. Rogachevskii, Large-scale instabilities in a nonrotating turbulent convection, Phys. Fluids **18**, 126601 (2006).
- [23] A. Glazunov and V. Dymnikov, Spatial spectra and characteristic horizontal scales of temperature and velocity fluctuations in the convective boundary layer of the atmosphere, Izv. Atmos. Ocean. Phys. **49**, 33 (2013).
- [24] T. Banerjee, G. Katul, S. Salesky, and M. Chamecki, Revisiting the formulations for the longitudinal velocity variance in the unstable atmospheric surface layer, Quart. J. Roy. Meteorolog. Soc. **141**, 1699 (2015).
- [25] S. T. Salesky, M. Chamecki, and E. Bou-Zeid, On the nature of the transition between roll and cellular organization in the convective boundary layer, Boundary-Layer Meteorol. **163**, 41 (2017).
- [26] S. Salesky and W. Anderson, Buoyancy effects on large-scale motions in convective atmospheric boundary layers: implications for modulation of near-wall processes, J. Fluid Mech. **856**, 135 (2018).
- [27] S. Salesky and W. Anderson, Coherent structures modulate atmospheric surface layer flux-gradient relationships, Phys. Rev. Lett. **125**, 124501 (2020).
- [28] S. S. Zilitinkevich, T. Elperin, N. Kleeorin, and I. Ro-

- gachevskii, Energy- and flux budget (efb) turbulence closure model for stably stratified flows. part i: Steady-state, homogeneous regimes, *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* **125**, 167 (2007).
- [29] S. S. Zilitinkevich, T. Elperin, N. Kleeorin, I. Rogachevskii, I. Esau, T. Mauritsen, and M. W. Miles, Turbulence energetics in stably stratified geophysical flows: Strong and weak mixing regimes, *Quarterly J. Roy. Meteorol. Soc.* **134**, 793 (2008).
- [30] S. S. Zilitinkevich, T. Elperin, N. Kleeorin, V. L'vov, and I. Rogachevskii, Energy-and flux-budget turbulence closure model for stably stratified flows. part ii: the role of internal gravity waves, *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* **133**, 139 (2009).
- [31] S. S. Zilitinkevich, I. Esau, N. Kleeorin, I. Rogachevskii, and R. D. Kouznetsov, On the velocity gradient in stably stratified sheared flows. part 1: asymptotic analysis and applications, *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* **135**, 505 (2010).
- [32] S. S. Zilitinkevich, T. Elperin, N. Kleeorin, I. Rogachevskii, and I. Esau, A hierarchy of energy- and flux-budget (efb) turbulence closure models for stably stratified geophysical flows, *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* **146**, 341 (2013).
- [33] N. Kleeorin, I. Rogachevskii, I. A. Soustova, Y. I. Troitskaya, O. S. Ermakova, and S. Zilitinkevich, Internal gravity waves in the energy and flux budget turbulence-closure theory for shear-free stably stratified flows, *Phys. Rev. E* **99**, 063106 (2019).
- [34] N. Kleeorin, I. Rogachevskii, and S. Zilitinkevich, Energy and flux budget closure theory for passive scalar in stably stratified turbulence, *Phys. Fluids* **33**, 076601 (2021).
- [35] J. Kondo, O. Kanechika, and N. Yasuda, Heat and momentum transfers under strong stability in the atmospheric surface layer, *J. Atmosph. Sci.* **35**, 1012 (1978).
- [36] F. Bertin, J. Barat, and R. Wilson, Energy dissipation rates, eddy diffusivity, and the prandtl number: An in situ experimental approach and its consequences on radar estimate of turbulent parameters, *Radio Science* **32**, 791 (1997).
- [37] Y. Ohya, Wind-tunnel study of atmospheric stable boundary layers over a rough surface, *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* **98**, 57 (2001).
- [38] E. J. Strang and H. J. S. Fernando, Vertical mixing and transports through a stratified shear layer, *J. Phys. Oceanogr.* **31**, 2026 (2001).
- [39] C. R. Rehmann and J. R. Koseff, Mean potential energy change in stratified grid turbulence, *Dynamics of Atmospheres and Oceans* **37**, 271 (2004).
- [40] D. D. Stretch, J. W. Rottman, S. K. Venayagamoorthy, K. K. Nomura, and C. R. Rehmann, Mixing efficiency in decaying stably stratified turbulence, *Dynamics of Atmospheres and Oceans* **49**, 25 (2010).
- [41] L. Mahrt, Variability and maintenance of turbulence in the very stable boundary layer, *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* **135**, 1 (2010).
- [42] L. Mahrt, Stably stratified atmospheric boundary layers, *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics* **46**, 23 (2014).
- [43] D. Li, Turbulent prandtl number in the atmospheric boundary layer-where are we now?, *Atmosph. Res.* **216**, 86 (2019).
- [44] L. Umlauf and H. Burchard, Second-order turbulence closure models for geophysical boundary layers. a review of recent work, *Continental Shelf Research* **25**, 795 (2005).
- [45] V. M. Canuto, Turbulence in astrophysical and geophysical flows, in *Interdisciplinary aspects of turbulence* (Springer, 2008) pp. 107–160.
- [46] P. Sagaut and C. Cambon, *Homogeneous turbulence dynamics*, Vol. 10 (Springer, 2008).
- [47] K. Hanjalić and B. Launder, *Modelling turbulence in engineering and the environment: second-moment routes to closure* (Cambridge university press, 2011).
- [48] T. Mauritsen, G. Svensson, S. S. Zilitinkevich, I. Esau, L. Enger, and B. Grisogono, A total turbulent energy closure model for neutrally and stably stratified atmospheric boundary layers, *J. Atmos. Sci.* **64**, 4113 (2007).
- [49] B. Galperin, S. Sukoriansky, and P. S. Anderson, On the critical richardson number in stably stratified turbulence, *Atmosph. Sci. Lett.* **8**, 65 (2007).
- [50] V. Canuto, Y. Cheng, A. Howard, and I. Esau, Stably stratified flows: A model with no ri (cr), *Journal of the atmospheric sciences* **65**, 2437 (2008).
- [51] V. S. L'vov, I. Procaccia, and O. Rudenko, Turbulent fluxes in stably stratified boundary layers, *Physica Scripta* **2008**, 014010 (2008).
- [52] S. Sukoriansky and B. Galperin, Anisotropic turbulence and internal waves in stably stratified flows (qnse theory), *Physica Scripta* **2008**, 014036 (2008).
- [53] H. Savijärvi, Stable boundary layer: Parametrizations for local and larger scales, *Quart. J. Roy. Meteorolog. Soc.* **135**, 914 (2009).
- [54] L. Kantha and S. Carniel, A note on modeling mixing in stably stratified flows, *J. Atmosph. Sci.* **66**, 2501 (2009).
- [55] Y. Kitamura, Modifications to the mellor-yamadanakanishi-niino (myynn) model for the stable stratification case, *J. Meteorolog. Soc. Japan. Ser. II* **88**, 857 (2010).
- [56] D. Li, G. G. Katul, and S. S. Zilitinkevich, Closure schemes for stably stratified atmospheric flows without turbulence cutoff, *J. Atmosph. Sci.* **73**, 4817 (2016).
- [57] Y. Cheng, V. Canuto, A. Howard, A. Ackerman, M. Kelley, A. Fridlind, G. Schmidt, M. Yao, A. Del Genio, and G. Elsaesser, A second-order closure turbulence model: new heat flux equations and no critical richardson number, *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences* **77**, 2743 (2020).
- [58] L. Ostrovsky and Y. I. Troitskaya, A model of turbulent transfer and dynamics of turbulence in a stratified shear-flow, *Izv. Atmos. Ocean. Phys.* **23**, 1031 (1987).
- [59] V. Canuto and F. Minotti, Stratified turbulence in the atmosphere and oceans: A new subgrid model, *J. Atmosph. Sci.* **50**, 1925 (1993).
- [60] J. C. Kaimal and J. J. Finnigan, *Atmospheric Boundary Layer Flows: Their Structure and Measurement* (Oxford University press, 1994).
- [61] V. S. L'vov, I. Procaccia, and O. Rudenko, Energy conservation and second-order statistics in stably stratified turbulent boundary layers, *Environmental Fluid Mechanics* **9**, 267 (2009).
- [62] I. Esau, Simulation of ekman boundary layers by large eddy model with dynamic mixed subfilter closure, *Environmental Fluid Mech.* **4**, 273 (2004).
- [63] I. N. Esau and S. S. Zilitinkevich, Universal dependences between turbulent and mean flow parameters in stably and neutrally stratified planetary boundary layers, *Non-linear Processes in Geophysics* **13**, 135 (2006).
- [64] J. L. Lumley, Rational approach to relations between motions of differing scales in turbulent flows, *Phys. Fluids* **10**, 1405 (1967).
- [65] J. C. Wyngaard and O. R. Coté, Cospectral similarity in the atmospheric surface layer, *Quarterly Journal of the*

- Royal Meteorological Society **98**, 590 (1972).
- [66] S. G. Saddoughi and S. V. Veeravalli, Local isotropy in turbulent boundary layers at high reynolds number, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **268**, 333 (1994).
- [67] T. Ishihara, K. Yoshida, and Y. Kaneda, Anisotropic velocity correlation spectrum at small scales in a homogeneous turbulent shear flow, *Physical Review Letters* **88**, 154501 (2002).
- [68] A. A. Grachev, P. O. G. Persson, T. Uttal, E. A. Akish, C. J. Cox, S. M. Morris, C. W. Fairall, R. S. Stone, G. Lesins, A. P. Makshtas, *et al.*, Seasonal and latitudinal variations of surface fluxes at two arctic terrestrial sites, *Climate Dynamics* **51**, 1793 (2018).
- [69] J. C. Rotta, Statistische theorie nichthomogener turbulenz, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **129**, 547 (1951).
- [70] T. R. Osborn and C. S. Cox, Oceanic fine structure, *Geophysical Fluid Dynamics* **3**, 321 (1972).
- [71] T. R. Osborn, Estimates of the local rate of vertical diffusion from dissipation measurements, *Journal of Physical Oceanography* **10**, 83 (1980).
- [72] A. Monin and A. Obukhov, Basic laws of turbulent mixing in the atmosphere near the ground, *Proc. Geophys. Inst. Academy of Science USSR (Tr. Geofiz. Inst., Akad. Nauk SSSR)* **24**, 163 (1954).
- [73] F. T. M. Nieuwstadt, The turbulent structure of the stable, nocturnal boundary layer, *J. Atmosph. Sci.* **41**, 2202 (1984).
- [74] L. Prandtl, Meteorologische anwendungen der stromungslehre, *Beitr. Phys. Atmos.* **19**, 188 (1932).
- [75] A. Obukhov, Turbulence in an atmosphere with a non-uniform temperature, *Proc. Geophys. Inst. Academy of Science USSR (Tr. Geofiz. Inst., Akad. Nauk. SSSR)* **1**, 95 (1946).
- [76] A. Obukhov, Turbulence in an atmosphere with a non-uniform temperature, *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.* **2**, 7 (1971).
- [77] B. Kader and A. Yaglom, Spectra and correlation functions of surface layer atmospheric turbulence in unstable thermal stratification, in *Turbulence and coherent structures* (Springer, 1991) pp. 387–412.
- [78] T. Elperin, N. Kleerorin, and I. Rogachevskii, Isotropic and anisotropic spectra of passive scalar fluctuations in turbulent fluid flow, *Phys. Rev. E* **53**, 3431 (1996).
- [79] S. W. Churchill, A reinterpretation of the turbulent prandtl number, *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research* **41**, 6393 (2002).
- [80] T. Foken, 50 years of the monin–obukhov similarity theory, *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* **119**, 431 (2006).
- [81] L. H. Shih, J. R. Koseff, J. H. Ferziger, and C. R. Rehmann, Scaling and parameterization of stratified homogeneous turbulent shear flow, *J. Fluid Mech.* **412**, 1 (2000).
- [82] D. Chung and G. Matheou, Direct numerical simulation of stationary homogeneous stratified sheared turbulence, *J. Fluid Mech.* **696**, 434 (2012).
- [83] L. Mahrt and D. Vickers, Boundary-layer adjustment over small-scale changes of surface heat flux, *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* **116**, 313 (2005).
- [84] G. S. Poulos, W. Blumen, D. C. Fritts, J. K. Lundquist, J. Sun, S. P. Burns, C. Nappo, R. Banta, R. Newsom, J. Cuxart, *et al.*, Cases-99: A comprehensive investigation of the stable nocturnal boundary layer, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* **83**, 555 (2002).
- [85] R. Banta, R. Newsom, J. Lundquist, Y. Pichugina, R. Coulter, and L. Mahrt, Nocturnal low-level jet characteristics over kansas during cases-99, *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* **105**, 221 (2002).
- [86] T. Uttal, J. A. Curry, M. G. McPhee, D. K. Perovich, R. E. Moritz, J. A. Maslanik, P. S. Guest, H. L. Stern, J. A. Moore, R. Turenne, *et al.*, Surface heat budget of the arctic ocean, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* **83**, 255 (2002).