

Even-odd alternative dispersions and beyond. Part I. Oscillations on both sides of the (anti-)shock, shocliton and other indications

Jian-Zhou Zhu (朱建州)

^a*Su-Cheng Centre for Fundamental and Interdisciplinary Sciences Gaochun Nanjing 211316 China*

Abstract

We have two basic observations: mathematically, the variational principle and Hamiltonian formulation of some models, such as the Korteweg-de Vries (KdV) equation, are preserved, *mutatis mutandis*, if each mode of freedom is assigned a different dispersion coefficient; and, physically, (similar) dispersive oscillations appear on both sides of some ion-acoustic and quantum shocks, not generated by the dynamics of the models such as the KdV(-Burgers) equation. We thus consider assigning different types of dispersions for different dynamical modes, particularly with the alternation of the signs for alternative Fourier components, different to the two-sided KdV equations for head-on collisions of nonlinear waves. The KdV equation with periodic boundary condition and longest-wave sinusoidal initial field, as used by N. Zabusky and M. D. Kruskal, is chosen for our case study with such alternating-dispersion of the Fourier modes of (normalized) even and odd wavenumbers. Numerical results verify the capability of our model to produce two-sided (around the shock) similar oscillations and indicate even more, including the notion of (anti)shock-soliton duality and/or “(anti)shocliton”, singular zero-dispersion limit or non-convergence to the classical shock (described by the entropy solution) and non-thermalization (of the Galerkin-truncated models). Extensions to other models and generalization of the mode-dependent dispersion models are also discussed, showcased respectively with Benjamin-Ono-type and the modified-KdV ones. A tentative physical application oriented towards modeling the ion-acoustic shock with the even-odd alternative dispersion model is made to compare against the traditional KdV-Burgers approach.

1. Introduction

Instead of the Gibbs phenomena, oscillations appearing on both sides of the (anti-)shock¹ can be due to “nonconvex” dispersions of (linear) waves of opposite velocities as in the Kawahara equation [1] or introduced externally by, say, forcing at small scales to form the shock with a transfer loop, as can be demonstrated by the Korteweg-de Vries-Burgers (KdVB) model [2]. The KdV equation, besides its origin in describing long one-dimensional, small amplitude, surface gravity waves propagating in a shallow water channel, with particularly the solitary wave solution [3] and the legendary connections with solitons and Fermi-Pasta-Ulam-Tsingou (FPUT) problem [4], has many more multi-disciplinary connections and applications [extending to classical (dusty) and quantum plasma dynamics, and, to bubbly liquids, quantum shock waves, conformal field theory and quantum gravity], in particular dispersive mediums with shocks, but the KdV equation in general admits dispersive oscillations only on one side of a shock, as evidenced by various results in the literature.

Shocks of some physical systems do appear to present the above mentioned two-sided oscillations. For example, the ion-acoustic shock waves observed in experiments [5] indeed show oscillations on both sides;

Email address: jz@sccfis.org (Jian-Zhou Zhu (朱建州))

¹Our usage of this terminology here simply refers to a clear jump before and after which the quantity is relatively much more tamed, including the dissipative and dispersive shocks and the steep kink structures.

most recent one-dimensional particle-in-cell simulation results in Ref. [6] also appear to present such two-sided oscillations, with even-smaller-scale numerical noise typical of such Lagrangian method though. And, a quantum nonconvex dispersion arises from the development of spin-orbit coupled Bose-Einstein condensates (BECs) [7, 8], the quasi-one-dimensional dynamics with two-sided oscillations around the shock has recently been clearly presented [9], especially in their two-component Gross-Pitaevskii equation (GPE) simulations. The oscillations on the two sides of these shocks however seem to be not of that drastically different features in terms of wavelength and/or amplitude as those produced by the Kawahara dispersions [1] (see also Hoefer et al. [10] for more), neither from “external” forcing, at least not always.

We propose the decomposition and alternation of opposite-sign dispersions of the same order, different to those of the Kawahara equation with different orders, motivated by the above observations and by the curiosity of the structural nature of the dynamics. For the former motivator, some intuitions are associated to opposite-direction departure of two sets of oscillations from the shock, which may sound similar to the idea of two-sided nonlinear-wave models for the head-on collisions of solitons and/or shocks in various systems, including the ion-acoustic solitary waves and shocks of different plasmas, dark solitons in BECs, magnetosonic solitary waves and blood nonlinear waves in vessels, etc. (e.g., Refs. [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19] and references therein). For the latter, we remark that it is an important progress finding the integrability of the KdV equation with the inverse scattering transform method [20], soon after the numerical discovery of the soliton properties in Zabusky and Kruskal [21] (ZK65), but it appears that the techniques are not transparent enough for direct physical insights and practical applications, even with the various nontrivial developments (e.g., Ref. [22]) and various other methods, including those for the periodic problem ([23, 24] and references therein and thereafter). Note that even for the Hopf-Cole transformation to obtain the formal solution as the Feynman-Kac formula for the simpler Burgers equation, the results are in general not explicit, thus not straightforwardly illuminating, so that other methods of evaluation are needed [25, 26]. To the best of our knowledge and understanding, no method of finding the solutions of nonlinear evolution equations is systematically general, in the sense that, as Lax [27] already pointed out for the inverse scatter method, though being developed further and “no fluke” [28], “it requires one to guess correctly...” So, although analysis and methods are still developing now [29, 30, 31], it may be necessary to examine with new closely relevant models the interplay between nonlinearity and dispersion, searching for the possibility of more transparent understanding and more direct method for the integrability issue. Actually, there are already various dispersion models which are studied in depth and which however might be too simple to be able to reveal thoroughly the very nature of dispersion effects, and that more general and critical models can be helpful in this respect.

We will be focusing on the KdV equation and its modifications. More specifically, the KdV equation with periodic boundary condition and longest-wave sinusoidal initial field, as used in ZK65, will be chosen for our case study with distinguishment and dispersion-alternation for Fourier modes of (normalized) even and odd wavenumbers. [The infinite-line problem, models with dissipation, and other theoretical aspects will be addressed in follow-up communications.] Neighboring even and odd numbers are in a sense twins whose corresponding wavenumbers of the Fourier modes are close (closer with larger k s), so it is natural for us to think of separating and reflecting the sign of dispersion of one class of them to account for oscillations of close features on both sides of the shock.

We will see that the proposed alternation of Fourier dispersions preserves some essential elegance of the original KdV equation, such as the variational principle and its Hamiltonian formulation, *mutatis mutandis*. Numerical results verify the two-sided oscillations around the shock but also indicate even more, including non-convergence (to the classical shock described by the entropy solution [33]), non-thermalization (similar to the FPUT recurrence [34, 35, 36] already noted in ZK65), the soliton-shock duality and applicability (to other models including the modified KdV equation with cubic nonlinearity). Many aspects of the notions are relevant to turbulence thus inspiring for thinking about the latter. Actually, we will see that the equilibrium spectrum of the KdV equation modified with alternative Fourier dispersion is pretty much that of standard Burgers turbulence with large-scale (random) forcing, and there is a field of research on integrable turbulence [32].

It should not be surprising that the classification of different modes and accordingly assigning different dispersions, preserving still the essential mathematical elegance, can be more general than the above

mentioned even-odd alternation, which may be practiced towards a unification of dispersions to model complicated dispersive nonlinear media. The modified KdV (mKdV) equation with the “second-level” even-odd alternation and a new model extending the Benjamin-Ono equation, the deep-water (opposite to KdV) limit of the intermediate long wave equation for the evolution of long internal waves with small amplitudes in a stably stratified fluid ([28] and references therein²), will be used for further case studies to make such an idea more explicit.

It is desirable to further examine and establish results somehow parallel to (some of) the series of KdV [38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44] applying the integrable structure or not (c.f., e.g., Ref. [45, 46] and references therein for those related to Whitham’s theory), and, check or apply the ideas in other models such as the KdVB equation [47] with diffusion and even with forcing, some of which are indeed under progress, but this note presents in the first step some notions, formulations and numerical results for general scenarios and insights, with the hope of, as remarked, applications in modeling and in fundamental issues beyond existing methods and theories.

Below, we will introduce in Sec. 2 the even-odd alternation of dispersions, and, the variational and Hamiltonian formulation. Sec. 3 contains the basic numerical analyses and tentative physical applications in modeling the ion-acoustic shocks, and Sec. 4 offers further discussions. Sec. 5 concludes the work with expectations, including new models for demonstrating the generalization of the dispersion unification idea. An appendix contains numerical results for closer inspection and parallel comparisons with some of those in the main text.

2. Theoretical formulation

We start with the KdV equation, with the 3rd-order dispersion,

$$\partial_t u + u \partial_x u + \mu \partial_x^3 u = 0 \quad (2.1)$$

which, in a periodic interval of length L_p normalized to be 2π for convenience of theoretical formulation, reads in Fourier k -space

$$(\partial_t - \mu \hat{i} k^3) \hat{u}_k + \hat{i} \sum_{p+q=k} q \hat{u}_p \hat{u}_q = 0, \quad (2.2)$$

where the Fourier coefficient

$$\hat{u}_k(t) = \int_0^{2\pi} u(x, t) \exp\{-\hat{i} k x\} dx / (2\pi) =: \mathcal{F}\{u\}(k, t) \quad (2.3)$$

with $\hat{i}^2 = -1$ and the complex conjugacy $\hat{u}_k^* = \hat{u}_{-k}$ for real u , thus

$$u(x, t) = \sum_k \hat{u}_k \exp\{\hat{i} k x\} =: \mathcal{F}^{-1}\{\hat{u}_k\}(x, t) \quad (2.4)$$

with appropriate properties depending on our requirements on the behaviors of the series [48]. In this note, we will be studying the KdV equation modified with even-odd alternative dispersion (“aKdV”),

$$\partial_t u + u \partial_x u + \mu \partial_x^3 \left[\mathcal{F}^{-1}\{\text{mod}(k+1, 2) \mathcal{F}\{u\}(k)\} - \mathcal{F}^{-1}\{\text{mod}(k, 2) \mathcal{F}\{u\}(k)\} \right] = 0 \quad (2.5)$$

with $\text{mod}(k, 2) = [(-1)^k + 1]/2$, and its further variations.

²For some different perspectives on the relations among various integrable models, c.f., e.g., Ref. [37] and references therein.

2.1. The definitions and equations

The modification of the dispersion term in Eq. (2.5) of the KdV dispersion $\hat{D}_k = -\hat{i}\mu k^3 \hat{u}_k$ is, put in words, simply separating the even and odd- k modes and reverse the sign of the dispersion of one of the branches with appropriate assumptions of the Fourier series [48, 49]; that is,

$$\hat{D}_k = (-1)^{\text{mod}(k,2)} \hat{i}\mu k^3 \hat{u}_k \quad (2.6)$$

which can be further generalized, as we will see immediately and later on. In x -configuration space, the more general even-odd separation of the dispersion term D is modified to be $\tilde{D} = {}^e\tilde{D} + {}^o\tilde{D}$, where

$${}^e\tilde{D}(x) := -\hat{i} {}^e\mu \sum_k (2k)^3 \hat{u}_{2k} \exp\{\hat{i}2kx\} = -\hat{i} {}^e\mu \sum_k k^3 {}^e\hat{u}_k \exp\{\hat{i}kx\} = {}^e\mu \partial_x^3 {}^e u, \quad (2.7)$$

with ${}^e\hat{u}_k := \text{mod}(k+1, 2)\hat{u}_k$; and, similarly for the odd component,

$${}^o\tilde{D} := -\hat{i} {}^o\mu \sum_k (2k+1)^3 \hat{u}_{2k+1} e^{\hat{i}(2k+1)x} = -\hat{i} {}^o\mu \sum_k k^3 {}^o\hat{u}_k \exp\{\hat{i}kx\} = {}^o\mu \partial_x^3 {}^o u, \quad (2.8)$$

with ${}^o\hat{u}_k := \text{mod}(k, 2)\hat{u}_k$. That is, we have

$$\partial_t u + u \partial_x u + ({}^e\mu \partial_x^3 {}^e u + {}^o\mu \partial_x^3 {}^o u) = 0 \quad (2.9)$$

with

$${}^e u = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\{\text{mod}(k+1, 2)\mathcal{F}\{u\}\} \text{ and } {}^o u = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\{\text{mod}(k, 2)\mathcal{F}\{u\}\}, \quad (2.10)$$

as used in Eq. (2.5); or, in k -space,

$$\partial_t \hat{u}_k - \hat{i} k^3 [{}^e\mu \text{mod}(k+1, 2) {}^e\hat{u}_k + {}^o\mu \text{mod}(k, 2) {}^o\hat{u}_k] + \hat{i} \sum_{p+q=k} q \hat{u}_p \hat{u}_q = 0. \quad (2.11)$$

${}^e\mu$ and ${}^o\mu$ may be chosen to be independent, but we will start with the alternation $\mu = {}^e\mu = -{}^o\mu$ (thus the conventional KdV dispersion $D = {}^e\tilde{D} - {}^o\tilde{D}$) which is used in the numerical analysis in Sec. 3.

2.2. The variational principle and Hamiltonian formulation

Obviously, for any variable v , the operators $\mathcal{E} : v \rightarrow {}^e v$ and, similarly, \mathcal{O} are *linear*, satisfying

$$\mathcal{E}\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O} \text{ and } \mathcal{E}\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{N} : v \rightarrow 0, \quad (2.12)$$

and, *commutativity* with respect to the differentiation operators. And just as the derivatives of v , ${}^e/o v$ should be treated as independent variables derived from v in functional calculations. The variation of ${}^e/o v$ comes from that of v . Introducing ϕ with $\phi_x = u$ (thus ${}^e/o\phi_x = {}^e/o u$ — subscripts for ϕ denoting partial differentiations), we have the least-action variational principle

$$\delta \int L dx dt = 0 \quad (2.13)$$

with the Lagrangian density

$$L = \phi_x \phi_t / 2 + \phi_x^3 / 6 - {}^e\mu ({}^e\phi_{xx})^2 / 2 - {}^o\mu ({}^o\phi_{xx})^2 / 2, \quad (2.14)$$

which gives Eq. (2.9) through the Euler equation

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \phi_t} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \frac{\partial L}{\partial \phi_x} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial {}^e\phi_{xx}} + \frac{\partial L}{\partial {}^o\phi_{xx}} \right) = 0. \quad (2.15)$$

[The above equation can be derived by introducing a ϕ variation (which causes the corresponding variations of ${}^e\phi_{xx}$ and all that functions in L) and perform the standard direct computations, with the application of

the properties (especially the *linearity* and *commutativity* with respect to differentiations) of the operators \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{O} , and, \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}^{-1} in Eq. (2.10).] Actually, we may define the (Hamiltonian) functional

$$\mathcal{H} = \int_0^{2\pi} [\text{}^o\mu(\partial_x \text{}^o u)^2/2 + \text{}^e\mu(\partial_x \text{}^e u)^2/2 - u^3/6] dx, \quad (2.16)$$

with the even and odd velocities given in the above through the Fourier expansion of u after Eqs. (2.7) and (2.8) respectively. We can directly verify, with Eq. (2.11), that

$$\frac{d\hat{u}_k}{dt} = \frac{\hat{i}}{2\pi} k \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial \hat{u}_k^*}. \quad (2.17)$$

The above agrees with the variational calculation, by the definition of the functional derivative $\delta\mathcal{H}/\delta u$ through

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial \hat{u}_k} = \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\delta \mathcal{H}}{\delta u} \frac{\partial u}{\partial \hat{u}_k} dx, \quad (2.18)$$

which leads to the formula

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{H}}{\delta u} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_k \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial \hat{u}_k^*} \exp\{\hat{i}kx\}. \quad (2.19)$$

Eq. (2.17) can be re-written as

$$\frac{dq_k}{dt} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial p_k}, \quad \frac{dp_k}{dt} = -\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial q_k}, \quad (2.20)$$

with $q_k := \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{ik}} \hat{u}_k$ and $p_k := \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{ik}} \hat{u}_k^*$ for $k > 0$. We can also verify

$$\partial_t u = \{u, \mathcal{H}\} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \frac{\delta \mathcal{H}}{\delta u} \quad (2.21)$$

with the cosymplectic operator ∂_x in the *Poisson bracket*

$$\{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}\} = \frac{\hat{i}}{2\pi} \sum_k \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial q_k} \frac{\partial \mathcal{G}}{\partial p_k} - \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial p_k} \frac{\partial \mathcal{G}}{\partial q_k} = \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta u} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \frac{\delta \mathcal{G}}{\delta u}. \quad (2.22)$$

We can prove the Jacobi identity with the same assumption and by the same arguments of Gardner [40] part of whose results for the classical KdV obviously carry over, *mutatis mutandis*. Further possibility of the exposition in this line with the spirit of Lie's theory (likely including the bi-Hamiltonian structure, indicated by the conjecture of integrability below [50, 51]), and others [44, 52] deserves further examination and is beyond the capability of this note.

We can see that the decomposition and assignment of dispersion, and, the above variational principle and Hamiltonian formulation hold actually for "arbitrary" grouping and dispersion-assignment (except for some possibly exotic ones which might lead to mathematical difficulties) of the Fourier modes and can be carried over to continuous- k case (for unbounded domain) by working with the intervals, say, $(I-0.5, I+0.5]$ for integer I s.

2.3. Other remarks

The KdV nonlinear term $N := u\partial_x u$ with the even-odd decomposition reads

$$N = (\text{}^e u \partial_x \text{}^e u + \text{}^o u \partial_x \text{}^o u) + (\text{}^e u \partial_x \text{}^o u + \text{}^o u \partial_x \text{}^e u) = \text{}^e N + \text{}^o N \quad (2.23)$$

with $\text{}^e N := \text{}^e u \partial_x \text{}^e u + \text{}^o u \partial_x \text{}^o u$ and $\text{}^o N := \partial_x (\text{}^o u \text{}^e u)$. Such definition of even/odd nonlinear term $\text{}^e/\text{}^o N$ is appropriate due to the k -space cubic interactions associated to the quadratic nonlinearity (more remarks on this in the next section).

It is not clear, so far, whether we can find an infinite sequence of conservation laws for such aKdV. The Miura [38] transformation, $u = v^2 \pm \sqrt{-6}\partial_x v$ (with appropriate normalizations of the units, say, to absorb the coefficient μ [38]), relating the modified KdV (mKdV) v governed by

$$\partial_t v + v^2 \partial_x v + \mu \partial_x^3 v = 0. \quad (2.24)$$

and the KdV u , appears not working anymore with such modifications of even-odd alternation (for both KdV and mKdV). There is still no completely general technique to proceed [50], to the best of our knowledge. However, with the three obvious invariants, the momentum, energy and Hamiltonian, we now already have, it is possible to develop the averaging (over one period of the fast oscillations) theory similar to that by Whitham [52] (see also Ref. [53] and references therein), so the related theories might be proliferating but are not the interest of this note: we will be focusing on the basic precise formulation and the raw data to promote insights on the fundamental issues such as integrability.

3. Numerical analysis

3.1. Even-odd decompositions

Note that the KdV even/odd dynamics

$${}^{e/o}\partial_t u + {}^{e/o}(u\partial_x u) + {}^{e/o}\mu {}^{e/o}\partial_x^3 u = 0, \quad (3.1)$$

which can be obtained by simply collecting from Eq. (2.2) the even/odd modes, are “non-symmetric” in the sense that triadic interactions in ${}^{e/o}\hat{i} \sum_{p+q=k} q \hat{u}_p \hat{u}_q$ corresponding to the nonlinear term are composed of the “even-even”, “even-odd” and “odd-odd” ones which result in, non-symmetrically, “even”, “odd” and “even” k , respectively. For example, we may remove all the odd- k modes to have pure even-dynamics, but there is no nonlinear pure odd-dynamics.

System (3.1) admits linear-wave even and odd branches of opposite directions with ${}^e\mu = -{}^o\mu$ and is indeed reminiscent of the two-sided (m)KdV(B) systems (e.g., Refs. [11, 13, 15]) for the head-on collision problems mentioned in the introductory discussions, with however obvious differences in the mathematical structures.

Following ZK65, we performed simulations with the same setup as theirs, that is, starting from the initial longest-wavelength profile $u_0 = \cos(\pi x)$ and performing the direct numerical simulation with periodic boundary condition over $[0, 2)$, but now with the standard pseudo-spectral method [54]; $\mu = \delta^2$ with $\delta = 0.022$ in Eq. (2.1).

Fig. 1 presents the velocity profiles precisely those of ZK65 and their even/odd components defined before, with the wavenumbers normalized accordingly to be integers. Some observations follow. Consistent with the initial condition, the corresponding even-velocities are actually of unit period, i.e., ${}^e u(x, t) = {}^e u(x + 1, t)$, and odd-velocities of “unit anti-period”, in the sense that within the period $L_p = 2$, ${}^o u(x, t) = -{}^o u(x + 1, t)$. ${}^e u$ tends to form shocks at both $x_B = 1$ and $x'_B = 3/2$ at the inviscid-Burgers blow-up time $t_B (= 1/\pi$ now), before evolving into soliton-like structures, and ${}^o u$ to shock and anti-shock (or steep “kink”, as used to describe the topological soliton of the sine-Gordon equation [23]), respectively at $x = 1$ and $x = 3/2$. Once they evolve into solitary pulses, ${}^e u$ and ${}^o u$ present similar features in their patterns, which however is not the case for the alternating-dispersion models to be presented below. They are not as solitary as real solitons (c.f., e.g., Refs. [42, 24, 29]), as indicated by the comparisons of their space-time contour plots (with still somewhat trackable space-time characteristics though) to that of the undecomposed u .

What appears remarkable is that ${}^{e/o}(u\partial_x u)$ tend to produce (anti)shocks at both $x_B = 1$ and $x'_B = 3/2$, even starting from the null field for ${}^e u$. The oscillations all emerge and develop, as already indicated by the nascent ones at t_B and other later ones (not shown) following them, behind the (anti)shocks, with the linear waves of both branches supposed to propagate backward with phase velocities $-k^2$ from the dispersion relation ${}^{e/o}\omega = -k^3$. Though not accomplished here, one of our motivations of inspecting such decomposed fields is to offer a comparison with those of aKdV below for the possibility of finding any original intuitions or clues to the integrability issue beyond the great ideas of past masters.




Figure 1: The KdV u (after ZK65) and the corresponding even and odd components at three times in the lower row and their contours in space-time in the upper row (u : left frame; u_e : middle); and, u_o : right) with time-axis vertical (up to $t = 80t_{ZK}$ with $t_{ZK} = 3.6t_B$) and space-axis horizontal. The meaning of the multicolor levels, independent for each frame, are self-evident, especially when compared to the discrete-time plots of the profiles, thus are not shown to avoid distraction (but see Fig. 10 in the Appendix for a closer view); the same for other plots, when unnecessary. The additional line at $t = 3.1t_B$ is for showing the signature of the ninth weakest soliton (rather than the radiating signal [24]; see also its characteristic in the Appendix.)

The cubic nonlinearity of the mKdV (2.24) corresponds to quaternary interactions. Unlike that of the even/odd dynamics of KdV,

$$e/o(\hat{i} \sum_{p+q+r=k} r \hat{v}_p \hat{v}_q \hat{v}_r) \leftrightarrow e/o(v^2 \partial_x v) \quad (3.2)$$

is much more “symmetric”, in the following sense: three even (respectively, odd) wavenumbers of p , q and r lead to even (respectively, odd) k , and two even (respectively, odd) and one odd (respectively, even) wavenumbers sum up to an odd (respectively, even) one. The even-odd decomposition analysis can be similarly extended to mKdV, but we do not bother to present them here. We will however come back to the even-odd-alternative-dispersion mKdV (amKdV) in Sec. 4.

3.2. Even-odd alternating dispersion: shock, soliton and shockiton

Fig. 2 presents the velocity profiles of the even-odd-alternating-dispersion KdV equation with decreasing $\mu = \pm \epsilon \mu = \mp \circ \mu$ from left to right, showing, just as the classical KdV [33], increasing oscillations on both sides of the (anti)shocks. So, we have seen not only the objective of mimicking the two-sided oscillations




Figure 2: Velocity profiles of aKdV with different parameters.

observed in some plasma and quantum shocks but also the singular behavior as an indication of nonconvergence to the classical shock described by an entropy solution. We reiterate that such two-sides oscillations for given μ are not the Gibbs phenomena but “physical”.




Figure 3: e/o_u of aKdV.

Fig. 3 presents e/o_u of the case with $e\mu = -o\mu = \delta^2$. [The other cases are accordingly similar and not shown.] As expected, the profiles are close to the corresponding ones in Fig. 1 for KdV at $t \leq t_B$, but e/o_u are quite different at $t = 3.6t_B$ after the differences in the dispersions take more and more effect: for instance, the plateau-basin structure of o_u of the aKdV is even strengthened (and persistent — see below), instead of broken into “simple” solitary pulses in the fashion of the KdV case.

Note that besides the shock at $x = 1/2$ as in KdV, the other anti-shock emerges at $x = 3/2$, and on both sides of the respective shock live the oscillations of close features (Fig. 2). Drastically different amplitudes of the oscillations around the respective shock can present (Fig. 2), but not always (Fig. 4 for $\mu = \delta^2/8$). The overall scenario is that the oscillations are “solitary”, which will become more obvious in the observation of Fig. 5 below. And, we also see slight leftward shift or slowly travelling of the (anti)shocks, due to the small difference between ${}^o\tilde{D}$ and ${}^e\tilde{D}$ coming from that of the alternating even and odd wavenumbers: as already can be seen from the comparison between the upper and lower rows of Fig. 2 and checked by the long-time contour patterns, when the signs of the even and odd dispersion coefficients are reflected to opposite signs, the (anti)shocks of the two cases travel with opposite but same-amplitude speed. Actually, as particularly clear at $t = 6t_B$, $9.6t_B$, $12t_B$, $18t_B$ and $19.2t_B$ for instance, the (anti)shocks seem to be “unifiable” into the oscillations: A rigorous and formal mathematical description is lacking, and the issue will become clearer




Figure 4: Velocity profiles of aKdV at various times with $\mu = \varrho\mu = -\epsilon\mu = \delta^2/8$ and $\delta = 0.022$.

with more insights motivated by the properties of the transported particles to be studied in Part II [55]. It appears then reasonable to raise the notion of “(anti)shock-soliton duality” or, probably even more precisely, “(anti)shocliton” as a mixture of (anti-)shock and soliton to indicate the continuous transition between an (anti-)shock³ and a (normal) soliton. All these then indicate that, even though (anti)shocks clearly persist in such aKdV system, the latter may well admit solitons and might even be “integrable (by some method)”.




Figure 5: Contours of u (left frame), ϵu (middle) and ϱu (right) for aKdV with $\epsilon\mu = \mu = -\varrho\mu$, respectively for $t \leq 20t_{ZK}$ (left panel, with four black dashed lines added to highlight the corresponding characteristics, two longest ones of them respectively for the shocliton and antishocliton) and $t \leq 80t_{ZK}$ (right panel); others the same as in Fig. 1 for ZK65.

The obvious feature of the persistent but slowly drifting plateau-basin structure carrying the smaller oscillations on both sides of the (anti)shocks is maintained by ϱu (c.f. Fig. 3) in this case, while ϵu presents

³The “shock” in this note however should be distinguished from the shock “soliton” [56, 24] of viscous Burgers equation, so the notion of duality or “shocliton” is not trivial. The other oscillations not of shock feature will be called “normal” solitons.

more of soliton feature, which is similarly followed by the others cases to be presented below. The conjecture that the oscillations of such aKdV equation are solitons appear to be supported by the contours presented in Fig. 5 where the (straight) “bars” coded by the same-level colors indicate the characteristics along which the solitary waves are travelling with collisions (interactions) resulting in some phase shifts: we indeed see there are “bars” of different slopes, indicating different velocities of the solitons, and their collisions seem to be weaker than those of the KdV equation in Fig. 1; careful inspection shows that the bars/characteristics (for solitons as conjectured by us) pass through the (anti)shoclitons which also travel at nearly (but probably not precisely) constant speeds as clearly shown by their characteristics over the time up to $80t_{ZK}$,⁴ supporting again the “soliton-shock duality”. [Within the plateau of the basin, the characteristics also appear to “return”, indicating unit period up to the drifts, which should be an accidental fact of this particular case for the specific initial field.] From the soliton point of view, such “shoclitons” present at the top and bottom anti-directional overshoots (compared to the respective average plateau/basin profiles further away from the jumps), thus characterized to be “big but weak” (“weak” for the strength averaged over the two sides). The anti-directional overshoots on the two sides of such a shock sum up to constitute the amplitude of the (weak) soliton identity, consistent also with the specification of the classical limiting shock velocity $u_s = (u^+ - u^-)/2$ (for quadratic nonlinearity here [57]) where u^+ and u^- are the left- and right-limit velocities of the ideal (entropy) shock. Being “weak”, the velocities of such solitons are then presumably very small, as shown by the slopes of their characteristics. The numerical errors, measured, say, by the deviations from the energy conservation, slightly grow (but still at a tolerable level, with the relative error $< 1/500$, for our purpose here) at later time, but the patten is still clear up to $80t_{ZK}$, thus reliable to our belief. At this point, we do not have a precise explanation for the deviation from constancy of the velocity of the “shoclitons” (not clear to our bare eyes for $t \leq 20t_{ZK}$ in the left panel of Fig. 5, but marked in the right panel; similarly for the case of even-order dispersions as given in the Appendix where the deviation is designated by referring to straight line added to the figure there). One possibility is that the otherwise higher-order/minor physical effects of the phase shifts of soliton interactions and/or other non-soliton dynamics present at a level comparable to the dynamics of such weak objects.

4. Further discussions

4.1. Miscellaneous remarks: (non)convergence, regularity and (non)thermalization

In this subsection, we would like to remark on issues which appear quite technically involved in a mathematically rigor level but which should be physically not remote, if not very familiar, to us (as physcists, say). [To this author’s point of view, they are intimate to various fundamental physical concerns.]

From the numerical results of aKdV, aside from the oscillations on both sides of the shock(s) that we were physically motivated, we are led to the conjecture of other similar mathematical properties to those of KdV’s equation, such as regularity [59, 64] and integrability. And, for Galerkin-truncated version of the system, as used in the numerical simulations, the non-thermalization property also holds as in the FPUT problem. A convenient way of demonstration is the power spectra, $E := |\hat{u}_k|^2$ of u , as given in Fig. 6 for different times including $t = t_B$ and those up to $19t_{ZK}$: the nonstationary spectra reach some “stable” state as if the statistical equilibrium were established, with the spectra at all times bounded by some “nice” time-invariant envelop which decays fast enough at large wavenumbers, a signature of global regularity. The lin-log plot shows that the spectra are actually dominated by the exponential decay, and such equilibrium spectra are similar to those of the standard Burgers turbulence [26] forced at large scales.

Note that the conventional notion of “thermalization” refers to some (generalized) equipartition of the energy over all modes and some completely noisy fluctuations in x -space. In this sense, we now have

⁴The penetration and continuation of the characteristics of the conjectured solitons across the (anti)shoclitons become much less trackable in the uniform color coding, due to the obvious jumps of the u -levels from the shock-property of the (anti)shoclitons.




Figure 6: Log-log (left column) and lin-log (right column) plots of the power spectra of aKdV case (upper row) corresponding to that in Fig. 5 compared to those of the ZK65 (lower row) results reported in Fig. 1: $n = |k| * L_p / (2\pi)$. The thicker straight dashed lines of reference scalings in the appropriate regimes are also added: the low- n regime of aKdV spectra appears to maintain an approximate scaling n^{-2} for the “shocliton”, while that of KdV is overwhelmed by an equipartition (n^0) distribution dominated by the “pure” solitons.

no thermalization behavior⁵, which does not depend on the numbers of modes, as long as the number is reasonably large, say, ≥ 16 as in the early FPUT experiments [34, 35]: we present in Fig. 6 the results from “very large” number of modes, in the sense that reasonable convergence to the limit of infinite modes has been achieved. Now, all the aKdV results in this relaxation/thermalization respect appear qualitatively the same as those of the traditional KdV equation (as given in the figure for comparison),⁶ except for some

⁵One might call any “final” states with vanishing energy flux in Fourier space [65] the “statistical equilibria”, and, actually, in a mathematically rigorous sense, we now cannot exclude the possibility that the average spectrum over long time be indeed that determined by the Gibbs state with the corresponding generalized equipartition [66] constrained by a set of (many) physically relevant invariants of the dynamics: note that the argument of Ref. [67] for the Galerkin-truncated dispersionless KdV (inviscid Burgers-Hopf) equation does not exclude higher-order invariants other than the projected/truncated powers of the velocity. In the conventional notion, statistical-equilibrium noisy fluctuations means no structures, which however is not the case here, and Zakharov’s notion of “integrable turbulence” appears more appropriate when the randomness enters (through the initial condition, say). Indeed, in contrast to the KdV case, we know that the truncated Burgers-Hopf equation presents thermalization [67] with the mathematical structure associated to the same Poisson bracket (2.22) of the truncated KdV equation as in the untruncated situation [50]. In other words, although the Hamiltonian formulation for the truncated Burgers-Hopf equation of Ref. [67] can be trivially extended to include the component corresponding to the dispersive term of the truncated KdV equation, also following closely Gardner [40], the thermalization results do not. For the fields with solitary-wave characteristics in the (seemingly) “random sea” for the KdV case (not shown) starting with a random field presenting energy equipartition on all Fourier modes, it appears particularly inappropriate to label them with “statistical equilibrium” or “thermalization”, and the situation of aKdV also presents different space-time structures determined by the initial fields, which belongs to another note particularly discussing such an issue on different Galerkin-truncated equilibria from various initial data.

⁶Of course, some of our conclusions, such as the specific shapes of the spectra, are restricted to the specific cases we have checked, and other initial configurations may result in different interesting consequences besides the fundamental common properties, which however is beyond the scope of this note and deserves further investigations.

details: for example, the aKdV shoeliton, as indeed a shock, leads to the n^{-2} scaling (but see below) for low ns , which is not supposed to appear in KdV with only pure solitons; the pure solitons obey an equipartition (n^0 , confirmed by long-time average — not shown) before the decay in the large-wavenumber regime, which also appears to be responsible for the aKdV (pure) solitons inbetween the shoeliton and anti-shoeliton with roughly an n^0 -regime (confirmed by long-time average — not shown) following roughly the n^{-2} -scaling at even lower ns and before the exponential decay (confirmed by long-time average — not shown). The ${}^o u$ - and ${}^e u$ -spectra are simply represented by the odd- and even- n data points in Fig. 6, where the KdV and aKdV results appear to show different behavior for such respective spectra. Additional insights are necessary, and a good understanding of such scaling laws will only be obtained by looking into the even- and odd-mode dynamics and making use of the observations of the (anti)shocks and solitary pulses in the middle and right frames of the velocity contours presented in this note, as will be proposed together with the argument for the particle density spectra, motivated by the latter (much more apparently approximating the Dirac delta) in Part II [55].⁷ Note that thin solid (red) lines for $t = t_B$ (when the Burgers-Hopf shock singularity presents) follow a scaling-law measured for both KdV and aKdV close to $n^{-2.6}$, slightly steeper than the standard shock scaling, n^{-2} given also for reference in Fig. 6, due to the dispersive regularization/smoothing. After the solitons are well developed, unlike the KdV case, the aKdV field present persistent shoeliton, slowly travelling though, which is responsible for the n^{-2} at lowest ns . Of course, the spectra are time varying, and it would be in a sense more appropriate to discuss the time-averaged one. The shoelitons (and anti-shoelitons) cannot be time-averaged into (white) noise statistics, because they present structural steadiness, stably standing in the travelling frame.

We are then led to speculate that the conventional (truncated-)KdV non-thermalization result holds for even more general dispersion models besides aKdV (we will come back on this with more remarks). It is not clear to what an extent the generalization can be made, and there should be a more precise mathematical tool based on (finite) Fourier-mode analysis to establish concretely such a result, at least under some meaningful families of parameterized models, as well as the (non)integrability.

With the general idea of re-assignment of dispersion in Fourier space, we can think of removing the dispersions for some of the modes, thus being of Hopf, while keeping the others being of KdV. For instance, unlike the alternating dispersion in aKdV, we can set all the ${}^o u$ -modes be dispersionless but the ${}^e u$ -modes still that of KdV. With a transition of the assigned dispersions, there must also be a transition of the thermalization properties. Analogous remarks can be made for the regularization issue for the un-truncated systems. For example, we cannot expect the system with a single mode being of KdV (with dispersion) and all the other of Hopf (with neither dispersion nor diffusion) be sufficient to regularize the solution of the full equation or to depress the thermalization of the Fourier Galerkin-truncated equation; and, we cannot expect a single mode being of Hopf and all the other of KdV be sufficient to lead to the finite-time blow-up of the solution of the full equation or lead to thermalization of the Fourier Galerkin-truncated equation with reasonably large number of modes.

4.2. Extensions: the mKdV case

The idea of even-odd alternation of the dispersion can of course be applied to other models, such as the Kawahara equation with the fifth-order dispersion in addition to the third-order one of KdV's model, the Benjamin-Ono equation [63] with second-order dispersion [from a simple Fourier representation of the Hilbert transform operator \mathcal{H} of the integro-differential operator of the dispersion term $\mu\mathcal{H}\{\partial_x^2 u\}$, thus the dispersion relation $\omega = \mu\text{sgn}(k)k^2$ [72, 31] and that the uni-directional phase velocity $\omega/k = \mu|k|$ which can also be split into even-odd branches and made alternative with opposite signs], the two-dimensional Kadomtsev-Petviashvili equation and its variations (where high-dimensional structures will be modified by the one-dimensional alternative dispersion), and, other models with different nonlinearities. However, the

⁷The k^0 -scaling of the spectra might be reminiscent of the partial thermalization of the nonlinear term: the high-wavenumber dispersive regularization, like that of the dissipative one, worked also as a kind of truncations leading to the thermalization, thus such “bottleneck” phenomena as in the dissipative case [68], which however is not the case here for lack of sharp decay at large- ns [with the hyperdispersion (see below in Sec. 4.3) of very high order, say].

extensions might not always be straightforward and trivial. Here, we show with the mKdV model how the alternation can be carried to a deeper level, which also serves to indicate other possibilities.

We want to use the same setup as ZK65 again, so some preliminaries about the corresponding modified Burgers equation, i.e., Eq. (2.24) without the dispersion term, should be prepared. The corresponding characteristics of the modified Burgers equation are defined by

$$dx/dt = v^2, \quad (4.1)$$

thus straight lines emanating from the x -axis with non-negative slopes. Solving the characteristic equation, we have

$$x = x_0 + v_0^2 t \text{ with } v_0 = \cos(\pi x_0), \quad (4.2)$$

and then, along the characteristic lines,

$$v(x, t) = v_0 = \cos(\pi x_0) = \cos\{\pi[x - t \cos^2(\pi x_0)]\} \quad (4.3)$$

which becomes singular with infinite derivatives at $t = 1/\pi = t_B$, as in Burgers' equation, and $x_{mB} = 1/4 + 1/(2\pi) \approx 0.41$ and $x'_{mB} = 5/4 + 1/(2\pi) \approx 1.41$, the latter slightly smaller than Burgers singular locations $x_B = 0.5$ and $x'_B = 1.5$, respectively. Note that any sinusoidal fields are the same up to phase shifts, so the above analysis is essentially the same as that of Lee-Bapty and Crighton [58] for the *sine* initial field.

However, we note that, according to our remark below Eq. (3.2) for the nonlinear interactions, no mKdV even-modes can be excited with the ZK65 initial field. That is, starting with the initial field with modes of only normalized wavenumber $|k| = 1$ (with the period normalized to be 2π),

$$\text{mod}(k + 1, 2) \text{ } {}^e\check{v}_k \equiv 0, \quad \forall k, \quad (4.4)$$

according to the quaternary interactions and the linear dispersion of mKdV, so it does not matter if we change the dispersion of the nonexistent even modes. Concerning the numerical method, we remark that the condition ${}^e v \equiv 0$ for this particular case of mKdV situation is implemented in our computations to enhance the accuracy [54, 73].

We can of course choose to start with a field including also the nonvanishing $k = 2$ modes, but, to be more consistent, we can also still further “deepen” the “alternation” strategy as follows. For an odd wavenumber $k = 2k' + 1$, we distinguish as before between even- and odd- k' (not k) modes and accordingly assign the alternative dispersions for them. So, to be more precise, we may use the terminologies of “even-of-odd (eo)” and “odd-of-odd (oo)”, thus the self-evident notations ${}^{eo}\mu$ and ${}^{oo}v$ etc. So, the previously mentioned “amKdV” for this particularly case studied in this work is specified as such (according to k' but not k), not as “aKdV”.

Wadati [60] further extended the extension of the inverse scattering method by Zakharov and Shabat (to nonlinear Schroedinger equation [61]) for mKdV to obtain soliton solutions (see recently Zhang and Yan [30] for more comprehensive bibliography and fresh developments). Periodic solutions have also been found later (see, e.g., Kevrekidis et al [69], and, Chowdurya, Ankiewicz and Akhmediev [71] and references therein).

Fig. 7 shows that indeed, again, we have the oscillations on both sides of the (anti)shocks. And, the corresponding other miscellaneous remarks also apply here (c.f., Fig. 8 for the space-time patterns). Of course there are many detailed differences between amKdV and aKdV, just as those between mKdV and KdV. For example, the amKdV shock emerge from x_{mB} with a strength around 0.5, similar to that of the largest solitary pulse at the valley which is not flat but goes slowly down 0.5 before the starting point x'_{mB} of the antishock. The plots of the corresponding decomposed components ${}^{eo}v$ and ${}^{oo}v$ support such “halfway house” shock nature which is actually rooted in the modified Burgers equation (of course!: c.f., Fig. 12 of Lee-Bapty and Crighton [58]). In other words, the (anti)shocks, trackable with our careful analysis though, show no apparent dominance, actually not even clear superiority over the oscillations. Or, we may say that the “shock-soliton duality” for amKdV is even more marked, and the shock feature of the “(anti)shocliton” is less clear. Actually, the mKdV equation may differ in a deeper way. For example, pulses local in space and time, not as those “breakdowns” of characteristic bars of solitons due to collisions in the left frame of




Figure 7: Velocity profiles of amKdV for two different sets of parameters (upper and lower rows, respectively).

Fig. 1 for KdV, are trackable in (the single frame of) the left panel of Fig. 8 for mKdV (c.f., also recent Ref. [74] and references therein): the visualization of the pattern depends on the details of the contour and multi-coloring details such as the maximum, minimum and number of levels, and more careful verification has been made by checking also the discrete-time profiles (snapshots); for example, we found “freak/rogue waves”, some of whose locations probed with circles in the left panel of Fig. 8, of amplitudes larger than 3.9, while most pulses are below 2 and a small fraction of them up to 3. As already seen in the left panel, the interactions of the solitons are more complicated than those of KdV ones (at least for this case), with, for instance, “dislocations” (strong “phase shifts” [21, 23] that strongly distorts the soliton trajectories to such a degree that a new global pattern emerges — indicated by the dashed-dot lines in the middle panel for the new global characteristics of the eventual drifting recursive evolution of the soliton groups⁸ — from those that would be determined by their own “genuine” velocities without interactions)⁹ when the bright soliton(s) interact with the dark one(s) and freak waves emerge. And our further numerical experiments indicate that amKdV depends on μ more nontrivially than aKdV, in the sense that new changes (on issues such as thermalization) may happen with decreasing μ , which however deserves a separate more systematic investigation.

The left two panels of Fig. 8 present different over-all patterns in different scales, which indicates nontriviality in the “recurrent” (truncated) dynamics, with (weak) chaoticity;¹⁰ and, as long as no precise periodicity exists, we cannot exclude the possibility of still different patterns at even larger (time) scales, with indefinite superperiods as in the FPUT experiments [35], say. The right panel (with three frames) of Fig. 8 for amKdV present soliton signature quantitatively quite different to that of aKdV: characteristics, for constant-velocity of solitons are much blurred with dominating wide ones, though still trackable; the mKdV drifting characteristics denoted by the dashed-dot lines in the middle panel (like those for the shock and antishock in aKdV)¹¹ are missing in amKdV, or needing much longer time to be visible.¹² Looking back at Fig. 7 for the velocity profiles at $t = 3.6t_B$, it is not surprising that the space-time patterns is not as clear

⁸Of course, as we will remark below, the group of solitons may actually be a single soliton which is weak relative to the background of its neighborhood.

⁹The early stage, say, for $t < 10t_{ZK}$, of the pattern does not appear to fit well into such “group trajectories” emerging later with the velocity much smaller than those of the constituting solitons.

¹⁰We may treat the mode truncation in our simulation as a kind of perturbation and refer to, for instance, Refs. [75, 76] for relevant discussions.

¹¹Continuing Footnote 9, it may indeed be possible to explain these characteristics as the signatures of some emerging (weak) solitons above the corresponding background v -levels.

¹²Indeed, the left frame appears to indicate that regular global pattern starts to emerge only after $t > 40t_{ZK}$, and numerical




Figure 8: v contour of mKdV (singular-frame left and middle panels for the same plot but for $t \leq 20t_{ZK}$ and $t \leq 80t_{ZK}$, respectively, with different multicolor levels: ${}^e v \equiv 0$ and ${}^o v \equiv v$, thus not shown) with $\mu = \delta^2$ as ZK65; and, in the right panel, contours of v (left frame), ${}^e v$ (middle frame) and ${}^o v$ (right frame) for amKdV, with ${}^e \mu = \delta^2 = -{}^o \mu$ and t also up to $80t_{ZK}$; others the same as in Fig. 5. Circles in the left panel probe those locations of contour values beyond the extremal levels (visible in the blowups easily manipulated from the electronic version).

as those of aKdV, due to the velocity properties we already mentioned. The patterns in the middle and right frames for the decomposed velocity components now seemingly present clearer soliton characteristics, due to the less highlighted characteristics for the weaker solitons (blue and red characteristics respectively outside and in the visionally dominating yellow wide ones in the middle frame, say). A complete understanding of such phenomena depends on that of the soliton interactions, and, to the best of our knowledge, the latter (say, particularly for the three-soliton-interaction phase shifts here for mKdV) is still not available.

The sign of the dispersion (relative to the nonlinear term), mathematically not essential for KdV, makes differences for mKdV [38]. Our amKdV can be viewed as a mixture of the focusing and defocusing cases.

Obviously, we can actually extend for also other initial fields the above second-level alternation on k' for both even and odd $k = 2k' + \text{mod}(k, 2)$ as a more general possibility, among others.

4.3. A tentative physical application

Like tuning the spin-orbit coupling of BECs [7, 8, 9] to engineer the dispersions, we can also accordingly design the latter in our aKdV models. Note that it is trivial to include the diffusive term to have our alternative-dispersion KdVB (aKdVB), and, according to the connection with quantum shocks [77], the corresponding two-sided oscillations may be associated to those found in BEC [9]. Our alternating-dispersion idea for the two-sided oscillations of the shock of course belongs to the nonconvex dispersion like the Kawahara model [1, 10], but is different to the latter, most obviously in their orders. Additional specific studies are needed to see which dispersion model is more appropriate for a particular physical system.

The aKdVB with appropriate diffusion (and forcing, if needed, say, for stationarity) can still produce the (anti)shoclon, and we should note particularly that, concerning the oscillations on both sides of the (anti)-shock, the numerical KdVB shocks with only one-sided oscillations in Ref. [5] actually could not

experiments with $t > 240t_{ZK}$ shows that more than 5 or even 10 times of longer time computation would be necessary to see the big picture, which however is a serious challenge for controlling the numerical errors, among others (such as the balancing of the presentation of both (soliton) details and the global picture), and is left for smarter techniques.




Figure 9: The aKdVB results with $m = 1$ (left: $\nu = 0.018/2$ and $\mu = 0.024/2$) and $m = 2$ (right: $\nu = 0.018/2$ and $\mu = 0.001/2$).

qualitatively explain the experimental results therein, and further efforts of modelling are necessary. Now, we consider the aKdVB model

$$\{\partial_t + \nu k^2 - \mu \hat{u} k^{2m+1} [\text{mod}(k, 2) - \text{mod}(k+1, 2)]\} \hat{u}_k = \hat{f}_k - \hat{i} \sum_{p+q=k} q \hat{u}_p \hat{u}_q. \quad (4.5)$$

Using the forcing $f(x) = (\sin x)/4$, two snapshots in the (quasi-)stationary stage from simulations over a 2π period, respectively with $m = 1$ and $m = 2$ (“hyperdispersion” mentioned earlier), as presented in Fig. 9, indeed have (anti)shoclitons with two-sided oscillations, but, unlike the aKdV ones in Figs. 2 and 4, with the oscillations far away from the shock being reasonably smoothed out by the diffusion term, thus closer to the ion-acoustic shocks measured in laboratory experiment of Ref. [5]. Instead of fixing $m = 1$ and tuning μ and ν , we have used $m = 2$ to obtain different oscillation features. Note that, like the aKdV case, the aKdVB shocliton and antishocliton in Fig. 9 do not collide but be constantly separated.

5. Conclusion and expectation

We have not applied any theory (such as modulation) or analytical approximation (such as asymptotics) but stucked to the basic formulation and “raw” data, excluding distractions from direct insights into the nature of problems such as integrability and the corresponding methods. Our analysis has revealed structural properties which lead to interesting issues similar to (nonconvergence and nonthermalization etc.) and beyond (invariants and integrability etc.) the original KdV equation. The idea of distinguishing and classifying different (Fourier or other decomposition-based generalized Fourier) components for dispersions of different characters, say, with the viewpoint of KdV being a special simplification of aKdV, offers a possible opportunity of looking at these issues from a broader and more unified angle of view. We have suggested the duality of shock and soliton, which may be justified if, for instance, the corresponding complex singularities [31] are found to be of the same nature in some sense.

Probably the “shocliton” (and “antishocliton” duo) is the most important result from the alternating-dispersion models. We don’t have a complete theory for such a discovery, and, in some sense, the timeline spirals back to the coordinate just before the birth of ZK65 and, hopefully, of the renaissance of solitary-wave relevant theories and applications. An important application of (anti-)shoclitons is the modeling of various combinations of waves and shocks, and, their effects on different problems, such as the turbulence transports (scalars, vectors and particles etc.) in Nature. Indeed, we have shown preliminary success in modelling a type of ion-acoustic shocks waves with aKdVB in Sec. 4.3. It is interesting to note that in Part II [55],

we will obtain, among others, not only the effects of different velocity structures on the density scalar of particles (say, cosmic dust for applications), but, in turn, also deeper insights on the shock and solitonic pulses in general, as already announced in advance for some properties of the spectra presented in Fig. 6.

Our analyses of the new idea of modelling have unavoidably touched many classical facets of the integrable systems but are still quite limited. For example, focusing on the very specific ZK65 initial field, we have not addressed the issue of “integrable turbulence”. Actually, in the latter context [32] associated to the discrimination of strongly and weakly integrable systems, it might be appropriate to classify the aKdV equation as weakly non-integrable: future works on the evolution of models of even-odd alternative dispersions from random fields should clarify this point.

Obviously, the assignments of dispersions for (generalized) different Fourier modes can be even generalized to those of distinct natures, with some modes assigned to be that of, say, Benjamin-Ono while others with that of Kawahara, keeping *mutatis mutandis* the variational principle and Hamiltonian formulation. This is because that the dispersion term is linearly superposable. For example, the additional fifth-order dispersion $\propto \partial_x^5 u$ corresponds to yet another term $\propto -\frac{1}{2}(\partial_x^2 u)^2$ [70] in the KdV Hamiltonian which then changes similar to our Eq. (2.16) according to the assignment of such a dispersion; and, the same works also for other more general linear operators such as the Hilbert transform with which we can extend the Benjamin-Ono equation with the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}_{12} = - \int_0^{2\pi} (\mu_1 \mathcal{H}\{\partial_x u\}u + \mu_2 \mathcal{H}\{\partial_x^3 u\}u + u^3/6)dx. \quad (5.1)$$

Further introducing a particular example of the even-odd alternations with ${}^{e/o}u$ defined previously by Eq. (2.10), we can also set

$${}^{e/o}\mathcal{H}_{12} = - \int_0^{2\pi} (\mu_1 \mathcal{H}\{\partial_x {}^{e/o}u\} {}^{e/o}u + \mu_2 \mathcal{H}\{\partial_x^3 {}^{e/o}u\} {}^{e/o}u + u^3/6)dx, \quad (5.2)$$

similar to that for aKdV but assigning even and odd modes with dispersions of different orders. We then have, respectively, an extended Benjamin-Ono equation (eBO¹³)

$$\partial_t u = \partial_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{H}_{12}}{\delta u} = -u\partial_x u - \mu_1 \mathcal{H}\{\partial_x^2 u\} + \mu_2 \mathcal{H}\{\partial_x^4 u\} \quad (5.3)$$

and an even-odd alternation of it (aeBO)

$$\partial_t u = \partial_x \frac{\delta {}^{e/o}\mathcal{H}_{12}}{\delta u} = -u\partial_x u - \mathcal{H}\left\{ \mu_1 \partial_x^2 \mathcal{F}^{-1}\{\text{mod}(k+1, 2)\mathcal{F}\{u\}\} + \mu_2 \partial_x^4 \mathcal{F}^{-1}\{\text{mod}(k, 2)\mathcal{F}\{u\}\} \right\}. \quad (5.4)$$

This is different to the collection of different(-order) dispersions for all modes, as happens to the Benjamin (without Ono but with KdV [62]) or the Kawahara [78] model, and we show in the Appendix that we can use eBO and aeBO to produce results similar to our previous ones of KdV and aKdV, respectively. Physically speaking, we are indeed quite flexible to model phenomena of complicated dispersion relation using a single model which combines various “nice” models with still the essential mathematical elegance of each. Some unification of the methods, or completely new but unified techniques for the problems of conserved quantities and integrability, or the lack thereof, would also be needed.

Motivated by the above even-order dispersions from Hilbert transforms, a dispersive derivative operator of real-number order α , ${}^{disp}\partial_x^\alpha \leftrightarrow i \text{sgn}(k)|k|^\alpha$, can be defined through the Fourier representation, and the dispersion naturally reduces to even- or odd-order by choosing α to be the integer as those appear in, say, the KdV or Benjamin(-Ono) equations.¹⁴ We then can start from such a general model for the grouping

¹³We have not particularly considered the precise physical relevance, but interested readers may consult the different assumptions in deriving the KdV, intermediate long-wave and Benjamin-Ono equations for internal waves [28] and consider possible variations that may apply to this model.

¹⁴The corresponding linear wave is not “dispersive” for $\alpha = 1$, but we reserve the terminology just for unification. The factor $\text{sgn}(k)$ is to cancel the contributions from wavenumbers $\pm k$ to ensure the *reality* of the (primitive) variable in the problems considered here, which however is not necessary in other situations such as the nonlinear Schroedinger type models.

and assignment of the dispersion term $\mu_\beta \text{disp} \partial_x^{\alpha_\beta} \beta u$, by introducing the *indicator/characteristic function* $E_\beta \chi$ [to replace, for example, the mod functions in Eq. (2.5)] and to select the $k \in E_\beta$ for wavenumber-sets of Fourier dispersion order α_β indexed by different β s, thus βu .

Finally, we wind up by coming back to remark on the physics and modelling. Our even-odd alternating dispersion does present opposite directions of the (linear) wave velocities, spiritually resonating with but also structurally differing to the two-sided (m)KdV(B) models for head-on collisions of nonlinear waves and/or shocks in various systems mentioned earlier. Further clarification of the relations between such two types of models and, if possible, extending the two-wave collision calculations of the latter to our (periodic) case would be of both theoretical and practical values. For example, it would be helpful for understanding aKdV normal soliton and (anti)shoclon to compute the phase shifts in the collisions between the (normal) solitons and between the (normal) soliton and (anti)shoclon. In particular, in Part II [55] we will be concerned with the cosmic dust [c.f., relevant discussions in Ref. [14] with two-sided KdV model for the head-on collision problem of plasmas containing (charged) dust grains] affected differently by KdV and aKdV dispersions.

Acknowledgement

The author thanks the communications on the historical information of FPUT and ZK65 with D. Levmore and E. Titi when Ref. [36] appeared.

Appendix: Numerical solutions of KdV and aKdV, and, those of eBO and aeBO models

The upper row of Fig. 10 is for a closer inspection of the KdV result (left) and for the comparison with that of the eBO (right), both for $t \leq 20t_{ZK}$, while similar aeBO results are presented in the lower row, for $t \leq 20t_{ZK}$ and $t \leq 80t_{ZK}$ respectively: all follow the setup and arrangement of Fig. 1. The longer-time aeBO results (lower-right panel) indicate that the aeBO “shoclitons” are traveling with nearly but not precisely constant speeds, similar to the aKdV case but quantitatively closer to constant speeds: the final relative error of energy conservation is $\approx 3/5000$, and a straight reference line is added to the left frame to indicate the nearly but not precisely constant speed.

References

- [1] P. Sprenger, M. A. Hoefer, Shock waves in dispersive hydrodynamics with nonconvex dispersion. *SIAM J Appl Math.* 77, 26–50 (2017).
- [2] J.-Z. Zhu, Transfer Loop of Korteweg-de Vries-Burgers Systems Associated to Classical Nonlinear Acoustics and Quantum Shock Waves, arXiv:2212.01252 [nlin.PS]
- [3] D. J. Korteweg, and G. de Vries, On the change of form of long waves advancing in a rectangular channel and on a new type of long stationary wave, *Philos. Mag.* 39, 422–443 (1895).
- [4] A. Vainchtein, Solitary waves in FPU-type lattices. *Physica D* 434, 133252 (2022).
- [5] Y. Nakamura, H. Bailung and P. Shukla, Observation of Ion-Acoustic Shocks in a Dusty Plasma. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 83, 1602–1605 (1999).
- [6] J. Huang et al., Ion Acoustic Shock Wave Formation and Ion Acceleration in the Interactions of Pair Jets with Electron-Ion Plasmas. *The Astrophysical Journal* 931, 1 (2022).
- [7] Y.-J. Lin, R. L. Compton, K. Jimenez-Garcia, J. V. Porto, and I. B. Spielman, Synthetic magnetic fields for ultracold neutral atoms, *Nature* 462 628–632 (2009).
- [8] Y.-J. Lin, K. Jimenez-Garcia, and I. B. Spielman, Spin-orbit-coupled Bose-Einstein condensates, *Nature* 471, 83–86 (2011).
- [9] M. E. Mossman, E. S. Delikatny, Michael McNeil Forbes, and P. Engels, Stability in turbulence: The interplay between shocks and vorticity in a superfluid with higher-order dispersion. *Phys. Rev. A* 102, 053310 (2020).
- [10] M. A. Hoefer, N. F. Smyth, P. Sprenger, Modulation theory solution for nonlinearly resonant, fifth-order Korteweg-de Vries, nonclassical, traveling dispersive shock waves. *Studies in Applied Mathematics* 142, 1 (2018).
- [11] G.-X. Huang, S.-Y. Lou and Z.-X. Xu, Head-on collisions between two solitary waves in a Reyleigh-Bérnard convecting fluid. *Phys. Rev. E* 47, R3830 (1993).
- [12] J.-K. Xue, Head-on collision of the blood solitary waves. *Physics Letters A* 331, 409–413 (2004).
- [13] H. Demiray, Head-on-collision of nonlinear waves in a fluid of variable viscosity contained in an elastic tube. *Chaos, Solitons and Fractals* 41, 1578–1586 (2009).
- [14] E.F. El-Shamy, W.A. Awad, On the characteristics of the head-on collision between two ion thermal waves in isothermal pair-ion plasmas containing charged dust grains. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* 45, 15–20 (2012).




Figure 10: Upper-row left panel with three frames arranged in the same way as the upper panel of Fig. 1: KdV-velocity contours for $t \leq 20t_{ZK}$, with the space-time trajectories/characteristics of the eight obvious solitons (identified by ZK65), together with yet a ninth one, marked by black dashed lines in the left frame. The smallest ninth one at $t = 3.1t_B$ in the lower-left panel of Fig. 1 is also identifiable (not as radiation [24]), as highlighted by the thinner dashed red lines in our simulation. Upper-row right panel with three frames: the eBO results, respectively corresponding to Figs. 1 and 5. Lower row: similar results from the same ZK65-fashion simulation of aeBO, with $\mu_1 = 0.02$ and $\mu_2 = 0.004^2$, for $t \leq 20t_{ZK}$ (left panel) and for $t \leq 80t_{ZK}$ (right).

- [15] P. Carbonaro, Head-on collision of ion-acoustic solitary and shock waves in a two-electron-temperature plasma. *Eur. Phys. J. D* 66, 302 (2012).
- [16] M. S. Alam and M. R. Talukder, Head-on Collision of Ion-Acoustic Shock and Solitary Waves in Collisionless Plasma with Pair Ions and Electrons. *Brazilian Journal of Physics* 49, 198–214 (2019).
- [17] L.-L. Tao, F.-P. Wang, D.-N. Gao, H. Zhang and W.-S. Duan, Effect of the pressure of the dust grains in strongly coupled dusty plasma on the head-on collision between two nonlinear waves. *J. Plasma Phys.* 86, 905860111 (2020).
- [18] T. Hashmi, R. Jahangir, W. Masood, B. M. Alotaibi, Sherif M. E. Ismael and S. A. El-Tantawy, Head-on collision of ion-acoustic (modified) Korteweg–de Vries solitons in Saturn’s magnetosphere plasmas with two temperature superthermal electrons. *Physics of Fluids* 35, 103104 (2023).
- [19] G. Zhang, H. Xiao, Y. Wang, Head-on collision of magnetosonic solitary waves at low latitudes ionosphere plasma. *Phys. Plasmas* 30, 012905 (2023).
- [20] Gardner, C. S., Greene, J. M., Kruskal, M. D., and Miura, R. M., Method for solving the Korteweg-de Vries equation, *Phys. Rev. Letters* 19, 1095–1097 (1967).
- [21] N. J. Zabusky and M. D. Kruskal, Interaction of “Soliton” in a Collisionless Plasma and the Recurrence of Initial States, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 15, 240 (1965).

- [22] X. Zhou, Chapter 6.2.2 - Zakharov-Shabat Inverse Scattering, in *Scattering*, editors: R. Pike and P. Sabatier, Academic Press (2002).
- [23] M.J. Ablowitz, H. Segur, *Solitons and the Inverse Scattering Transform*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1981.
- [24] A. R. Osborne, *Nonlinear Ocean Waves and the Inverse Scattering Transform*, International Geophysics Series, Vol 97, Elsevier/Academic Press (2010).
- [25] M. Okamura and T. Kawahara, Steady solutions of forced Burgers equation, *J. Phys. Soc. Jap.* 52, 3800 (1983).
- [26] U. Frisch and J. Bec, “Burgulence,” *Les Houches 2000: New Trends in Turbulence*, edited by M. Lesieur (Springer EDP-Sciences. 2001); J. Bec and K. Khanin, *Burgers turbulence*, *Physics Reports* 447, 1 (2007).
- [27] P. D. Lax, Integrals of nonlinear equations of evolution and solitary waves, *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* 21, 467–490 (1968).
- [28] M. J. Ablowitz and P. A. Clarkson, *Solitons, Nonlinear Evolution Equations and Inverse Scattering*, Cambridge University Press (1991).
- [29] G. Deng, G. Biondini, S. Trillo, Small dispersion limit of the Korteweg-de Vries equation with periodic initial conditions and analytical description of the Zabusky-Kruskal experiment. *Phys. D* 333, 137–147 (2016)
- [30] G. Zhang, Z. Yan, Inverse scattering transforms and soliton solutions of focusing and defocusing nonlocal mKdV equations with non-zero boundary conditions, *Physica D* 402, 132170 (2020).
- [31] J. A. C. Weideman, (2022). Dynamics of Complex Singularities of Nonlinear PDEs. In: Chacón Rebollo, T., Donat, R., Higuera, I. (eds) *Recent Advances in Industrial and Applied Mathematics*. SEMA SIMAI Springer Series, vol 1. Springer, Cham.
- [32] V. E. Zakharov, Turbulence in integrable systems. *Stud. Appl. Math.* 122, 219–234 (2009).
- [33] P. D. Lax and C. D. Levermore, The small dispersion limit of the Korteweg-de Vries equation: 1–3, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 36 (3, 5, 6) (1983) 253–290. 571–593; 809–830.
- [34] E. Fermi, J. Pasta, S. Ulam, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory report LA-1940 (1955). Published later in E. Segrè, ed., *Collected Papers of Enrico Fermi*, Vol. 2, U. Chicago Press, Chicago (1965).
- [35] J. L. Tuck, M. T. Menzel, The superperiod of the nonlinear weighted string (FPU) problem. *Adv. Math.* 9, 399 (1972).
- [36] T. Dauxois, Fermi, Pasta, Ulam, and a mysterious lady. *Physics Today* 61, 1, 55 (2008).
- [37] J. Nian, Note on nonlinear Schrödinger equation, KdV equation and 2D topological Yang-Mills-Higgs theory, *International Journal of Modern Physics A* 34, 1950074 (2019).
- [38] R. M. Miura, Korteweg-deVries equation and generalizations. I. A remarkable explicit nonlinear transformation, *J. Math. Phys.* 9, 1202–1204 (1968).
- [39] R. M. Miura, C. S. Gardner and M. D. Kruskal, Korteweg-deVries equation and generalizations. II. Existence of conservation laws and constants of motion, *J. Math. Phys.* 9, 1204–1209 (1968).
- [40] C. S. Gardner, Korteweg-de Vries Equation and Generalizations. IV. The Korteweg-de Vries Equation as a Hamiltonian System, *J. Math. Phys.* 12, 1548 (1971).
- [41] M. D. Kruskal, R. M. Miura, C. S. Gardner, and N. J. Zabusky, Korteweg-deVries Equation and Generalizations. V. Uniqueness and Nonexistence of Polynomial Conservation Laws. *J. Math. Phys.* 11, 952 (1970).
- [42] C. S. Gardner, J. M. Greene, M. D. Kruskal and R. M. Miura, Korteweg-de Vries Equation and Generalizations. VI. Methods for Exact Solution. *COMMUNICATIONS ON PURE AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS*, VOL. XXVII, 97-1 33 (1974)
- [43] S.P. Novikov, The periodic problem for the Korteweg-de Vries equation, *Funct. Anal. Appl.* 8, 236–246 (1974).
- [44] P. Lax and J. M. Hyman, Periodic Solutions of the KdV Equation. *COMMUNICATIONS ON PURE AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS*, VOL. XXVIII, 141-188 (1975)
- [45] M. J. Ablowitz, J. T. Cole, I. Rumanov. Whitham equations and phase shifts for the Korteweg–de Vries equation. *Proc. R. Soc. A* 476, 20200300 (2020).
- [46] R.-Z. Gong and D.-S. Wang, Whitham modulation theory of defocusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation and the classification and evolutions of solutions with initial discontinuity, *Acta Phys. Sin.* 72, 100503 (2023).
- [47] C. H. Su, and C. S. Gardner, Korteweg-deVries equation and generalizations. IZZ. Derivation of the Korteweg-deVries equation and Burgers’ equation, *J. Math. Phys.* 10, 536–539 (1969).
- [48] E. M. Stein and R. Shakarchi, *Fourier Analysis: An Introduction*. Princeton University Press, 2003.
- [49] A. V. Oppenheim, and A. S. Willsky. *Signals and Systems*. Prentice Hall, 1982.
- [50] P. J. Morrison, Hamiltonian description of the ideal fluid. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 70, 467 (1998).
- [51] V. I. Arnold and B. Khesin, *Topological Methods in Hydrodynamics*. Springer (1998).
- [52] G. B. Whitham. Non-linear dispersive waves. *Proc R Soc Lond A.* 283, 238–261 (1965).
- [53] N. J. Zabusky, A synergetic approach to problems of nonlinear dispersive wave propagation and interaction, *Proc. Symp. on Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*, Academic Press, 1967.
- [54] The Fourier pseudospectral method marches according to the spectral space dynamics, such as Eq. (2.2), with the nonlinear term computed in physical space. This involves the fast Fourier transform and dealiasing. When computing the quadratic nonlinear term, we apply the 2/3 rule for dealiasing, which can be repeated for dealing with the higher order nonlinearity such as the cubic one in the computation of the modified KdV equation below. When large-wavenumber modes or higher-order dispersions (such as the fourth-order one in the extended Benjamin-Ono equation below) are involved, the stiffness problem may be severe, which is overcome by using the exponential time differencing scheme [particularly the “ETDRK4” one suggested by S. M. Cox and P. C. Matthews, “Exponential Time Differencing for Stiff Systems”, *J. Comput. Phys.* 176, 430 (2002)].
- [55] J.-Z. Zhu, Even-odd alternative dispersions and beyond. Part II. Noninertial and inertial particles, and, astrophysical chirality analogy, arXiv:2311.15659 [physics.flu-dyn].

- [56] S. Wang, X. Y. Tang, S. Y. Lou, Soliton fission and fusion: Burgers equation and Sharma-Tasso-Olber equation, *Chaos Solitons Fractals* 21, 231–239 (2004).
- [57] G. B. Whitham, *Linear and Nonlinear Waves*. Wiley, New York (1974)
- [58] I. P. Lee-Bapty & D. G. Crighton, Nonlinear wave motion governed by the modified Burgers’ equation. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. A* 323, 173–209 (1987).
- [59] J. Colliander, M. Keel, G. Staffilani, H. Takaoka, and T. Tao. Sharp global well-posedness for KdV and modified KdV on \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{T} . *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 16, 705–749 (2003)
- [60] M. Wadati, The modified Korteweg-de Vries equation, *J. Phys. Soc. Japan* 34, 1289–1296 (1973).
- [61] V. Zakharov and A. Shabat, Interaction between solitons in a stable medium, *Sov. Phys. JETP* 37, 823–828 (1973).
- [62] T. B. Benjamin, Solitary and Periodic Waves of a New Kind. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 354(1713), 1775–1806 (1996).
- [63] J. C. Saut, (2019). Benjamin-Ono and Intermediate Long Wave Equations: Modeling, IST and PDE. In: Miller, P., Perry, P., Saut, J.C., Sulem, C. (eds) *Nonlinear Dispersive Partial Differential Equations and Inverse Scattering*. Fields Institute Communications, vol 83. Springer, New York, NY.
- [64] W. Craig, T. Kappeler and W. Strauss, Gain of Regularity for Equations of KdV Type. *Annales de l’ Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse non linéaire*, 9, 147–186 (1992).
- [65] M. K. Verma, S. Chatterjee, A. Sharma and A. Mohapatra, Equilibrium states of Burgers and KdV equations. *Phys. Rev. E* 105, 034121 (2022).
- [66] R. C. Tolman, *Principles of statistical mechanics* (Oxford University Press, 1938).
- [67] R. V. Abramov, G. Kovacic and A. J. Majda, Hamiltonian Structure and Statistically Relevant Conserved Quantities for the Truncated Burgers-Hopf Equation. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics LVI*, 0001–0046 (2003).
- [68] U. Frisch et al., Hyperviscosity, Galerkin truncation and bottlenecks in turbulence. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 101, 144501 (2008).
- [69] P. G. Kevrekidis, A. Khare, A. Saxena, G. Herring, On some classes of mKdV periodic solutions. *J. Phys. A* 37, 10959 (2004).
- [70] J. Vašíček, Symmetries and conservation laws for a generalization of Kawahara equation, *Journal of Geometry and Physics* 150, 103579 (2020).
- [71] A. Chowdurya, A. Ankiewicz, and N. Akhmediev, Periodic and rational solutions of modified Korteweg-de Vries equation. *Eur. Phys. J. D* 70, 104 (2016).
- [72] P. Gerard, T. Kappeler, P. Topalov, On the Benjamin–Ono equation on \mathbb{T} and its periodic and quasiperiodic solutions. *J. Spectr. Theory* 12, 169–193 (2022).
- [73] Such a semi-analytical treatment turns out to be crucial for the simulation to be able to run up to $80t_{ZK}$; otherwise, the numerical noise of ϵ_v eventually overwhelms, and the time marching can hardly go beyond $20t_{ZK}$, with of course the details depending on the size of time step etc. Similar semi-analytical scheme was also designed [J.-Z. Zhu, Real Schur flow computations, helicity fastening effects and Bagua-pattern cyclones, *Physics of Fluids* 33, 107112 (2021)] for the component-wise dimensionally reduced flow which is supposed to be of some limit under particular constraint(s). This should be common to similar nonlinear problems with constantly vanishing modes which are unstable (c.f., e.g., the parity issue in the so-called “FPU α -model”: G. P. Berman and F. M. Izrailev, *The Fermi–Pasta–Ulam problem: Fifty years of progress*, *Chaos* 15, 015104 (2005), and references therein).
- [74] G. Chen, J. Liu, Soliton resolution for the focusing modified KdV equation, *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse non linéaire* 38, 2005–2071 (2021).
- [75] B. Birnir, Chaotic perturbations of KdV I. Rational solutions, *Physica D* 19, 238–254 (1986).
- [76] K.B. Blyuss, Chaotic behaviour of solutions to a perturbed Korteweg—de Vries equation, *Reports on Mathematical Physics* 49, 29–38 (2002).
- [77] M. Kulkarni and A. G. Abanov, *Phys. Rev. A* 86, 033614 (2012).
- [78] T. Kawahara, Oscillatory solitary waves in dispersive media, *J. Phys. Soc. Japan* 33, 260–264 (1972).